

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(219)

CWP-20241-2019

Date of decision: - 04.09.2023

Amarjit Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

District Magistrate-cum-Deputy Commissioner Ludhiana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- None for the petitioners.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ravinder Pankaj, Advocate
for Mr. Maninder Bharthy, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 07.12.2018 (Annexure P-3) passed by respondent No.1 whereby the petition filed by respondents No.2 and 3 under Section 22 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 for providing protection of life and property of the respondents and further seeking eviction of the petitioners from the property has been allowed.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3 has pointed out that in the present case, on 24.07.2019, Co-ordinate

Bench of this Court had directed the petitioner to deposit Rs.1 lakh in the name of respondent No.2 and the petitioner had further recorded the statement to the effect that during the pendency of the petition a sum of Rs.10,000/- each month would be made to the parents and a lump sum amount of Rs.25,000/- would be paid towards litigation costs. It has further been pointed out that on 14.10.2022, Co-ordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order: -

“Mr. Maninder Bharthy, Advocate, files power of attorney on behalf of respondent No.2 and 3, same is taken on record. He seeks time to file written statement.

At the request of learned counsel for the petitioners, adjourned to 06.04.2023.

In the meantime, since the interim directions qua payment of compensation has not been complied with by the petitioners, therefore, the interim order dated 13.09.2019 stands vacated.

14.10.2022

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)
JUDGE”

3. None has appeared on behalf of the petitioners to rebut the said aspect.

4. Dismissed for non-prosecution.

September 04, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No