



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD
WRIT PETITION NO. 977 OF 2026**

NILESH SANJAY SALUNKE
VERSUS
SANJAY ALIAS SANJIV MHASU SALUNKE AND OTHERS

...
Mr. Shubham Dattatrya Jayabhar, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. S. A. Gaikwad, AGP for Respondents-State.

...
CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.
DATED : 30th JANUARY, 2026.

P.C.:-

1. The petitioner impugns order dated 24.10.2025 passed by District Collector, Ahilyanagar in Appeal No.SR/Office No.9-C/JN/14/2025, whereby order dated 08.05.2025 passed by Sub Divisional Officer, Ahilyanagar in Kavi/Fouj/SR-20/2024 has been rejected.

2. The respondent no.1, who is father of petitioner instituted proceeding for grant of maintenance under provisions of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (for short "Act of 2007") before Sub Divisional Officer, Ahilyanagar. The Sub Divisional Officer after considering rival contentions rejected said application. Aggrieved respondent no.1 filed Appeal No.SR/Office No.9-C/JN/14/2025 before learned District Collector, Ahilyanagar under Section 16 of Act of 2007. The District Collector partly allowed Appeal and directed petitioner to pay maintenance of Rs.5,000/- per month to respondent no.1.

3. Relationship between parties is undisputed. It is not in dispute that respondent no.1 is father of petitioner. In light of object of Act of 2007 aging has become major social challenge and need was felt to give more attention to care and protection of older persons. Accordingly, provisions have been engrafted in Statute to achieve welfare of senior citizens. The obligation is sought to be put upon children to maintain his/her parents. Accordingly, respondent no.1 had applied under Section 5 of Act of 2007 for grant of maintenance. The District Collector held that respondent no.1 is senior citizen and needs care and protection of maintenance from his son. Accordingly, directions for payment of maintenance and care have been issued.

4. The only submissions advanced by learned advocate appearing for petitioner is that, because there is civil dispute as regards to partition of properties, present proceeding has been initiated. The aforesaid submission cannot be countenanced, when observing need of old aged father, order granting maintenance has been passed against the son by competent authority.

5. In that view of matter, no case is made out to cause interference under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. In result, writ petition stands **rejected**.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR)
JUDGE