



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

**CWP-16856-2018**

Date of Decision : **04.09.2025**

**ANTERPREET KAUR**

.....Petitioners

***VERSUS***

**STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS**

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**

Present : Mr. Rishabh Gupta, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Akshay Jindal, Advocate,  
for respondent no.6.

Mr. Narinder Kumar Vadhera, Advocate,  
for respondent no.7.

**KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)**

1. The legality of the orders dated 31.10.2017 (Annexure P-3) and 21.06.2018 (Annexure P-9), have been put to challenge by filing the instant writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, by the petitioner who is daughter-in-law of respondent no.6 on whose application the impugned orders have been passed.

2. Vide interim order dated 31.10.2017 (Annexure P-3), the applicant-Gulzar Singh (respondent no.6), was given the right to enter in his own house i.e. 339, Ward No.13, near Bibian Da Gurudwara, Tanda, (residential house). Further, a direction was passed to ensure the protection of his life and liberty. Apart from that it was also ordered that

no hindrance shall be caused by the petitioner while using daily usage items by the senior citizen. The relevant direction is extracted hereinafter:

“In respect of Senior Citizen Act 2007 and Punjab Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Rules 2012 the SDM, Dasuya is directed that in view of the facts stated in the application and after considering the circumstances, the applicant be made to enter his own house .e. 339 ward no. 13 (old) near Bibian Da Gurudwara, Tanda (residential house) and his life and liberty be also protected. Apart from this it shall also be seen that day to day usage items of Gulzar Singh, Anterpreet Kaur should not create any hurdle Smt. Anterpreet Kaur is hereby instructed that if any of the family members come to meet Gulzar Singh then in that case she should not create any interference. This order will continue to operate till further orders.”

3. Subsequently, an order dated 21.06.2018, was passed to ensure the implementation of the direction issued by the Deputy Commissioner concerned. The relevant is extracted hereinafter:-

“Regarding the above mentioned subject the applicant prays that the District Magistrate, Hoshiarpur has passed order dated 31.10.2017 under the Senior Citizen Act 2007 that the applicant be made to enter his house (ward no. 13, house no. 339 near Bibian Da Gurudwara, Tanda Tehsil Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur) and further prayed that his life and liberty be also protected. But for the last so many days the opposite party Anterpreet Kaur did not allow the applicant to enter the house despite the fact that the domestic violence case filed by Anterpreet Kaur in the court of L.d. Counsel SDJM, Dasuya, which was dismissed by the concerned court on 11.06.2018 (copy attached).

With a complaint of the applicant the copy of the order is attached, according to which petitioner (Anterpreet Kaur) is a daughter in-law of respondent no. 2, and therefore she has no right to stay in the house of respondent no. 1 (applicant). The copy of applicant along with the orders of the court as produced for necessary action.”

4. From the perusal of the above, two things clearly transpires that the only right of residence was given to respondent no.6-Gulzar Singh, whereas no eviction order has been passed against the petitioner.

5. It is informed to this Court by learned counsel for respondent no.6, that unfortunately, now the demise of Gulzar Singh has occurred, in that eventuality there cannot be any possible grievance left with the petitioner to agitate.

6. Confronted with the above, learned counsel for the petitioner draws attention of this Court towards order dated 21.06.2018, wherein, the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner has been recorded to the effect that the petitioner does not have any right to stay in the house in question. He submits that this observation can create problem for the petitioner, and the same needs to be set aside.

7. This Court has heard learned counsel for the petitioner, and finds that these are not the observation, rather, these are only the submissions made by learned counsel for respondent no.6, and such submissions cannot be considered as any observation of the competent authority. With this clarification no further order is required to be passed in the instant matter.

8. It is also made clear that in case, the petitioner has any grievance left, she has liberty to avail legal recourse, as per law.

9. **Disposed of** accordingly.

**September 04, 2025**

*dharamvir*

**(KULDEEP TIWARI)**

**JUDGE**

|                            |   |        |
|----------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned. | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable.        | : | Yes/No |