

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10426 of 2022**

---

---

1. Shailesh Kumar @ Azad.
2. Manish Kumar @ Guddu.
3. Krishnakant Kumar @ Nikku.
4. Rajeev Kumar.
5. Sanjeev Kumar.

All are sons of late Santosh Prasad, Resident of Peoples Co-operative Colony, Sector-F-90, Kankarbagh, P.S.-Kankarbagh, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Co-operative, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The Chairman Abhikaran Samiti cum Sub Divisional Officer, Patna Sadar, Patna.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Patna Sadar, Patna.
5. Rajendra Prasad, son of Late Surya Deo Narayan Singh, Resident of Peoples Co-operative Colony, Sector-F-90, Kankarbagh, P.S.-Kankarbagh, District-Patna, presently residing at Mohalla-Road No. 13-C, P.S.-Bahadurpur, District-Patna.

... .. Respondents

---

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Siya Ram Shahi, Advocate Mr. Santosh Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Uday Shankar Sharan Singh (GP-19)
For the Resp. No.5	:	Mr. J.S. Arora, Sr. Advocate Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Advocate

---

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR**  
**ORAL JUDGMENT**  
**Date : 29-01-2024**

By way of this writ petition, the petitioners have  
prayed for the following reliefs:-

*“(i) For quashing of the order dated  
10.06.2022 passed in Senior Citizen  
(Misc.) Appeal No. 01/2020-21 by the  
Collector-cum-District Magistrate,*



*Patna whereby and whereunder the learned Collector set aside the order of Chairman cum Sub Divisional Officer, Patna Sadar, Patna whereunder and whereby the learned court passed order in Case No.59 of 2019, to pay 50% of the income arises from the house.*

*(ii). For issuance of direction in the nature of mandamus upon the respondents authority to not dispossess the petitioners from House No.90, Block-F, Peoples Co-operative Construction Society Ltd., Kankarbagh, Patna.”*

2. It is the case of the petitioners that the house situated at plot no.90, Sector- F, Peoples Co-operative Society Ltd., Kankarbagh, Patna is the ancestral property of the petitioners and the aforesaid house was earlier subject matter of a title suit, in which judgment and decree dated 12.01.1984 was passed holding that the aforesaid house was apportioned to late Surya Narayan Singh (grandfather of the petitioners). After the aforesaid judgment and decree, there has been no partition between heirs of late Surya Narayan Singh and as such, the petitioners are owner and co-sharers of the aforesaid property.

3. It is also the case of the petitioners that the petitioners along with his full brothers have filed a Partition Suit



bearing Partition Suit No.327 of 2018 before the learned Sub Judge-I, Nalanda against other co-sharers. The house in question is the subject matter of the aforesaid partition suit. The respondent No. 5-Rajendra Prasad has filed Case No.59 of 2019 before the Chairman, Adhikaran -cum- Sub Divisional Officer, Patna Sadar under the provisions of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as the "Senior Citizens Act, 2007) and sought only relief to evict the petitioners from the house in question without seeking any maintenance either from the petitioners or from his own legal heirs under Section 4 of the Senior Citizens Act, 2007.

4. The Chairman, Adhikaran -cum- Sub Divisional Officer, Patna Sadar vide order dated 14.03.2020 refused to grant the relief of eviction to the petitioners but contrary to the pleading of the parties, directed the petitioners to pay 50% of the income arising from the house in question. Against the aforesaid order, the respondent no.5 filed Senior Citizen Appeal No.1 of 2022 before the Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Patna to evict the petitioners from the house in question. The petitioners have also filed an appeal bearing Appeal No.04 of 2020-21 against the order dated 14.03.2020.



Both appeal and cross appeal were tagged with each other. The Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Patna vide impugned order dated 10.06.2022 decided both the appeals and set aside the order dated 14.03.2020 with a direction to the Chairman, Adhikaran-cum-Sub Divisional Officer, Patna Sadar to give possession of the house in question in favour of respondent no.5 and in this process, if the petitioners create any trouble then strict action shall be taken against them under the provisions of Rule-22 of the Bihar Maintenance & Welfare of Parents & Senior Citizens Rules, 2012. Hence, this writ petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the respondent no.5 has his own house in Bahadurpur, Patna. He was married with late Asha Sinha and his son is an Engineer and his daughter-in-law is also working in a private company at Bengaluru. Further, the respondent no.5 has two grand-daughters and all of them are jointly residing in the house situated at Bahadurpur, Patna.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the reply of the petitioners filed in Senior Citizen (Misc.) Appeal No.1 of 2020-21 was not considered by the Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Patna, in which the petitioners have specifically mentioned about the Title Suit



pending before the Sub Judge- 1, Nalanda bearing Title Suit No. 327 of 2018 and also the fact that the house in question of which the Collector -cum- District Magistrate, Patna has issued the order of eviction is also the part of partition suit. He further submits that the Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Patna does not have power to pass any order when a competent civil court is adjudicating the matter and when the title, possession and status of the house in question is itself under challenge in a proceeding.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that house in question is the ancestral property of the petitioners which was purchased from the joint family fund. He also submits that the case of the respondent no.5 does not come under the Senior Citizens Act, 2007 made for the welfare of parents and senior citizen as he has other self acquired properties also and has huge income from his profession as an advocate.

8. It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that the impugned order is illegal as the Senior Citizen Act, 2007 has got no application in this case. He has relied upon Section 2 of the Senior Citizens Act, 2007. Section 2(a) of Senior Citizen Act, 2007 is the definition of 'children'



which includes son, daughter, grandson, grand-daughter but does not include a minor. The definition of 'parents' has been provided in Section 2(d) which means father or mother whether biological, adoptive or step father, or step mother as the case may be whether or not the father or the mother a senior citizen. The 'relative' has been defined in Section 2(g) which means any legal heirs of the childless senior citizen who is not a minor and in possession of or would inherit his property after his death.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioners has also relied upon Section 4 of the Senior Citizens Act, 2007, which reads as under:-

***“4. Maintenance of Parents and Senior Citizens***

*1. A senior citizen including parent who is unable to maintain himself from his own earning or property owned by him, shall be entitled to make an application under section 5 in case of -*

- i. parent or grand-parent, against one or more of his children not being a minor*
- ii. a childless senior citizen, against such of his relative referred to in clause (g) of section 2*

*2. The obligation of the children or relative, as the case may be, to maintain a senior citizen extends to the needs of such citizen so that senior citizen may lead a normal life.*



3. *The obligation of the children to maintain his or her parent extends to the needs of such parent either father or mother or both, as the case may be, so that such parent may lead a normal life.*

4. *Any person being a relative of a senior citizen and having sufficient means shall maintain such senior citizen provided he is in possession of the property of such senior citizen or he would inherit the property of such senior citizen:*

*Provided that where more than one relatives are entitled to inherit the property of a senior citizen, the maintenance shall be payable by such relative in the proportion in which they would inherit his property.”*

**10.** It has also been argued that the petitioners are neither the children of respondent no.5 nor his relative rather they are the nephew of respondent no. 5. The respondent no.5 is a senior Advocate of this Court and the house in question is not owned by him rather the same has been purchased from the joint family fund, which is evident from compromise decree filed in Title Suit No. 224 of 1970 /45 of 1978 and therefore, on both these grounds, the application under the Senior Citizens Act, 2007 is not maintainable as the aforesaid Act is applicable in a



case where the property is self acquired property, which is lacking in the present case.

**11.** By making the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the impugned order is not sustainable and therefore, this Court may quash the same in the interest of justice.

**12.** Learned counsel for the respondent no.5 submits that the property in question is not the joint family property rather the same is self acquired property of the respondent no.5. He further submits that it is true that earlier there had been a partition suit between the parties in respect of the joint family properties, but in the said partition suit, the house in question was not the subject matter. In Title Suit No.224 of 1970/45 of 1978, the plaintiff was Most. Pato Kunwar and the defendants were Babu Suryadeo Narayna Singh and his sons and other co-sharers. Out of the defendants, the defendant no. 2 was Santosh Kumar, the father of the petitioners and the respondent no.5 herein was the defendant no. 3 in the suit.

**13.** Learned counsel for the respondent no.5 further submits that the house in question has been acquired through the registered deed of lease executed by the Peoples Co-



operative Housing Society in favour of the respondent no.5 on 25.04.1972 and thereafter the respondent no.5 has constructed a three-storeyed building thereon and has been continuing in peaceful possession over the same. He also submits that on the basis of the aforesaid facts, it is quite apparent that the respondent no.5 is the absolute owner of the house in question and the petitioners have got no concern whatsoever from the said house but, they have wrongfully entered into the said house and have deprived the respondent no.5 from going over there and from collecting rent from the tenants. In fact, the petitioners have illegally and forcefully started collecting rent from the tenants of the respondent no. 5 although the respondent no.5 is a senior citizen and he is entitled to be protected against the high-handed acts of the petitioners in view of the provisions of the Senior Citizens Act, 2007.

**14.** It has also been argued by learned counsel for the respondent no.5 that only contention of the petitioners is that the house in question is a joint family property by virtue of the compromise decree filed in Title Suit nos. 224 of 1970/ 45 of 1978 and the said house is the property of the schedule of Suryadeo Narayan Singh, the common ancestor of the parties and therefore they are not liable to be evicted from that property



but, it is an admitted position that the property in question has been acquired from the Peoples Cooperative Housing Society through a registered long term lease having been executed by the said society in favour of respondent no.5 and the said deed has never been challenged before any Court of law rather to put a false claim a completely vexatious Partition Suit No. 327 of 2018 has been filed by the petitioners seeking a decree of partition in regard to that property. Moreover, the petitioners have not been able to produce any document/material either before the authorities below or before this Court to show that the said house is not the exclusive property of the respondent no.5, rather the same is joint family property and only by filing a suit, the character of the property shall not be changed rather, the said suit having been filed in the year 2018 needs to be decided and until that the said property cannot be treated as joint family property.

**15.** It has also been contended by respondent no.5 that the provision of Rule 21 of the Bihar Maintenance & Welfare of Parents & Senior Citizens Rules, 2012 is very clear that the Collector is to ensure that life and property of senior citizens of the district are protected so that they are able to live with security and dignity and therefore, the impugned order



passed by the Collector is just and proper on the facts of this case as the Collector has power to evict the wrongdoers intervening in the properties of a senior citizen. In support of his contentions, he has relied upon a decision of this Court rendered in the case of *C.W.J.C. No.7851 of 2022 (Ravi Shankar & Anr. vs. the State of Bihar & Ors.)* reported as *2023(5) BLJ-39*.

16. By making the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel for the respondent no.5 submits that this writ application is devoid of any merit and therefore, the same is liable to be dismissed.

17. I have considered the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the respondent no.5 and also perused the materials on record.

18. The basic argument of the petitioners is that the impugned order passed under the Senior Citizens Act, 2007 is not maintainable and since the partition Suit No.327 of 2018 is pending in the Court below, the District Magistrate ought not to have passed the impugned order, as indicated above.

19. So far as the maintainability issue is concerned, Rule 21 of the Bihar Maintenance & Welfare of Parents & Senior Citizens Rules, 2012 reads as under:-

***“21. Duties and powers of the District Magistrate. - (1)The District Magistrate***



*shall perform the duties and exercise the powers mentioned in sub-rule (2) and (3) so as to ensure that the provisions of the Act are properly carried out in his district.*

*(2) It shall be the duty of the District Magistrate to:*

*(i) ensure that life and property of senior citizens of the district are protected and they are able to live with security and dignity;*

*(ii) oversee and monitor the work of Maintenance Tribunals and Maintenance Officers of the district with a view to ensuring timely and fair disposal of applications for maintenance, and execution of Tribunals' orders;*

*(iii) oversee and monitor the working of old age homes in the district so as to ensure that they conform to the standards laid down in these rules, and any other guidelines and orders of the Government;*

*(iv) ensure regular and wide publicity of the provisions of the Act, and Central and State Governments' programmes for the welfare of senior citizens;*

*(v) encourage and coordinate with panchayats, municipalities, Nehru Yuva Kendras, educational*



*institutions and especially their National Service Scheme Units, organizations, specialists, experts, activists, etc. working in the district so that their resources and efforts are effectively pooled for the welfare of senior citizens of the district;*

*(vi) ensure provision of timely assistance and relief to senior citizens in the event of natural calamities and other emergencies;*

*(vii) ensure periodic sensitization of officers of various Departments and Local Bodies concerned with welfare of senior citizens, towards the needs of such citizens, and the duty of the officers towards the latter;*

*(viii) review the progress of investigation and trial of cases relating to senior citizens in the district, except in cities having a Police Commissioner;*

*(ix) ensure that adequate number of prescribed application forms for maintenance are available in offices of common contact for citizens like Panchayats, Block Development Offices, Tahsildar offices, District Social Welfare*



*Offices, Collectorate, Police Stations etc;*

*(x) promote establishment of dedicated Help-lines for senior citizens at district headquarters, to begin with; and*

*(xi) perform such other function as the Government, may by order, assign to the District Magistrate in this behalf, from time to time.”*

20. From reading of the aforesaid rules, it appears that power has been vested with the Collector to ensure that life and property of senior citizens of the district are protected and they are able to live with security and dignity. It is the duty cast upon the Collector to exercise the power mentioned in Sub Rule-2 and 3 to ensure that the provisions of the Act are properly carried out in the District.

21. This Court in the case of ***C.W.J.C. No.7851 of 2022 (Ravi Shankar & Anr. vs. the State of Bihar & Ors.)*** (*supra*) has held in paragraph nos. 28 and 29 as under:-

*“28. Having regard to the foregoing discussion, considering the scope and purview of the provisions contained in the Act, 2007 as also in the Rules, 2012, as referred to hereinabove in the preceding paragraphs, having regard to*



*the aims and objects of the Act, 2007, apart from considering the judgment, rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **S. Vanitha** (supra) and the judgments, rendered by the various High Courts, in the cases of **Niraj Shivkumar Maholay & Anr.** (supra), **Sandeep Gulati** (supra), **Justice Shanti Sarup Dewan & Anr.** (supra), **Shweta Shetty** (supra), **Jayantram Vallabhdas Meswania** (supra), **Sunny Paul** (supra), **Harvinder Kaur Bawa** (supra), **Nasir** (supra), **Promil Tomar** (supra), **Aarshya Gulati** (supra) and **Shadab Khairi & Anr.** (supra), this Court is of the considered view that the Act, 2007 and the Rules, 2012 have been enacted/framed to provide simple, speedy and inexpensive mechanism for the protection of life and property of the older persons as also for maintenance and welfare of parents and senior citizens, who are in distress, by a summary procedure, thus the provisions contained in the Act, 2007 and Rules, 2012 are required to be liberally construed, since the primary object is to give social justice to parents and senior citizens, more so since the same are Social Welfare Legislation and further, the statutory intent of the Act, 2007 is to protect senior citizens and not to foist*



*on them any imaginary claim over their property by such claimant, who has no such right to begin with, as such removal of such a person, with no right in the premises in question, will not be construed to be an eviction, inasmuch as to invoke any prohibition against eviction, it must be shown that some legally enforceable civil right of the person sought to be evicted, has been determined, in the property itself and he has been denied that right. However, this is not the position in the present case, inasmuch as admittedly, Preeti Guest House is a self-earned property of the Respondent No. 8, situated over Plot No. G-626, P.O.-Lohiyanagar, P.S.-Kankarbagh, District-Patna, which was allotted to the private respondent no. 8, by a perpetual lease deed dt. 20.7.1992, by the Bihar State Housing Board, Patna and tax receipts are also being issued in his name by the Patna Municipal Corporation, Patna, from time to time.*

*29. In view of the scope and purview of the provisions contained in Section 4 and Section 22 of the Act, 2007 read with various other provisions of the said Act, 2007 as well as Rule 21 and Rule 22 of the Bihar Rules, 2012, this Court is of the considered opinion that the*



*same definitely permits an application for eviction of children by senior citizens or parents, inasmuch as the said Act, 2007 is enacted for the benefit and protection of a senior citizen from his children or grandchildren. If the argument of the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners is accepted then no senior citizen, who has been harassed and mentally tortured by his/her children, will be able to recover possession of his/her property from the children or grand children during his/her life time. Therefore, if the private Respondent No. 8, who is 73 years old, is a senior citizen and has been harassed to bits by the petitioners, is asked to file a civil suit for recovery of possession of the property in question from the petitioners, who are not maintaining him, but are creating nuisance, the whole purpose and object of the Act, 2007 would stand frustrated, especially since the said Act, 2007 has an overriding effect qua any other enactment, in view of Section 3 thereof. In fact, the Civil Court has been precluded from entertaining any matter qua which jurisdiction is vested under the said Act, 2007 and especially bars granting any*



*injunction, thus, the petitioners are required to move out of the premises in question to permit the Respondent No. 8 to live in peace and civil proceedings can only be qua a claim thereafter, if the petitioners so choose to pursue the title suit in question, which they have filed after initiation of maintenance proceedings by the private respondent No. 8, however, without any interim injunction. In any view of the matter, the title suit in question has been filed belatedly, as aforesaid, by the petitioners to thwart the legitimate and genuine right of the private respondent no. 8, wherein imaginary claims have been made over the property in question with bald allegations, hence, at the moment, the private respondent no. 8, being the owner of the property in question, as aforesaid, cannot be dispossessed in the garb of pendency of the civil suit. Consequently, this Court is of the firm view that under the provisions of the Act, 2007 and the Bihar Rules, 2012, the maintenance tribunal can issue an eviction order to ensure that senior citizen lives peacefully in his/her house without being forced to accommodate their children. In view of the foregoing discussion, the order dated 16.4.2022,*



*passed by the Chairman Tribunal-cum-Sub-Divisional Officer, Patna Sadar, in Tribunal Case No. 55 of 2021 and the direction to vacate the rest house in question within one month and hand over the keys to the private respondent no. 8 cannot be said to be without jurisdiction or beyond the scope of the Act, 2007/ the Rules, 2012, much less suffering from any illegality or infirmity, so as to warrant any interference by this Court.”*

**22.** From the aforesaid discussions, it will appear that authorities have been vested with power under the Act to protect the life and property of the senior citizens to enable them to live with security and dignity and the authorities under the Act have power to evict the wrongdoers who are disturbing the senior citizens in enjoyment of their property.

**23.** The second argument of the petitioners is that the house in question belongs to the joint family property and it was allotted in the share of the petitioners in the Title Suit No.224 of 1970/45 of 1978 and thereafter a fresh Partition Suit no.327 of 2018 has been filed for partition of the suit property. In the title suit no.224 of 1970/45 of 1978 which was disposed of on 12.01.1984, the house in question was not the subject matter. In the said title suit, the plaintiff was Most. Patto Kuer



and the defendants were Suryadeo Narayan Singh and his sons and other co-sharers. The respondent no.5 herein was the defendant no.3 in the said title suit. The parties in the said title suit had entered into a compromise. In para 24-A of the compromise petition, it was stated that the properties purchased by the defendant nos.1 to 7 after filing of Title Suit No.224 of 1970 shall be the property of the persons who has purchased the same and other properties of the suit have no concern whatsoever from those properties. In paragraph no.25 of the compromise petition, it was further stated that the property acquired from the Peoples Co-operative Housing Society in lieu of money deposited there, the said property shall form part of the schedule of the property allotted to Suryadeo Narayan Singh.

**24.** Paragraph no.24 and 25 of the compromise petition read as under:-

“(24-ए) यह कि मुदालेहुम नम्बर-1 ता 7. जो जायदाद को खरीद सन् 1970 ई0 के वादयानि टाईटोल मु0नम्बर 224 सन् 1970 दायर होने के बाद खरीद को है उस जायदादो किसी फरीक को कोई मतलब नही रहा वो नही रहेगा।

(25). यह कि मोजा शेरपुर में प्लॉट नम्बर 306 अराजी 7 रि0 वो प्लॉट नम्बर 514 में 3 जो कुल 10 डि0 अराजी पर श्री सुर्यदेव नारायण सिंह, का करार पाया वो पिपुल्स हाउस कन्सट्रक्सन कोपेरटिव सोसाईटी में जमा रूपये



से जो जमीन मिला वह मुदालेह नम्बर-1 श्री  
सूर्य देवनारायण सिंह से दान में दर्ज पाया।”

**25.** The house in question has been acquired from the Peoples Cooperative Housing Society in favour of respondent no.5 on 25.04.1972 and the respondent no.5 has constructed three-storied building thereon. It is an admitted position that as per the compromise petition, the properties acquired till 1970 were to be partitioned and all the properties acquired after 1970 were to be owned by the persons, who had acquired the same. The house in dispute has been purchased by the respondent no.5 in his name from the Peoples Cooperative Housing Society and the construction over the property has also been made by the respondent no.5. At no point of time, the petitioners had made any objection with regard to the property of the Peoples Cooperative Housing Society and the construction being made by the respondent no.5. The petitioners have been saying that the property which the respondent no.5 claims is a part of the Partition Suit no.327 of 2018 and is a joint family property. In the Partition Suit no.327 of 2018 filed by the petitioners, the following prayer has been made:-

“(क) यह कि न्यायालय से डिक्री इबतदाई वास्ते  
बंटवारा प्रार्थी वादीगण के पक्ष में 18 पैसे कसरे  
वाला प्रदान किया जाय तो वाद सदुरे इबतदई



वास्ते बंटवारा के वतैनाती सर्वे पास अधिवक्ता आयुक्त के एक तख्ता मयाजी 18 पैसे कसरेवाला हिस्सा को अलग बॉटकर करवा दिया जाय और बजरिये अहलेकार अदालत वो बजरिये सर्वे जानकार अधिवक्ता आयुक्त के बांटकर अलग किये गये सम्पति पर अलग वो खास कब्जा-दखल प्रार्थी वादीगण का दिलवा दिया जाय।

(ख) न्यायालय द्वारा अस्थाई निषेधाज्ञा के आदेश द्वारा प्रस्तुत वाद के लंबित रहने के दौरान वादपत्र के परिशिष्ट सं०-01 ता 04 में वर्णित विभाजन योग्य संपति जो बिक्री करने अंतरण करने या उसके निश्चत किसी तरह का वसीका करने से इस वाद के निर्णय होने तक प्रतिवादीगण को रोक दिया जाय।

(ग) प्रस्तुत वाद का कुल वाद व्यय प्रार्थी वादीगण को प्रतिवादीगण से दिलवा दिया जाय।

(घ) उपरोक्त अनुतोषों के अतिरिक्त जिस अन्य अनुतोष के हकदार प्रार्थी वादीगण बाजए न्यायालय समझे जाय प्रार्थी वादीगण को दिलवा दिया जाय।”

**26.** From the prayer made in the Partition Suit, it appears that the petitioners have claimed only 18 *paise* share in the suit properties including the house in question which is in the name of the respondent no.5. The partition suit is yet to be decided. The petitioners by filing a suit cannot change the character of the property. The lease deed is in favour of respondent no.5 and unless and until the share of the petitioners



is decided by a competent court, the house in question cannot be treated as a joint family property. Further, in the partition suit the petitioners have prayed for recovery of possession and therefore, it appears that the petitioners are not in possession of the property in question. The respondent no.5 being a senior citizen is being harassed by the petitioners by simply filing a Partition Suit and the claim of the petitioners is yet to be decided by the District Court. Therefore, I am of the view that merely by filing a Partition Suit, the house/property acquired and owned by the respondent no.5 cannot be interfered with by the petitioners.

27. For the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that the impugned order dated 10.06.2022 passed by the Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Patna in Senior Citizen (Misc.) Appeal No.01 of 2020-21 cannot be interfered with as there is no infirmity in the same. This writ petition is devoid of any merit and accordingly, it is dismissed. The interim order dated 10.08.2022 is hereby vacated.

**(Sandeep Kumar, J)**

pawan/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N/A.
Uploading Date	16.02.2024.
Transmission Date	

