



106

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

CWP-20267-2025

Date of Decision : 21-07-2025

KRISHANA DEVI**.....Petitioner**

VERSUS

CHAIRMAN, APPELLATE AUTHORITY AND OTHERS**.....Respondent(s)**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Lajpat Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Lalit Pardhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the order dated 30.05.2024, copy of which has been appended as Annexure P-5 by which, passed by the appellate authority envisaged under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 has set aside the order of the Tribunal by which maintenance of Rs.2000/- was directed to be given to the petitioner-Senior Citizen by her two sons.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner-Senior Citizen is getting pension itself to the tune of Rs.16,000/-, the maintenance granted to the petitioner-Senior Citizen was not good enough and the same is needed to be enhanced.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that even the maintenance of Rs.2,000/- each imposed upon her two sons has been set aside, which has been challenged in CWP No.20238 of 2025.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the prayer of the petitioner is for enhancement of the maintenance amount from Rs.2,000/- from each son so that the petitioner–Senior Citizen could live a dignified life.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the records of the present case with his able assistance.

5. The petitioner has 4 children i.e. 2 sons and two daughters. No claim has been raised against the daughters though it is admissible under the 2007 Act. The tribunal had granted a sum of Rs.2,000/- directing each of the sons to pay the petitioner-Senior Citizen especially when the petitioner was getting a pension of Rs.16,000/- and by the grant of the said maintenance of Rs.4000/- every month, the petitioner will be getting Rs.20,000/- per month to live a life, by which it can be safely presumed that by this amount the petitioner-Senior Citizen can live a dignified life hence, the claim of the petitioner that her sons should be directed to pay more especially when no claim has been raised against the daughters to take care of her, cannot be accepted.

6. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and the circumstances of the present case hence, the present petition stands dismissed in limine.

21-07-2025
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES
Whether reportable: NO