



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

WP No. 18604 of 2025

and

WMP Nos.20857 and 20858 of 2025

V.Mariyappan

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The District Collector
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Revenue Divisional Office, Krishnagiri

3. V. Bodiyaammal

4. Vasantha,

5. V. Govindaraj,

6. Krishnan

7. Madhu

8. S. Amala Rani,

Respondent(s)

**PRAYER**

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, calling for the records pertaining to the order passed by the 2nd respondent herein in his proceedings in Mu.Mu.1499/2021/F dated 22.02.2022 which unlawfully cancelled an unconditional settlement deed executed in petitioner favor on 16.02.2019 (Document No.1903/2019) by the 3rd respondent herein and to quash the same and pass

For Petitioner(s): Mr.J.Prakasam

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.U.Dinesh Rajkumar
Additional Government Pleader
For R1 and R2
Mr.Yaman Oberoi
for R3, R4, R6 and R7
Mr.P.Kannan
for R5
Mr.L.Ramu
for R8

ORDER

This writ petition is filed challenging the order passed by the second respondent dated 22.02.2022 on the file of the second respondent thereby cancelling the settlement deed dated 16.02.2019 executed in favour of the petitioner by the third respondent.



2. The petitioner is son of the third respondent. The respondents 4 to 7 are brothers and sisters of the petitioner. While that being so, the property comprised in Survey No.3/2C measuring an extent of 2.85 acres and the property comprised in Survey No.4/1C was settled in favour of the petitioner by the third respondent by way of settlement deed dated 16.02.2019 vide document No.1903 of 2019. Thereafter, the third respondent lodged a complaint under Section 23(1) of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 before the second respondent alleging that the settlement deed was obtained by the petitioner by fraud and even after the execution of the settlement deed, the petitioner failed to maintain the third respondent. It was taken on file by the second respondent and detailed enquiry was conducted by issuing notice to the petitioner and other legal heirs. Thereafter, the second respondent passed a detailed order on 22.02.2022 thereby cancelling the settlement deed executed in favour of the petitioner. The petitioner was directed to handover the physical possession and all the parent documents in respect of the said property to the third respondent. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has preferred this writ petition.



3. In the meantime, the subject property after cancellation of settlement deed executed in favour of the petitioner, was sold to the 8th respondent herein.

The 8th respondent herein is now in enjoyment and possession of the subject property. Before filing the writ petition, the petitioner has already filed a suit in OS No.133 of 2023 on the file of the Sub Court, Uthagarai for a declaration declaring the sale deed executed in favour of the eighth respondent as null and void. While pending suit, the eighth respondent has filed a petition for rejection of plaint on the ground that already the settlement deed executed in favour of the petitioner was cancelled by second respondent herein in respect of the subject property. Thereafter, the third respondent had executed the sale deed in favour of the eighth respondent herein. Therefore, without challenging the order passed by the second respondent herein, the suit filed by the petitioner is not maintainable. Therefore, the petitioner filed this writ petition challenging the order passed by the second respondent.



4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that as per the settlement deed, there is no condition to maintain the third respondent.

Therefore, the complaint under Section 23 (1) of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 itself is not maintainable. 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 and another*** rendered in Civil Appeal No.174 of 2021 dated 06.12.2022.

5. Heard, the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused all the materials placed before this Court.

6. This Court has already dealt with the present issue in several writ petitions including the case of ***Mohamed Dayan Vs. District Collector,*** 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 different High Courts of India, held in favour of the senior citizen who executed the settlement deed. The relevant portion is extracted



hereunder: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 “Normal Life” emboldened under Section 4(2) of the Senior Citizen Act. Therefore, simply providing food and



WEB COPY

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 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 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 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*



WEB COPY

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 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 of the case on hand is concerned.”

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

7. 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.

8. In view of the above, the second respondent rightly exercised its jurisdiction and cancelled the settlement deed executed in favour of the petitioner. Hence, this Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the impugned order. As such, this writ petition is devoid of merits and liable to be dismissed. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

03-11-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WP No. 18604 of 2025



mrn
To

WEB COPY

1.The District Collector

Krishnagiri District,Krishnagiri

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,

Revenue Divisional Office, Krishnagiri



WEB COPY

WP No. 18604 of 2025



G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN J.
mrn

WP No. 18604 of 2025

03-11-2025