



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

103

CWP-18241-2023

Date of Decision : March 24, 2026

SAVITA MAHAJAN

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Sr. Advocate, with
Mr. Saksham Kaushik, Advocate,
Mr. Devyansh Arora, Advocate, and
Ms. Marvi Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Aayush Gupta, Advocate, and
Mr. Abhishek Chaudhary, Advocate
for the respondent No.3.

Mr. Prateek Gupta, Advocate, with
Ms. Vanshika Tuteja, Advocate
for the respondent No.4.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, the petitioner, a sexagenarian senior citizen, assails the order dated 19.05.2022, whereby her application filed under the provisions of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act of 2007"), seeking eviction of the respondents No.3 and 4 (son and daughter-in-law) from the house in question, was dismissed by the respondent No.2- Additional Deputy Commissioner. The petitioner further assails the order dated 24.11.2022, whereby her application seeking recall/review of the order dated 19.05.2022 was also dismissed by the respondent No.2 on the



following grounds: (a) that, in light of the verdict dated 15.12.2020 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No.3822 of 2020, a daughter-in-law cannot be evicted from the shared household/matrimonial home by her parents-in-law; (b) that, in light of the verdict dated 23.01.2020 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP-4744-2018, the power of eviction vested in the District Magistrate has been struck down; and (c) that the authority concerned did not have the power to review its own order.

2. The principal contention advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the impugned order dated 19.05.2022 has been passed by an authority devoid of statutory jurisdiction, and therefore, warrants interference on this ground alone. It is contended that post the drawing of the verdict dated 23.01.2020 by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***CWP-4744-2018 titled "Simrat Randhawa Vs. State of Punjab"***, the eviction application (*supra*) ought to have been adjudicated by the Maintenance Tribunal-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate and not by the Appellate Tribunal-cum-Additional Deputy Commissioner.

3. Learned State counsel does not dispute the submissions made hereinabove by learned counsel for the petitioner and fairly concedes that the eviction application (*supra*) ought to have been adjudicated by the Maintenance Tribunal-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent No.4 vehemently opposes the maintainability of the eviction application (*supra*) against the respondent No.4/daughter-in-law. It is submitted that the issue whether eviction proceedings can be initiated against a daughter-in-law under the provisions of the Act of 2007 stands conclusively answered in the negative by a Division Bench of this Court in ***LPA-701-2018 (Babu Lal***



Sharma vs. Sushila Devi and others), decided on 15.12.2025, and, therefore, the eviction proceedings initiated against the respondent No.4 (daughter-in-law) are wholly untenable.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. A perusal of the application (Annexure P-3) reveals that it is not maintainable before the Appellate Tribunal-cum-Additional Deputy Commissioner, as such applications lie before the Maintenance Tribunal presided over by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate. The issue is no longer *res integra*, as it has been consistently held that applications seeking eviction orders under the Act of 2007 are required to be filed before the Maintenance Tribunal-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate and not before the Appellate Tribunal-cum-Additional Deputy Commissioner. A similar issue was considered by this Court in CWP-22501-2021, which was disposed of on 27.10.2025 with the following observations:

“5. This Court has heard the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties concerned, and has also examined the issue. In Gurdial Singh (supra) case, the Coordinate Bench of this Court, has held that since the notification has been issued by the State of Punjab, wherethrough, the powers have been bestowed with the Maintenance Tribunal, to adjudicate the application seeking eviction. The relevant extract from the said judgment is extracted hereinafter:-

“4. A perusal of the above instructions would show that in view of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and by this Court, it has been decided by the State of Punjab that the Maintenance Tribunal can pass the eviction orders in view of the provisions of Section 23 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act as there is no bar regarding the same but the



District Magistrate cannot pass the eviction orders on account of the judgment dated 23.01.2020 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench in CWP-4744-2018 titled 'Simrat Randhawa Vs. State of Punjab'.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the present case, he had filed an application before the Additional Deputy Commissioner, Patiala in pursuance of the District Magistrate having delegated its powers under Section 22 to the Additional Deputy Commissioner, Patiala and thus, he states that he may be permitted to withdraw the said application with liberty to file a fresh application before the Maintenance Tribunal in accordance with the latest instructions issued by the State of Punjab.

6. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.3 and 4 has submitted that in case any such application is filed, respondents No.3 and 4 be permitted to raise all the pleas which are available to them, in accordance with law.

7. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) It would be open to the petitioner to file an application for eviction in addition to other pleas that he might wish to raise before the Maintenance Tribunal.

(ii) The Maintenance Tribunal would decide the same after hearing all the parties concerned and after giving due opportunity to file reply to respondents No.3 and 4.

(iii) The Maintenance Tribunal would also take into consideration the instructions dated 18.12.2023 passed by the State of Punjab and decide the matter, in accordance with law.

(iv) The filing of the earlier petition by the Senior Citizen before the District Magistrate/ADA and the order passed thereon by the said authority, would not come in the way of the petitioner instituting the fresh proceedings before the Maintenance Tribunal in view of the instructions dated 18.12.2023 of Government of Punjab. The above said earlier petition would be deemed to have been withdrawn,



with liberty to file a fresh petition, as detailed in the present order.

(v) In case any such petition is filed by the Senior Citizen, the Maintenance Tribunal is requested to decide the same, as expeditiously as possible.”

6. In view of the above propositions laid down by Coordinate Bench of this Court, the issue, as involved in the instant writ petition, is also squarely covered therein. Therefore, the impugned order is set aside, and the Deputy Commissioner concerned, is directed to transfer the original application to the learned Maintenance Tribunal concerned, and upon such transfer, the Sub Divisional Magistrate, concerned, after giving due opportunity of hearing to both the parties, shall decide the application afresh, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of 2007.”

7. In summa, the **impugned order dated 19.05.2022 is hereby set aside**, and the **matter is remanded** for fresh adjudication in accordance with law. The Appellate Tribunal-cum-Additional Deputy Commissioner is directed to, on receipt of a certified copy of this order, forthwith transmit the original application (Annexure P-3) to the Maintenance Tribunal-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate. The parties are directed to cause appearance before the Sub-Divisional Magistrate on 09.04.2026, whereupon the latter shall make an endeavour to decide the matter expeditiously, but only after due compliance with the provisions of the Act of 2007 and the apposite Rules, including the grant of a fair opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned.

8. Insofar as the issue ***“Whether, in view of the verdict rendered in LPA-701-2018 (supra), eviction proceedings initiated under the Act of 2007 against the respondent No.4/daughter-in-law are maintainable?”*** is concerned, the same is left open for adjudication by the Maintenance Tribunal.



CWP-18241-2023

6

9. Disposed of accordingly.

10. Needless to say, nothing observed hereinabove shall have any bearing on the merits of the case.

**March 24, 2026
devinder**

**(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE**

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