

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

103

CWP-6590-2026

Date of Decision : May 14, 2026

JAGE RAM

-PETITIONER

V/S

**DISTRICT MAGISTRATE CUM APPELLATE AUTHORITY AND
OTHERS**

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

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

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Devesh Nehra, Advocate
for the respondents No.4 to 7.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, the petitioner, an octogenarian senior citizen, impugns the orders dated 20.03.2025 and 12.11.2025, passed respectively by the Maintenance Tribunal and the Appellate Tribunal.

2. Succinctly stated, the petitioner instituted a petition under the provisions of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as “the Act of 2007”) before the Maintenance Tribunal, seeking eviction of respondents No.3 to 7 from the house in question as well as maintenance @ ₹8,000/- per month. Vide order dated 20.03.2025, the Maintenance Tribunal partly allowed the application, directing respondent Nos.3 to 7 to permit the petitioner to reside in the house in question and to pay him maintenance @ ₹3,000/- per month. The order dated 20.03.2025, granting partial relief, caused pain to the petitioner

and propelled him to institute a statutory appeal before the Appellate Tribunal, which, although dismissed the appeal vide order dated 12.11.2025, increased the amount of maintenance from ₹3,000/- to ₹5,000/- per month (payable by each of the petitioner's three sons). Thus, having remained unsuccessful in obtaining the desired relief even from the Appellate Tribunal, the petitioner has approached this Court assailing the orders (*supra*).

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner draws the attention of this Court to Haryana Government's notification dated 08.12.2020, prescribing the composition of the Maintenance Tribunals and Appellate Tribunals, to submit that the impugned order dated 20.03.2025 suffers from illegality, having been passed *coram non judice*. It is submitted that under the notification (*supra*), both the Maintenance Tribunal and the Appellate Tribunal are required to comprise three members, with the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Deputy Commissioner/District Magistrate acting as their respective Chairmen. In the present case, however, the impugned order dated 20.03.2025 was passed solely by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate. Therefore, the said order was rendered without the mandated coram, rendering it illegal and without jurisdiction. In support of this contention, reliance is placed on the ***judgment dated 26.10.2016*** rendered by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***CWP No.18784 of 2015***, the relevant paragraph whereof is extracted hereunder:

“I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with able assistance and am of the considered opinion that the impugned order passed by the Appellate Authority is patently without jurisdiction because as per the Scheme of the Act, the Tribunal and the Appellate Tribunal are constituted by the State

Government by way of notification and the appeal has to be decided by the duly constituted Tribunal. In the present case, notification dated 10.12.2012 has been relied upon to which there is no contrary notification produced before this Court. In this notification, the Tribunal has been specifically constituted for Kurukshetra in which there are three Members. District Magistrate may be the Chairman of the Tribunal but once there is a Tribunal of three Members, the District Magistrate has no jurisdiction to take decision alone and the decision has to be taken unanimously or by way of majority. Therefore, on this ground alone, the impugned order deserves to be set aside and thus the present writ petition is hereby allowed and impugned order is set aside and the matter is remanded back to the Tribunal constituted as per notification dated 10.12.2012 to decide the matter afresh after affording due opportunity of hearing to both the parties and by passing a reasoned order.”

4. Learned State counsel and learned counsel for the respondents No.4 to 7 do not dispute that the impugned order dated 20.03.2025 is vitiated as it was passed *coram non judice*.

5. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, this Court finds that the order dated 20.03.2025 was passed by an authority lacking jurisdiction and lawful coram prescribed in the notification dated 08.12.2020. Consequently, the same is a nullity in the eyes of law and cannot be sustained.

6. Further, since the Appellate Tribunal overlooked the aforesaid infirmity that the order dated 20.03.2025 was vitiated having been passed *coram non judice*, and proceeded to uphold the same by increasing the amount of maintenance, the appellate order is also unsustainable and deserves interference.

7. Accordingly, **the orders dated 20.03.2025 and 12.11.2025, passed respectively by the Maintenance Tribunal and the Appellate**

Tribunal, are hereby set aside. The matter is remanded to the Maintenance Tribunal for fresh adjudication in accordance with the provisions of the Act of 2007. The parties shall cause appearance before the Maintenance Tribunal on 29.05.2026, whereupon the latter shall endeavour to decide the matter expeditiously, preferably within 06 weeks, but after affording adequate opportunity of hearing to all parties concerned.

8. Disposed of accordingly.

May 14, 2026
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No