



117 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

LPA-722-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.09.2025

AMIT KUMAR AND OTHERS

...APPELLANTS

Vs

APPELLATE AUTHORITY AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
 HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMARI**

Present:- Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Advocate
 for the appellants.
 Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant appeal arises out of order dated 27.01.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP No.12393 of 2022 whereby the Writ Court has refused to interfere with the orders passed by the authorities under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (*for short, 'Act of 2007'*).

2. The applicant-respondent is the biological father of the appellant who moved an application before the authorities that he has no means to support himself. The Competent Authority under the Act of 2007 has issued a direction to pay a sum of Rs.3,300/- each month to the respondent-father towards the maintenance. Learned Single Judge has observed that under the Act of 2007, it is the duty of the children to maintain old-aged parents. Further, finding was returned that the father lacked sufficient means to support himself.

3. It is for this reason that the learned Single Judge has refused to interfere in the writ petition.

4. At the time of arguments of the present appeal, learned

counsel for the appellant contends that the respondent is a man of sufficient means and that he was below 60 years of age on the date of filing of the application.

5. So far as the respondent possessing sufficient means at his command is concerned, we do not find that any material in that regard to have been placed before the authorities. As far as age of the respondent is concerned, except to state that he was below 60 years, no other material has been placed on record.

6. It is undisputed that over a period of time, the father has aged further and it is not in dispute that as of now, the respondent is much above 60 years. The authorities, otherwise, have found the respondent to be above 60 years of age on the date of filing of the application. We moreover find that this argument was not pressed before the learned Single Judge.

7. In such view of the matter, we are not inclined to interfere in the matter particularly when a meager amount has been awarded to the father for his maintenance. The instant appeal is accordingly dismissed.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

**[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE**

**[RAMESH KUMARI]
JUDGE**

SEPTEMBER 12th, 2025

Rahul Joshi

1. Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
2. Whether Reportable	Yes/No