



WEB COPY



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.11.2025

CORAM:

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

W.P.No.18952 of 2025 and
WMP.no.21239 of 2025

R.Babu

...Petitioner

-Vs-

- 1.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR
CUM DISTRICT EXECUTIVE MAGISTRATE, CHENNAI
- 2.THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
NORTH CHENNAI, CHENNAI
- 3.THE SUB REGISTRAR,
ROYAPURAM, CHENNAI
- 4.MEHURINISA
- 5.SYED ISHAK

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records of the impugned order of the 1st Respondent vide Se.Mu. Na.Ka.No.2155/ A1 / 2023 dated 12.03.2025 and quash the same and subsequently direct the 3rd respondent to cancel the settlement deeds in Doc 3842 / 2014 dated 5.12.2014, Doc No 457/2017 dated 17.08.2016 and Doc 3167 / 2019 dated 8.11.2019.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Iyyapparaj



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

For Respondents

For R1 to 3 : Mr.V.Jeevagiridharan,
Additional Government Pleader

For R4 & 5 : No appearance

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the order passed by the first respondent dated 12.03.2025 thereby confirming the order passed by the second respondent dated 12.01.2023 thereby rejecting the complaint lodged by the petitioner seeking cancellation of settlement deed executed in favour of respondents 4 & 5 herein under Section 23 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”)

2. On receipt of the complaint from the petitioner, the second respondent conducted enquiry after issuance of notice to respondents 4 & 5 herein who are none other than the wife and son of the petitioner respectively and rejected the complaint on the ground that the settlement deed did not contain the twin conditions in order to maintain the complaint under Section 23 of the Act.



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

3. On perusal of the records, it is revealed that aggrieved by the

WEB COPY

aforementioned order, the petitioner preferred appeal before the first respondent and the same was dismissed. On perusal of the said order, it is revealed that the petitioner is the father of the fifth respondent and the husband of the fourth respondent. The petitioner had purchased the property by way of sale deed dated 28.11.2011 registered vide document No.4116 of 2011. Thereafter he had executed settlement deed in respect of the said property in favour of the fourth respondent who is being the wife of the petitioner on 05.12.2014 registered vide document No.3842 of 2014. Thereafter, the petitioner and the fourth respondent had executed settlement deed in favour of the fifth respondent in respect of the very same property on 17.08.2016 vide document No.457 of 2017. There was a condition in the said settlement deed that the fifth respondent shall become absolute owner of the property only after life time of the fourth respondent herein. Further, another settlement deed was executed in favour of the fourth respondent on 08.11.2019 in respect of the very same property by the petitioner and the fifth respondent herein and registered vide document No.3167 of 2019. Thereafter, the petitioner was neglected to be maintained by the fourth and fifth respondents herein. They also harassed the petitioner and continuously ill-treated him without even

Page 3 of 14



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

spending any money for his medical expenses. Therefore, the petitioner

lodge complaint under Section 23 (1) of the Act. 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.

4. 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 Legislature thought that such transaction could be declared as void, as the

Page 4 of 14



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

conduct leading to the transaction was based on malice or fraud.

Therefore, the condition referred under Section 23 of the Act, 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.

5. 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 counsel for the third respondent, held as follows:-

“33. Close reading of the principles considered by



WEB COPY



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

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 taking into consideration of



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

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*



WEB COPY



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

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.



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

WEB COPY

“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



WEB COPY



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

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 the second respondent in the present case.

42. The human conduct in the context of the senior



WEB COPY



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

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



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

specific stipulation of condition in the Deed of Gift or Settlement.

WEB COPY

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.

6. In view of the above discussion, the impugned order dated 12.03.2025 is set aside. The settlement deeds in Doc.No.3842 of 2014 dated 5.12.2014 and Doc.No..457 of 2017 dated 17.08.2016 and Doc.No.3167 of 2019 dated 08.11.2019 are cancelled. Respondents 4 & 5 are directed to hand over the vacant possession of the subject property to the petitioner within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of this order.



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. With the above direction, this writ petition is allowed.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

28.11.2025

Neutral citation: Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Speaking/Non Speaking order
lok



WEB COPY



W.P.No.18952 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

lok

To

- 1.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR
CUM DISTRICT EXECUTIVE MAGISTRATE, CHENNAI
- 2.THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
NORTH CHENNAI, CHENNAI
- 3.THE SUB REGISTRAR,
ROYAPURAM, CHENNAI

W.P.No.18952 of 2025

28.11.2025