



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 09.08.2024

PRONOUNCED ON : 14.08.2024

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

W.P.No.9414 of 2024  
and W.M.P.Nos.10424 & 10425 of 2024

R.Srinivasan

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The District Collector,  
Office of the Chennai Collectorate,  
Chennai – 600 001.

2. The District Revenue Officer,  
Office of Chennai Collectorate,  
Chennai – 600 001.

3. S. Rajan

4. R.Geetha

5. Sumathi Dcruz

6. P.Rekha

7. S.Sathish Kumar

8. S.Mohanaraj

(R4 to R8 are impleaded as per  
order dated 25.06.2024 in  
WMP.No.16585 of 2024 in  
W.P.No.9414 of 2024)

...Respondents

**Prayer:** Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India  
for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

impugned order passed by the first respondent in Sa.Mu.Na.Ka.No.1821/A1/2023 dated 31.10.2023 which confirms order of the second respondent bearing Na.Ka.No.A7/1615/2023 dated 20.07.2023 and quash the same and direct the third respondent to provide accommodation in the property at No.18, Periyaplayathamman Kovil Street, Maduma Nagar, Perambur, Chennai – 600 011, and cancel the settlement deed bearing No.2273 of 2019 dated 12.07.2019, registered in Sembiam Sub Register Office, settled by the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Manisekaran  
For Respondents  
For R1 & R2 : Mr.M.S.Arasa Kumar  
Government Advocate  
For R3 : Mr.A.Palaniappan  
For R4 to R7 : No appearance

### **ORDER**

This writ petition has been filed challenging the order passed by the first respondent dated 31.10.2023, confirming the order passed by the second respondent dated 20.07.2023, thereby dismissing the complaint lodged by the petitioner seeking cancellation of the settlement deed dated 12.07.2019, under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Act, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”).

2. The petitioner is the father and the respondents 3 to 8 are the



*W.P.No.9414 of 2024*

sons and daughters. The petitioner got married one S.Baby and gave birth to three daughters and one son viz., the third respondent herein. He also married her own sister viz., Shantha as second wife and gave birth to two sons. The petitioner was doing wholesale paper business and out of the income from the said business, the petitioner brought up his children in good manner and educated them well and also got them married. Out of his earnings, the petitioner had purchased several properties in his name and also in the name of his two wives.

3. While being so, the petitioner settled three properties in favour of his elder son viz., the third respondent herein, by way of three settlement deeds. On the date of execution of third settlement deed viz., on 12.07.2019, the third respondent had executed undertaking affidavit and agreed to collect all the rents from the property settled in favour of the third respondent by the petitioner for his livelihood. However, after execution of settlement deed, the third respondent refused to give the rental income to the petitioner and his wife as agreed by the undertaking affidavit.

4. Further, the petitioner mortgaged other properties and



*W.P.No.9414 of 2024*

WEB COPY  
availed loan to the tune of Rs.30,00,000/- for the third respondent's business in the name of “New Star Foundation”. Now the third respondent is doing well in the said business. However, the third respondent refused to permit the petitioner to collect the rents from the settled property for his livelihood. He also failed to maintain the petitioner and his wife and now they are residing in a rental premises. Therefore, the petitioner was constrained to lodge complaint before the second respondent under Section 23 of the Act.

5. The second respondent after enquiry, rejected the complaint filed by the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is receiving the rental amount from the settled property. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the first respondent and the same was also dismissed on the very same ground and also observed that the petitioner can able to maintain himself from the income derived from the settled property.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was not permitted to collect any rent from the property



*W.P.No.9414 of 2024*

settled in favour of the third respondent. Further, the petitioner is residing in the rental premises and he is struggling even for his daily livelihood.

He also produced photographs to show that the third respondent is well off and having huge house and new variant cars. He is also running sophisticated life. That apart, the petitioner and his wife are suffering from all their old age ailments and they could not able to meet out their medical expenses.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the third respondent submitted that there is no proof to show that the petitioner has right to collect rent from the property settled in favour of the third respondent. That apart, the petitioner owned other properties and he has permanent income. The petitioner had pick and choose the third respondent alone and filed the complaint under Section 23 of the Act. The petitioner also settled so many properties in favour of other sons and daughters and they have not maintained the petitioner. However, the petitioner did not file any complaint as against them. The third respondent is being the son of his first wife, the petitioner is treating him as differently.

7.1. He further submitted that the petitioner failed to fulfill the



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

two conditions as contemplated under Section 23 of the Act. The settlement deed dated 12.07.2019, does not contain any clause that the third respondent shall have to maintain the petitioner till his life time. In the absence of the said condition, the complaint itself is not maintainable under Section 23 of the Act. In support of his contention, he relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Sudesh Chhikara Vs. Ramti Devi*** in Order dated **06.12.2022** in ***Civil Appeal No. 174 of 2021***, which reads as follows:-

*“12. Sub-section (1) of Section 23 covers all kinds of transfers as is clear from the use of the expression “by way of gift or otherwise”. For attracting sub-section (1) of Section 23, the following two conditions must be fulfilled:*

- a. The transfer must have been made subject to the condition that the transferee shall provide the basic amenities and basic physical needs to the transferor; and*
- b. the transferee refuses or fails to provide such amenities and physical needs to the transferor.*

*13. If both the aforesaid conditions are satisfied, by a legal fiction, the transfer shall be deemed to have been made by fraud or coercion or undue influence. Such a transfer then becomes voidable at the instance of the transferor and the Maintenance Tribunal gets jurisdiction to declare the transfer as void.*



WEB COPY

*14. When a senior citizen parts with his or her property by executing a gift or a release or otherwise in favour of his or her near and dear ones, a condition of looking after the senior citizen is not necessarily attached to it. On the contrary, very often, such transfers are made out of love and affection without any expectation in return. Therefore, when it is alleged that the conditions mentioned in sub-section (1) of Section 23 are attached to a transfer, existence of such conditions must be established before the Tribunal.*

*15. Careful perusal of the petition under Section 23 filed by respondent no. 1 shows that it is not even pleaded that the release deed was executed subject to a condition that the transferees (the daughters of respondent no. 1) would provide the basic amenities and basic physical needs to respondent no. 1. Even in the impugned order dated 22nd May 2018 passed by the Maintenance Tribunal, no such finding has been recorded. It seems that oral evidence was not adduced by the parties. As can be seen from the impugned judgment of the Tribunal, immediately after a reply was filed by the appellant that the petition was fixed for arguments. Effecting transfer subject to a condition of providing the basic amenities and basic physical needs to the transferor - senior citizen is sine qua non for applicability of sub-section (1) of Section 23. In the present case, as stated*



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

WEB COPY

*earlier, it is not even pleaded by respondent no. 1 that the release deed was executed subject to such a condition.*

*16. We have perused the counter affidavit filed by respondent no. 1. Even in the counter, it is not pleaded that the release was subject to such a condition. It is merely pleaded that the appellant had no intention to take care of her mother. Thus, the order of the Maintenance Tribunal cannot be sustained as the twin conditions incorporated in sub-Section (1) of Section 23 were not satisfied. Unfortunately, the High Court has not adverted to the merits of the case at all.*

*17. There is an application for intervention on behalf of a developer. The intervenor claims that he is a bona fide buyer of a part of the land subject matter of the release deed from the appellant and that he has carried out substantial work of development. It is not necessary for us to deal with the rights claimed by the intervenor. All questions regarding the rights claimed by the intervenor are left open to be decided in appropriate proceedings.”*

Thus, it is clear from the above judgment that there are two essential pre-conditions in order to invoke the provisions of Section 23 of the Act and that the documents should have been executed after coming into force of the Act and it should contain a clause imposing an obligation on the settlee or transferee to maintain settlor or transferor.



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

WEB COPY 8. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

9. The petitioner lodged complaint to cancel the settlement deed executed in favour of the third respondent on 12.07.2019 vide document No.2273/2019. On perusal of the settlement deed executed in favour of the third respondent revealed that the petitioner had settled the property in order to make arrangement for the third respondent during his life time to settle him down. It was executed due to love and affection on the third respondent. It is relevant to extract Section 23 of the Act as follows :-

*“23. Transfer of property to be void in certain circumstances:-*

*1. Where any senior citizen who, after the commencement of this Act, has by way of gift or otherwise, his property, subject to the condition that the transferee shall provide the basic amenities and basic physical needs to the transferor and such transferee refuses or fails to provide such amenities and physical needs, the said transfer of property shall be deemed to have been made by fraud or coercion or under undue*



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

*influence and shall at the option of the transferor be declared void by the Tribunal.*

*2. Where any senior citizen has a right to receive maintenance out of an estate and such estate or part , thereof is transferred, the right to receive maintenance may be enforced against the transferee if the transferee has notice of the right, or if the transfer is gratuitous; but not against the transferee for consideration and without notice of right.*

*3. If any senior citizen is incapable of enforcing the rights under sub-sections (1) and (2), action may be taken on his behalf by any of the organisation referred to in Explanation to sub-section (1) of section 5. ”*

Therefore, if the settlee failed to provide basic amenities and basic physical needs to the settlor and such settlee refuses or fails to provide such amenities and physical needs, the said settlement of subject property shall be deemed to have been made by fraud or coercion or under undue influence.

10. Section 23 of the Act provides that when a property has been transferred by way of gift or otherwise by the senior citizen on the condition that the transferee or ownee shall provide the basic amenities



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

and basic physical needs to the transferor or the owner, but such transferee or owner subsequently fails to provide such amenities, then it would be deemed that the transfer was made by fraud, or coercion or under undue influence and the transferor would have the option of obtaining declaration that such transfer was void. In the case on hand, the father has settled the subject property to the son out of love and affection and as a reward for the respect, reward and care that the son had shown to the father. It is relevant to extract the relevant portion of the settlement deed dated 12.07.2019 as follows:-

"....அப்படி ஆண்டு அனுபவித்து வருகின்ற 2397 சதுரடி பரப்பளவு கொண்ட கதவு எண்.18-ம் எண்ணுள்ள மனையும் அதிலடங்கிய வீடு, மின் இணைப்பு உள்படவுமான சொத்தினை, நீ எனது குமாரரானபடியாலும், உன் மீது எனக்கு இருக்கும் அன்பு, பற்று, பாசம், விகவாசம் உள்ளதின் காரணமாகவும், உனது வருங்கால வாழ்க்கைக்கு ஒரு ஏற்பாடு செய்து வைக்க வேண்டும் என்கிற தெளிவான திட சிந்தனையுடனும், யாருடைய தூண்டுதல் இல்லாமலும் இந்த செட்டில்மெண்ட் பத்திரத்தை இன்றைய தேதியில் உனது பெயருக்கு பதிவு செய்துக் கொடுத்துவிட்டேன்."

11. On a perusal of the settlement deed, it reveals that being



*W.P.No.9414 of 2024*

pleased with the care, love, affection, respect and good behaviour, the father had executed settlement deed as a reward in favour of his son and in discharge of his responsibilities towards the son, he has also given future security to the son. Further, though no consideration was passed for execution of settlement deed, the consideration for executing the settlement deed is based on human conduct, caring and conscious. The transfer was made admittedly out of love and affection. The settlor in the settlement deed would expect in the natural course of human conduct that the settlee continues to behave in the same manner as behaved before execution of the settlement deed. Therefore, it would form part of condition of the transaction for future conduct as well.

12. Thus, in the absence of any other circumstances, it must be presumed that the settlor expects continuation of the care and love from the settlee even after the execution of the settlement deed in the same manner, the settlor was taken care prior to the execution of the settlement deed. Further, the intention of the Legislature and terms of the Act would declare certain transfer as void, taking note of the fact that by taking advantage of the emotionally dependent senior citizens, relatives grab the property on the pretext of providing emotional support. Therefore, the



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

Legislature thought that such transaction could be declared as void, as the conduct leading to the transaction was based on malice or fraud.

Therefore, the condition referred under Section 23 has to be understood based on the conduct of the settlor and not with reference to the specific stipulation in the deed of transfer. Therefore, it is sufficient if the settlee breached the promise given to the settlor at the time of execution of the settlement deed.

13. Further, sub-Section 2 of Section 23 of the Act envisages the situation where a senior citizen has a right to receive the maintenance out of an estate. Where such a right exists, the right of maintenance can be enforced, where the estate or a portion of it is transferred against a transferor, who has noticed the right or if the transfer is gracious. The right however cannot be enforced against a transferee for consideration without notice of right. It is also relevant to rely upon the judgement of this Court in the case of *Mohamed Dayan Vs. District Collector.*, order dated **08.09.2023** made in *W.P.No.28190 of 2022* in which this Court, after discussing various judgements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various judgements of High Court including the cases referred by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, held as follows:-



WEB COPY

*“33. Close reading of the principles considered by the various High Courts and the Supreme Court, there is no ambiguity with reference to the purpose and object sought to be achieved under the provisions of the Senior Citizen Act. Section 4(2) of the Act, unambiguously stipulates that the obligation of the children or the relative, as the case may be, to maintain a senior citizen extends to the needs of such citizen so that senior citizen may lead a normal life.*

*34. In the context of the adoption of the phrase “lead a normal life” Rule 20(2)(i) of the Maintenance of Senior Citizen Rules, enumerates that “it shall be the duty of the District Collector to ensure that life and property of senior citizens of the District are protected and they are able to live with security and dignity”. Therefore, normal life includes security and dignity. Thus the normal life as indicated under Section 4(2) of the Act, is not mere life, but a life with security and dignity. In the context of Article 21 of the Constitution of India, life includes decent medical facility, food, shelter with dignity and security. All such combined necessities of human life is falling under the term “Normal Life” emboldened under Section 4(2) of the Senior Citizen Act. Therefore, simply providing food and shelter would be insufficient. But life includes providing of decent medical facilities, food, shelter and other requirements with dignity in commensuration with the status of the family and*



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

*taking into consideration of the living style of the senior citizen throughout.*

*35. Therefore, the children defending their case merely on the ground that they are willing to provide food and shelter, cannot be taken as a ground for the purpose of sustaining the Settlement Deed executed by the senior citizen. The requirement of the provisions are to be complied in its real spirit and in the event of an iota of doubt, the Authority Competent is empowered to cancel the Settlement Deed or Gift Deed, as the case may be, in order to protect the normal life of senior citizen.*

*36. Section 4(3) denotes, the obligation of the children to maintain his or her parent extends to the needs of such parent either father or mother or both, as the case may be, so that such parents may lead a normal life. Therefore, it is an obligation on the part of the children to maintain his or her parents and ensure the parents to lead a normal life. In the event of complaint, the Authorities Competent are expected to ensure that the senior citizen and their life and dignity are protected. The above provision is to be read in conjunction with the Rules framed under the Act.*

*37. Rule 20 of the Maintenance of Senior Citizen Rules, provide duties and powers of the District Collector. The District Collector is casted upon the duty to ensure that*



*the life and property of citizens of the District are protected and other people to live with security and dignity. Therefore, it is the statutory duty on the part of the District Collector to protect the safety and security of senior citizens in his District. Thus the complaint filed by the senior citizen, cannot be treated lightly. Such complaints are to be enquired into in a pragmatic manner, so as to understand the real grievances of the senior citizen and accordingly, all appropriate actions are to be initiated to provide safety, security and to protect the dignity of the senior citizen.*

*38. The Kerala High Court observed in the case of Radhamani and Others (cited supra), Section 23(1) of the Senior Citizen Act, cannot be interpreted to the disadvantage of the senior citizen. Section 23(1) of the Act contemplates that “Where any senior citizen who, after the commencement of this Act, has by way of gift or otherwise, his property, subject to the condition that the transferee shall provide the basic amenities and basic physical needs to the transferor and such transferee refuses or fails to provide such amenities and physical needs, the said transfer of property shall be deemed to have been made by fraud or coercion or under undue influence and shall at the option of the transferor be declared void by the Tribunal”. The phrase “ subject to the condition that the transferee shall provide the basic amenities” does not mean that the*



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

*Gift or Settlement Deed should contain any such condition expressly. “Subject to the condition” as employed in Section 23(1), is to be holistically understood with reference to the subsequent phrase i.e., “deemed to have been made by fraud or coercion or undue influence”. Both the phrases would amplify that the deeming clause should be considered so as to form an opinion that the phrase “subject to condition” amounts to an implied condition to maintain the senior citizen and any violation would be sufficient for the purpose of invoking Section 23(1) of the Act, to cancel the Gift or Settlement Deed executed by the senior citizen.*

*39. To elaborate, the phrase “subject to condition” employed under Section 23(1) of the Act, is to be understood with reference to the love and affection by the senior citizen towards the person in favour of whom such Gift or Settlement Deed has been executed.*

*40. “Love and Affection” is an implied condition in the context of Section 23(1) of the Act, and therefore, there need not be any express condition in the Settlement Deed for the purpose of maintaining the senior citizen. Refusal of maintenance after executing the Settlement Deed or Gift Deed, is the ground for invoking the deemed ground of fraud or coercion or undue influence. When the deeming clause has been incorporated under the provisions of*



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

*Section 23(1) of the Act, 'Love and Affection' to be construed as the consideration for executing the Gift or Settlement Deed. Thus the condition need not be expressly made in the document and the love and affection, which resulted in execution of the Deed by the senior citizen is to be construed as a condition for the purpose of invoking the deeming clause for declaring the document as fraud or coercion or undue influence.*

*41. The entire purpose and object of the Senior Citizens Act, is to consider the human conduct towards them. When the human conduct is indifferent towards senior citizen and their security and dignity are not protected, then the provisions of the Act, is to be pressed into service to safeguard the security and dignity of senior citizen. Therefore, the purposive interpretation of the provisions are of paramount importance and Section 23 of the Act, cannot be mis-utilised for the purpose of rejecting the complaint filed by the senior citizen on the ground that there is no express condition for maintaining the senior citizen. Even in the absence of any express condition in the document, "Love and Affection" being the consideration for execution of Gift or Settlement Deed, such love and affection becomes a deeming consideration and any violation is a ground to invoke Section 23(1) of the Act. Thus there is no infirmity in respect of the order passed by*



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

*the second respondent in the present case.*

42. *The human conduct in the context of the senior citizen Act, is to be understood considering the relationship between the senior citizen and the beneficiaries of the Gift or Settlement Deed. Mostly the parents are executing the document in favour of their children. Since they may not be in a position to maintain the property at their old-age and more-so, they are intending to visibly express their love and affection towards their children by settling their properties. In some cases, the parents during their old-age are settling their property in order to avoid conflict between their children and to ensure that all children get equal share. If at all the parents decide to settle the property in favour of a son or daughter, then they are doing so, only with love and affection and with a fond hope that they will be taken care of by the son or daughter during their old-age. Thus love and affection, being the consideration and implied condition, within the meaning of Section 23(1) of the Act. The subsequent non-maintenance of senior citizen would attract Section 23(1) of the Act and the Authorities in such circumstances are empowered to declare the document as null and void.*

43. *Therefore, Section 23 is referable as a conduct of the transferee prior to and after execution of the Deed of Gift or Settlement, as the case may be. For all purposes,*



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

WEB COPY

*Section 23 is to be understood taking note of the conduct of the transferee and not with reference to the specific stipulation of condition in the Deed of Gift or Settlement.”*

The above case is squarely applicable to the case on hand. In respect of the judgment relied on by the third respondent in the case of ***Sudesh Chhikara vs. Ramti Devi and Another*** (cited supra), the Three Judges Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***S.Vanitha vs. Deputy Commissioner, Bengaluru Urban and District and Others*** (cited supra) is to be followed. There are several judgments to establish that the purpose and object of the Senior Citizens Act, is to be complied with in its letter and spirit in order to protect the life, security and dignity of senior citizens. Thus the judgment relied on by the third respondent is of no avail as far as the present facts and circumstances of the case on hand is concerned.

14. On perusal of the complaint lodged by the petitioner revealed that the third respondent had driven out the petitioner from his house. Therefore, there are specific allegations in order to attract the provision under Section 23 of the Act. Unfortunately, both the respondents 1 & 2 failed to consider the above aspects and mechanically dismissed the



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

complaint lodged by the petitioner. In view of the above reasons stated, this Court finds infirmity and illegality in the orders passed by the respondents 1 & 2 as such, the impugned orders cannot be sustained and are liable to be quashed.

15. Accordingly, the order passed by the first respondent dated 31.10.2023, and the order passed by the second respondent dated 20.07.2023, are hereby quashed. The complaint lodged by the petitioner is allowed and the settlement deed dated 12.07.2019 registered vide document No.2273 of 2019, executed in favour of the third respondent, is declared as null and void. The possession of the subject property shall be handed over to the petitioner by the third respondent, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.

16. With the above directions, the Writ Petition stands allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

14.08.2024

Index : Yes/No  
Speaking/Non Speaking order  
Neutral Citation : Yes/No



W.P.No.9414 of 2024



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9414 of 2024

**G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J.**

rts

To

1. The District Collector,  
Office of the Chennai Collectorate,  
Chennai – 600 001.
2. The District Revenue Officer,  
Office of Chennai Collectorate,  
Chennai – 600 001.

ORDER IN  
W.P.No.9414 of 2024 and  
W.M.P.Nos.10424 & 10425 of 2024

14.08.2024