

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**983 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO.168 OF 2020
IN WP/11807/2019**

**SIMA DIPAK AHIRRAO PATIL
VERSUS
THE SENIOR CITIZEN APPELLATE TRIBUNAL AND OTHERS**

...
**Advocate for Applicant : Patil Prakashsing B.
Advocate for Respondent No.4 : Mr.A.S.Savale
Adv.Mr. Menezes Joslyn for R/5**

...

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL, J.
DATE : 05/11/2020**

Heard learned Advocate Mr.Patil for the petitioner.

2] By way of this Petition the petitioner is seeking review of the judgment and order passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.11807 of 2019. The learned advocate for the petitioner submits that after pronouncement of the judgment it transpired that in Civil Appeal No.2483/2020 arising out of S.L.P (C) No.1048/2020 the Supreme Court in the matter of Satish Chander Ahuja V/s Sneha Ahuja has upheld right of a daughter in law to occupy a shared household under the provisions of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act. He would point out that even in the present matter the petitioner should get a right to occupy a shared household. He would therefore submit that this Court having decided the matter after the Supreme Court had pronounced judgment in Satish Chandra Ahuja's case, it is a fit case to review the judgment and order under Review.

3] I have carefully gone through the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of Satish Chandra Ahuja. It is apparent that the Supreme Court has considered the matter under the provisions of Domestic Violence Act.

4] However, the present matter is arising out of provisions of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act 2007 which is a special statute. The mother in law of the petitioner was making a grievance that her house property was occupied by the petitioner daughter in law and in that context after considering the scope of the relevant provisions of that statute this Court has dismissed the Writ Petition holding that the petitioner was merely a daughter in law and was occupying the house property of her mother in law. In my considered view, the issue involved in the present Petition was not the issue before the Supreme Court in the case of Satish Chandra Ahuja and the petitioner is not entitled to derive any benefit therefrom.

5] There is no error apparent on the face of the record which would enable this Court to review the judgment and order.

6] The Review Application is dismissed.

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]