



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

CWP-1357-2020
Decided on: 03.02.2026

Krishan Murari Sharma Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Harsh Manocha, Advocate
for the petitioner (through video conferencing).

Ms. Pratibha Bali, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rahul Sharma, Advocate
for respondents No.3 to 5.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, as cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the senior citizen has approached this Court, to throw challenge to the order dated 29.10.2019 (Annexure P-5), passed by the learned Appellate Tribunal (constituted under the provisions of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007), whereby, the order dated 08.10.2018 (Annexure P-1), ordering eviction of respondents no.3 to 5, has been set aside.

2. The petitioner (senior citizen), had filed an application seeking eviction of respondents no.3 to 5, which was allowed vide order dated 08.10.2018 (Annexure P-1), and order of eviction was passed.

Fetching grievance from the order (*supra*), respondents no.3 to 5, preferred a statutory appeal, which was decided in their favour, vide order dated 29.10.2019 (Annexure P-5). Hence, the instant writ petition has been filed.

3. This Court, at the very outset, confronted learned counsel for the petitioner, that as to how the application under the Act of 2007, is maintainable against the daughter-in-law, specifically, in view of the judgment dated 15.12.2025, rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in “**Babu Lal Sharma vs. Sushila Devi and others**” LPA-701-2018, **and connected petitions**, to which, he is unable to point out any other precedent law or the provision of said Act, to substantiate that the application is maintainable against the daughter-in-law.

4. Following the aforesaid judgment, this Bench has also taken a similar view in “**Anupam vs. Additional District Magistrate, Panchkula and others**” (CWP-2472-2019, decided on 29.01.2026). Therefore, this Court does not find any reason to take a divergent view.

5. Hence, finding no merit in the instant petition, the same is hereby, **dismissed**. However, liberty is afforded to the petitioner take other alternate legal remedial measures for redressal of his grievance, as per law.

6. All pending application(s), if any, stand **disposed** of accordingly.

February 03, 2026

dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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