

**CM No.9247-48 of 2016 and  
RA No.238 of 2016 in  
CWP No.15477 of 2014**

BALBIR KAUR

VS.

PRESIDING OFFICER-CUM-S.D.M., KURUKSHETRA AND OTHERS

Present: Mr. Sudershan Goel, Advocate  
with Ms. Rupinder Kaur, Advocate  
for the applicant-petitioner.

**CM No.9247 of 2016**

Prayer in this application is for exemption from filing the certified copy of judgment dated 29.06.2015 passed by this Court and Notification dated 26.05.2015 issued by Haryana Government.

Application is allowed.

Exemption from filing the certified copies of aforesaid documents is granted subject to just exceptions.

**CM No.9248 of 2016 and  
RA No.238 of 2016**

Prayer in this application is for condonation of delay of 400 days in filing the present review application. The only ground which has been projected for filing the application for review at this belated stage after a delay of 400 days, is that the Notification dated 26.05.2015 had been issued by the Haryana Government notifying a comprehensive action plan for the protection of life and property of senior citizens, according to which it has been asserted that the competent authority to entertain application for eviction under Section 22(2) read with Rule 23 of The Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007. He, thus, contends that the delay which has occurred is neither intentional nor deliberate.

This contention of learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner cannot be accepted in the light of the fact that the Notification which was issued by the Government of Haryana is dated 26.05.2015 and the judgment which was pronounced by this Court was 29.06.2015. No reason whatsoever, much less justifiable, can be given by asserting that since the copy of the Notification was not available with the applicant-petitioner, the delay has occurred. The said ground cannot be accepted and accordingly the application stands dismissed.

As regards the review application which has been preferred, the same would not be maintainable in the light of the dismissal of the application for condonation of delay and in any case, in the light of the comprehensive order passed by this Court, the plea as taken in the review application, would not be of any consequence as far as the present case is concerned as the Court with regard to the jurisdiction has specifically stated and come to the conclusion that this Court had the jurisdiction to entertain the writ petition in exercise of its constitutional powers.

The review application, therefore, stands dismissed.

**October 25, 2016**  
*Puneet*

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)**  
**JUDGE**