



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

935 WRIT PETITION NO. 11838 OF 2025

KARBHARI VITHALRAO GAIKWAD AND ANTOHER
VERSUS
THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR CUM DISTRICT MAGISTRATE BEED
AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Mukund D. Gitte
AGP for Respondent/State: Mr. K. B. Jadhavar
...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.
DATE : 26.09.2025

PER COURT:

1. Heard.

2. By the present writ petition, the petitioners challenge the order passed by the District Collector, Beed under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (*for brevity "the 2007 Act"*) so also, the order passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, directing the petitioners to pay maintenance of Rs.2,000/- each. Undisputedly, the petitioners are the children of respondent no.3 - mother. The facts in brief are that respondent no.3 - mother filed an application under Section 5(1) of the 2007 Act, claiming maintenance of Rs.10,000/- from each of the petitioners, who are the sons. She is 76 years of age and that she need maintenance. It is also stated that the petitioners have substantial land and have substantial income and that they are not maintaining her. The notices were issued to the petitioners but the petitioners did not remain present before the Sub-Divisional Officer. As such, the order was passed against the petitioners and the

direction was issued to pay Rs.2,000/- each to the mother respondent no.3. The order dated 05.07.2023 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer is challenged before the appellate authority / Collector under Section 16 of the 2007 Act. By the impugned order, the appellate authority / Collector has maintained the order passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer directing to pay maintenance of Rs.2,000/-.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have other brothers and sisters and the maintenance is only claimed against them. However, in the order of the Sub-Divisional Officer it is stated that respondent no.3 - mother is maintained by other siblings and one of them is also paying Rs.10,000/- per month. The appellate authority has given opportunity of hearing to all the parties on various dates and, thereafter, as confirmed the order of the Sub-Divisional Officer.

4. Considering the same and the small amount of maintenance is granted and also considering the aspect that the petitioners are not able to demonstrate before me that they have no income, I see no reason to interfere in the impugned order.

5. The Writ Petition stands dismissed.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]

marathe