

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

**(106)**

**2024:PHHC:054149  
CWP-8760-2024  
Date of Decision: 22.04.2024**

Surinder Kaur

--Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh & others

--Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL.**

Present:- Mr. Vikas Kuthiala, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Gurinderjit Singh, Addl. Standing Counsel,  
U.T., Chandigarh with Mr. Varun Veer Chauhan,  
Junior Panel Counsel for U.T., Chandigarh.

\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL.J (Oral)**

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing respondent no.2 i.e. Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh to decide the Appeal No.01/2023 (Annexure P-6) filed under Section 15 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Act, 2007 filed by respondent no.3.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is a 79 year old senior citizen and vide order dated 22.12.2022 the Maintenance Tribunal, Chandigarh had decided the application filed by the petitioner in her favour against which respondent no.3, who is the daughter of the petitioner, had filed an appeal and in the said appeal both the parties have appeared and the matter is now fixed for 01.05.2024. It is prayed that the petitioner at this stage would be satisfied, in case, respondent no.2 is directed to consider and decide the said appeal, as expeditiously as possible, and in a time bound manner.

3. Learned counsel for U.T., Chandigarh has submitted that the Appellate Authority would make every endeavour to decide the said appeal, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of five months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.
4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.2 to consider the appeal filed by respondent no.3, in accordance with law, within a period of five months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.
5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority would consider the case independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)  
JUDGE

22.04.2024

lucky

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable:        | Yes/No |