



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

**CWP-19171-2024**

Date of Decision : **22.05.2026**

**RAJENDER SINGH AND ANOTHER**

.....Petitioners

***VERSUS***

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, CHARKHI DADRI AND OTHERS**

.....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Vishal Sharma, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl.AG, Haryana.

Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate,  
for respondents no.3 and 4.

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

1. Through the instant petition, cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a challenge is thrown to the order dated 15.06.2023 (Annexure P-2), passed by the SDM, Charkhi Dadri, whereby the application of the petitioners, preferred under the provisions of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 seeking eviction of their of their daughter-in-law (respondent no.3) and minor grand-daughter (respondent no.4), from the house in question, was dismissed. Challenge is also laid to the order dated 24.04.2024 (Annexure P-3), whereby the appeal filed against the order dated 15.06.2023, has been dismissed.

2. It is not under dispute that the petitioners-senior citizens, and respondents no.3 and 4, are residing in different houses, and considering the facts and circumstances, of the instant matter, both the learned Tribunals, had rejected the application of the petitioners.

3. This Court vide order dated 18.05.2026, had passed the hereinafter extracted order:-

“At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not wish to press the instant writ petition on merits, specifically, in view of the judgment passed by Division Bench of this Court in **LPA No.701 of 2018 and other connected matters**, titled ‘**Babu Lal Sharma vs. Sushila Devi and others**’. However, he submits that in order to live in peace, he wishes to offer a new house, where the respondents No.3 and 4, can shift and reside according to their own wish, and in this regard, he is ready and willing to give an affidavit/undertaking before this Court. He further submits that in case, the respondents No.3 and 4, shift to the offered house, they will never be dispossessed in future.

Learned counsel for respondents No.3 and 4, has made a request for an adjournment, to have apposite instructions, in this regard.

Asked for request is accepted. List on 22.05.2026.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

4. Today, learned counsel for respondents no.3 and 4, submits that the aforesaid proposal as made by the petitioners is not *bona fide*. Rather, the house in which the the petitioners want to shift respondents no.3 and 4, is situated in a village, which is about 7 k.ms. away from the house in which they are presently residing. He further submits that the minor daughter of respondent no.3 is studying in a nereby school. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal is not acceptable to respondents no.3 and 4.

5. Even this Court finds that the aforesaid proposal has been made only with a motive to seek eviction of respondents no.3 and 4 from

the house in question which is situated in the urban area, to a house in the village area, which cannot be considered as a *bona fide* proposal. Therefore, the instant petition, which was dismissed on merits, as reflects from above extracted order dated 18.05.2026, does not require further consideration.

6. However, in case the petitioners have any alternate remedy under the law, they are at liberty to avail the same.

7. **Disposed of** accordingly.

8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.

**May 22, 2026**  
*dharamvir*

**(KULDEEP TIWARI)**  
**JUDGE**

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