

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CWP No.14587 of 2018

Date of decision: May 31, 2018

Satwinder Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

Additional Deputy Commissioner & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. Naveen Batra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Rajan Gupta, J.

Petitioner poses a challenge to order dated 04.05.2018, passed by Addl. Deputy Commissioner-cum-Appellate Tribunal, Roopnagar, whereby application under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Act, 2007, filed by respondent No.2 has been accepted and petitioner as well as proforma respondent No.3 have been directed to vacate the house in question within a period of 30 days from the date of order.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has urged before this court that the order suffers from patent illegality. Thus, same deserves to be set-aside.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and given careful thought to the facts of the case.

Brief factual matrix of the case is that respondent No.2, father-in-law of petitioner and father of proforma respondent No.3, who is senior citizens, filed an application under the provisions of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 against the petitioner as well as proforma respondent, seeking their eviction from the house, situated

in Mohalla Ashishganj Sahib, Anandpur Sahib. During proceedings, respondent No.2 stated before the authority that petitioner alongwith her husband i.e. proforma respondent No.3 used to harass and humiliate him without any reason. They also started putting pressure upon respondent No.2 to transfer the house in question in their name. Petitioner also got a false case registered against him regarding demand of dowry. After considering entire material on record, the, Additional Deputy Commissioner, Roopnagar allowed the application filed by respondent No.2 and directed the petitioner and her husband to vacate the said house within a period of 30 days. The authority also directed Sub Divisional Magistrate, Sri Anandpur Sahib and Dy. Superintendent of Police, Anandpur Sahib to get the house vacated.

I find no infirmity with the order. In judgment reported as ***Gurpreet Singh vs. State of Punjab and others, 2016 (1) R.C.R. (Civil) 324***, a Division Bench of this court held as under:-

“12. The petitioner is a licensee living in the premises on the basis of concession given by his father to live in the property owned by him. As a licensee, the petitioner is only permitted to enjoy the possession of the property licensed but without creating any interest in the property. A licence stands terminated the moment the licensor conveys a notice of termination of a licence. There is no vested right of any kind in the licensee to remain in possession of the property licensed. Admittedly, respondent No.4 is the owner of the property in question. The petitioner is living in part of the property. Such property owned by respondent No.4 is required to be protected as mandated by Section 22 of the Act read with Rule 23 of the Rules and para 1 of the Action Plan. There cannot be any effective protection of property of the senior citizens unless the District

Magistrate has the power to put the senior citizen into possession of the property and/or to restrain or eject the person who wishes to interfere in the possession of the property of the senior citizen. Protection of the property of a senior citizen includes all incidences, rights and obligations in respect of property in question. Once a senior citizen makes a complaint to District Magistrate against his son to vacate the premises of which the son is a licensee, such summary procedure will ensure for the benefit of the senior citizen. The petitioner would have no right to resist his eviction only on the ground that the Act does not contemplate eviction of an occupant. Eviction is one part of the right to protect the property of a senior citizen which right could be exercised by a senior citizen in terms of provisions of the statute, Rules framed and the Action Plan notified.”

In view of above, I am of the considered view that the pleas raised before this court are without any merit. Same are hereby rejected. Petition is hereby dismissed.

May 24, 2018
'Rajpal'

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:

Yes / No