



CWP-15724-2025

-1-

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

104

CWP-15724-2025

Date of Decision :28.05.2025

Jeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**Present:-** Mr. Rajbir Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, challenge is to the orders dated 19.02.2025 (Annexure P/3) and 17.09.2024 (Annexure P/2) passed by the authorities exercising the jurisdiction under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Act, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as '2007 Act') by which, the claim of the petitioner-senior citizen that he is not being maintained by the private respondents, who are his sons from his first wife and the property transferred in their name should be set aside and be restored to the petitioner-senior citizen, has not been accepted.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner-senior citizen submits that the petitioner-senior citizen had given the property in question to the private respondents, who are his sons from the first wife but as they are not maintaining him, the said property should be reverted back to the petitioner-senior citizen, which fact has not been appreciated by the Tribunal in a

**CWP-15724-2025****-2-**

correct perspective hence, the impugned orders dated 19.02.2025 (Anenxure P/3) and 17.09.2024 (Annexure P/2) may kindly be set aside.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record with his able assistance.

4. The Tribunal after appreciating the evidence, which had come on record have recorded the finding that the senior citizen is living with his second wife and the children born out of the said wedlock and is living separately from the private respondents-sons from the first wife. Further, the facts have also come on record which could show that the claim that the petitioner-senior citizen that he is not being maintained, has not been proved as the senior citizen has enough property to support himself. The said fact has gone unrebutted even before this Court.

5. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner-senior citizen has enough property to maintain himself and the present claim is only a property dispute so as to claim back the property from the children of the first wife of the petitioner hence, the order dated 19.02.2025 (Anenxure P/3) passed by the authority exercising the jurisdiction under the 2007 Act is perfectly valid and legal and needs no interference at the hands of this Court especially when the impugned award has not been shown to be perverse to the facts or evidence that has come on record hence, the present petition is accordingly dismissed.

May 28, 2025
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No