



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.09.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

W.P.No.9947 of 2024

and

W.M.P. Nos. 10962 and 10964 of 2024

Rukmani

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Collector,
Collectorate,
GST Road,
Chengalpattu – 603001.
2. The Sub Divisional Magistrate and the Revenue Divisional Officer,
Tambaram Division,
Taluk Office Complex,
Opp. Mepz, GST Road,
Kadaperi, West Tambaram,
Chennai – 600 045.
3. The Sub Registrar,
Selaiyur Sub Registration Office,
Integrated Tambaram and Selaiyur Sub Registrar Office,
Maruthi Nagar Main Road,
Anjugam Ammaiyar Park Opposite,
Rajakilpakkam, Chennai – 73.

4. Govindasamy

... Respondents



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

WEB COPY

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the impugned order dated 31.05.2023 passed by the second respondent in Na. Ka. No. 83/2023/A and quash the same as illegal, arbitrary and non-est in law and consequently, direct the third respondent to make necessary mutation in the encumbrance certificate restoring both settlement deeds dated 19.07.2021 registered as Doc. No. 8360 of 2021 and Doc. No. 8361 of 2021 on the file of SRO, Selaiyur within the time stipulated by this Court. Consequently direct the third respondent to restore the settlement deeds dated 19.07.2021 registered as Doc. No. 8360 of 2021 and Doc. No. 8361 of 2021 on the file of SRO, Selaiyur.

For Petitioner : Mr. A.R.Balaji

For Respondents : Mr. M.S.Arasakumar,
Government Advocate (for R1 & R2)

Mr. B.Saravana Kumar (for R3)

O R D E R

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the order dated 31.05.2023, passed by the second respondent, thereby allowing the complaint lodged by the fourth respondent and declared the settlement deed in favour of the petitioner void.



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

WEB COPY

2. The petitioner is the daughter of the fourth respondent. The fourth respondent owned the properties comprised in Survey Numbers (S.Nos.) 83/4A, Old No. 26/1P, New No. 154/3, 52/2D, 59/2, 63/5, 68/2, 21/5, 83/3A, 90/1, 57, 63/1, and 70/2, measuring 18 cents, 4284 sq.ft, 32 cents, 25 cents, 11 cents, 16 cents, 24 cents, 18 cents, 11 cents, 3 cents, 12 cents, and 23 cents. Due to love and affection for the petitioner, the fourth respondent settled the aforementioned properties through settlement deeds dated 19.07.2021, registered as Document Nos. 8360 and 8361 of 2021.

2.1. Thereafter, the fourth respondent lodged a complaint under Section 23 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity) before the second respondent, alleging that the petitioner exploited the fourth respondent's blindness and unconsciousness to execute the settlement deeds in her favour, thereby grabbing the said properties. Furthermore, the fourth respondent alleged that the petitioner failed to provide maintenance thereafter. After conducting a due inquiry, the second respondent allowed



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

WEB COPY

the complaint filed by the fourth respondent and declared the settlement deeds executed in favor of the petitioner to be void.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that to attract the provisions under Section 23(1) of the Act, two conditions must be fulfilled. Firstly, the settlement deeds should have been executed after the commencement of the Act. Secondly, they should contain a condition requiring the settlee to maintain the settlor. Since the settlement deeds executed by the fourth respondent do not contain such a condition, the complaint itself is not maintainable under Section 23(1) of the Act.

4. He further submitted that the fourth respondent was deeply hurt by her brothers' inaction in caring for them in their old age and decided to take steps in their favor. Therefore, the fourth respondent lodged a complaint under Section 23 of the Act against her brothers for failing to provide basic amenities. The complaint was allowed, and her brothers, aggrieved by the decision, filed an appeal before the District Collector. While the appeal was pending, they came to an understanding to take care



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

WEB COPY

of the fourth respondent. Believing those words, the fourth respondent and his wife withdrew the appeal and resided with them, but only on the instigation of her brothers, the fourth respondent now lodged a complaint against the petitioner.

5. In support of his contentions, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Sudesh Chhikara vs. Ramti Devi and Another* reported in **2022 SCC OnLine SC 1684**. He also pointed out that this Court followed the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case of *S.Vanitha vs. the Deputy Commissioner* reported in **(2021) 15 SCC 730** holding that the Section 23 of the Act does not contemplate the condition that the transferee shall provide the basic amenities and basic physical needs to the transferor should form part as a recital in the deed of transfer. This condition can be either express or implied. If there is no express recital in the deed, the Tribunal has to look around to find out the intention of the transferor.



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

WEB COPY

6. However, the other learned Single Judge of this Court followed the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India ***Sudesh Chhikara vs. Ramti Devi and Another*** reported in ***2022 SCC OnLine SC 1684*** and held that the settlement deed should contain specific condition in order to attract the complaint under Section 23 of the Act. The said judgment also followed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in several judgments.

7. This Court already relied upon the judgment of the ***S.Vanitha vs. the Deputy Commissioner*** reported in ***(2021) 15 SCC 730*** and held in the case of ***Mohamed Dayan vs. The District Collector, Tiruppur District*** reported in ***2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6079 (W.P. No. 28190 of 2022 dated 8.09.2023)***. The said judgment was followed and this Court held in several cases. Section 23 of the Act does not contemplate the condition that the transferee shall provide basic amenities and physical needs to the transferor should form part as a recital in the deed of transferor.

8. This court already dealt with the present issue in several writ petitions including the case of ***Mohamed Dayan Vs. District Collector.,***



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

WEB COPY

order dated **08.09.2023** 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, held as follows:-

“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



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

“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 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



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

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



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 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.



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

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 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*



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

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 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, 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.

44. In respect of the judgment relied on by the petitioner 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 petitioner is of no avail as far as the present facts and circumstances



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

of the case on hand is concerned.”

WEB COPY

The above case is squarely applicable to the case on hand.

9. Therefore, though there is no specific condition in the settlement deed to show that the petitioner shall maintain the third respondent, the complaint is very much maintainable under Section 23 of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007.

10. In view of the above, this Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the order passed by the second respondent. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. However, the petitioner shall hand over the vacant possession of the subject properties in favour of the fourth respondent within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed. No costs.

11.09.2024

Index: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
kv



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

1. The District Collector,
Collectorate,
GST Road,
Chengalpattu – 603001.
2. The Sub Divisional Magistrate and the Revenue Divisional Officer,
Tambaram Division,
Taluk Office Complex,
Opp. Mepz, GST Road,
Kadaperi, West Tambaram,
Chennai – 600 045.
3. The Sub Registrar,
Selaiyur Sub Registration Office,
Integrated Tambaram and Selaiyur Sub Registrar Office,
Maruthi Nagar Main Road,
Anjugam Ammaiyar Park Opposite,
Rajakilpakkam, Chennai – 73.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9947 of 2024

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

kv

W.P.No.9947 of 2024

11.09.2024