



2023/KER/62656

'CR'

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN

FRIDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2023 / 14TH ASWINA, 1945

WP(C) NO. 18335 OF 2023


PETITIONER:

SRI. SIJU K. BHANU, AGED 47 YEARS



(Party-In-Person)

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR & MAINTENANCE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, DISTRICT COLLECTORATE, CIVIL STATION, KUDAPPANAKKUNNU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM., PIN - 695043
- 2 THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER & SUB DIVISIONAL MAGISTRATE & MAINTENANCE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, DISTRICT COLLECTORATE, CIVIL STATION, KUDAPPANAKKUNNU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM ,PIN-695043.
- 3 SMT. KAMEELA. G., AGED 80 YEARS

- 4 KERALA MENTAL HEALTH AUTHORITY,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, RED CROSS ROAD, RISHIMANGALM ROAD, VANCHIYOOR,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695035.
- 5 ADDL. R5. DISTRICT POLICE CHIEF,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, UNIVERSITY OF KERALA SENATE HOUSE CAMPUS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA -695033 IS SUO MOTO IMPLEADED AS ADDITIONAL R5 AS PER ORDER DATED 26.09.2023 IN WP(C)18335/2023.

PIRAPPANCODE V.S.SUDHIR
AKASH S.
GIRISH KUMAR M S



2023/KER/62656

WP(C) NO. 18335 OF 2023 & con.case

2

DEVIKA JAYARAJ
MARY KUNJU JOHN
SMT.VIDYA KURIAKOSE - GP

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 06.10.2023, ALONG WITH WP(C).22758/2023, THE
COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM****PRESENT****THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN****FRIDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2023 / 14TH ASWINA, 1945****WP(C) NO. 22758 OF 2023****PETITIONER:**

KAMEELA, AGED 80 YEARS, [REDACTED]

PIRAPPANCODE V.S.SUDHIR
AKASH S.
GIRISH KUMAR M S
DEVIKA JAYARAJ**RESPONDENTS:**

- 1 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR & MAINTENANCE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, DISTRICT COLLECTORATE, CIVIL STATION, KUDAPPANAKKUNNU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695043
- 2 THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER & SUB DIVISIONAL MAGISTRATE & MAINTENANCE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, DISTRICT COLLECTORATE, CIVIL STATION, KUDAPPANAKKUNNU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695043
- 3 SRI.SIJU K. BHANU, [REDACTED],
[REDACTED]
- 4 THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, MARAYIMUTTOM POLICE STATION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695124

SRI.SIJU K. BHANU (Party-In-Person)
SMT.VIDYA KURIAKOSE - GP

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 06.10.2023, ALONG WITH WP(C).18335/2023, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



' CR '

JUDGMENT**[WP(C) Nos.18335/2023, 22758/2023]**

"Till death do us part". An octogenarian wife has been driven to knock on the doors of this Court for consortium and company of her dementia afflicted husband – twelve years her senior – who, she says has been unfairly taken away by her son to his house and detained.

2. Incredulous as it may sound, sometimes life is stranger than fiction.

3. Among the afore two writ petitions - which are being disposed of together - W.P.(C) No.18335/2023 has been filed by Sri.Siju K.Bhanu — who is appearing in person — impugning Ext.P12 order of the first respondent — Maintenance Appellate Tribunal, constituted under the provisions of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (for short 'the Act'), whereby, he has been directed to take his nonagenarian ailing father — the senior citizen — to his family home at Neyyattinkara, so that he can live with his wife there.

4. The petitioner asserts that the afore order is illegal and



unlawful because it was issued on the basis of a complaint filed by his mother, to the effect that he had taken away his father to his house using force. He contends that there was no such force used, his father being happy to be with him; and that he is also willing to take care of his mother, if she is willing to reside with him. He further explains that his father — the senior citizen — is suffering from dementia and that his mother — who is 80 years in age and suffering from various ailments — cannot take care of him at all; and that it is, therefore, that he took over his care. He added that, unfortunately, he cannot live in the family house, since he and his father have disputes with certain neighbours there and that if he is to go there now, he would be attacked by them and even done away with. He thus prays that Ext.P12 be set aside, since his father cannot do without his care and since he cannot stay at the family house to take care of him, for the reasons above.

5. While so, W.P.(C) No.22758/2023 has been filed by Smt.Kameela — mother of Sri.Siju K.Bhanu, seeking that the aforementioned order of the Maintenance Appellate Tribunal be implemented. Her specific contention is that her husband is happiest when he is in her company at the family house; and



that he is now being detained by her son — Sri.Siju K.Bhanu, against his wishes in his home, where he is living like a destitute, in an uncared for situation. She adds that she cannot stay at the house of her son, since she fears ill-treatment by him and his family and cites certain instances of the past. She then asserts that, in any event, she and her husband have a right to live together, especially at their own residence, namely, the family house at Neyyattinkara.

6. Sri.Ramkumar Nambiar — learned *amicus curiae*, submitted that what is crucially relevant in these matters are the requirements and wishes of the senior citizen; and hence that an assessment of what would be the best for him, to lead a life of safety and dignity, is imperative. He submitted that, even when the senior citizen may be suffering from dementia or such other age-related cognitive difficulties, it can, to a large extent, be alleviated if he is offered an atmosphere of peace and love, which should be left to him to decide, to the extent to which he is capable. He asserted that, therefore, this Court had done the right thing in having called for reports from the Social Justice Officer — with respect to the situation of the senior citizen; and the Police Authorities — as to whether Sri.Siju K.Bhanu is facing



threats from the neighbours of his family home at Neyyattinkara; and prayed that this Court decide these matters on the basis of the same.

7. Smt.Vidya Kuriakose — learned Government Pleader, submitted that, as per the interim order of this Court dated 26.09.2023 — which date these cases were last listed — Smt.Kameela was accompanied by the Social Justice Officer to the house of Sri.Siju K.Bhanu to meet her husband and that they spent time together; subsequent to which, a report has been filed by the Officer in W.P.(C) No.22758/2023. She pointed out that the said report clearly says that the senior citizen is happiest in the company of his wife; and that he has made it very clear that he wants to stay with her at the family house at Neyyattinkara.

8. Smt.Vidya Kuriakose, thereafter, submitted that, since Sri.Siju K.Bhanu had made a submission — when W.P.(C) No.18335/2023 had been earlier listed — that he cannot go to the family house at Neyyattinkara, because he is facing danger and threats from various persons there, a report had also been called for by this Court from the District Superintendent of Police, Thiruvananthapuram (Rural). She pointed out that the



said report is also on record, which unequivocally states that there is no threat — either to the senior citizen or to Sri.Siju K.Bhanu — in the locality of their family house and that the police are willing to take care of them to the extent which is necessary in law; for which, all measures and steps will be put in place. She, therefore, left it to this Court to issue appropriate orders.

9. Faced with the afore reports, Sri.Siju K.Bhanu submitted that they are all “unbelievable” and are doctored to suit the interests of his mother — who, he alleged is acting under the dictates of his sister, who is now staying with her at the family home at Neyyattinkara; and then tried to impress upon this Court that he has voice recordings, as also video recordings, to show that his father does not want to go and stay there. He, however, conceded, to a pointed question from this Court, that none of these materials have been placed on record; but, nevertheless, asserted that, since he is the only person who can take care of his father suffering from dementia and failing health — especially because his mother is also unwell and unable to even take care of herself — if he is to be shifted to the family house, as ordered by the Tribunal, he would be put to



great prejudice and detriment, being left without care at all. He reiterated that all this is being done at the instance of his siblings, who, he asserted, want to bring his father to Neyyattinkara for questionable reasons. He thus prayed that W.P.(C) No.22758/2023 be dismissed and W.P.(C) No.18335/2023 be allowed.

10. Noticing the afore dialectical submissions of the parties as recorded above, this Court had called for reports, vide order dated 26.09.2023, from the jurisdictional Social Justice Officer of the area where the house of Sri.Siju K.Bhanu is situated, as to the present condition of the senior citizen; as also from the District Police Chief in charge of the area where the “family house” of the parties is situated, to report about the apprehensions of threat projected by Sri.Siju K.Bhanu.

11. Both the afore Authorities have, in obedience, filed their respective reports.

12. The report, dated 05.10.2023, of the Social Justice Officer in W.P.(C) No.22758/2023, avers as under:

“As per the instruction of the Hon. Court, the District Social Justice Officer and team accompanied Smt Kameela to visit Mr.Bhanu, who is residing with his son at Jagathy



Kochar Road on 03.10.2023 at 11.00 AM. Mr. Bhanu was happy to see his wife and shared good moments with her. District Social Justice Officer is not a competent authority to interpret the cognitive faculty of Mr Bhanu, who is a Dementia patient. But his interaction with his wife seems happiness to him. Since the senior citizen is suffering from dementia related problems keeping him in a room with a care taker could degrade his current level. He might get much more relief in his condition if he is with his wife at his family residency at Manjavilakom. Moreover Kamela who is also a senior citizen of 80 years old has prayer to live rest of her life along with her husband at their family house. So it is recommended to leave Mr Bhanu with his wife Smt. Kameela at their family residency at Manjavilakom, Neyyattinkara so as to improve his overall condition.”

13. The District Police Chief, Thiruvananthapuram (Rural), states *ut infra*, in his report dated 04.10.2023:

“I am the District Police Chief Thiruvananthapuram Rural and the 5th respondent in the above writ petition submitting the report as per the direction of the Honourable High Court.

The petitioner filed the above writ petition before the Hon'ble Court to stay the Order No. DCTVM/2239/2023 dated 31.05.2023 of the District Collector, Thiruvananthapuram which was ordered in terms of Rule 19(1) of the Maintenance & Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Rules, 2009.

In WP(C) No. 18335/2023 dated 26.09.2023 the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala directed the District Police Chief, Thiruvananthapuram Rural to cause an enquiry into the allegations of the petitioner in this writ petition in a thorough manner. In this regard Assistant Superintendent of Police, Neyyattinkara was directed to conduct an enquiry as per the No. D2- 70786/2023/T dated 30.09.2023. The facts which are revealed from the enquiry are as described below.

It is submitted that, Bhanu and his wife were living at SKB Bhavan, Manchavilakam, in Neyyattinkara Taluk. Both of them were teachers and they have three



Children; two daughters; Simi.K.Bhanu, Siji.K.Bhanu and one son, Siju.K.Bhanu. There was a dispute between the families of Bhanu with the neighbouring people at Manchavilakam in connection with construction of a road. In this regard two crime cases were registered at Parassala Police Station; 1) vide Crime No. 429/2010, U/s. 143,147,148,149,447,427, 294(b), 506 IPC, registered based on the statement of Bhanu. The case is that on 02.05.2010, the accused, including the neighbors of Bhanu, unlawfully assembled, demolished the wall of the complainant and committed damage, W/Rs. 75,000/-. The accused in the case are; 1) Prasanth, 2) Ajeesh, 3) Aneesh, 4) Murukan Assari, 5) Chandrasekharan Nair, and 6) Chidambaram. The case was charge sheeted and is under trial before the Hon. JFMC-II, Neyyattinkara as vide CC-252/2012. The next hearing of the case is on 20.10.2023. Later another case was registered against Siju.K.Bhanu and his relatives vide Crime No. 825/2010, U/s. 143,147,148,149, 323,447,427, IPC, based on the statement of Chidambaran (6th accused in crime 429/2010). The accused in this case are; 1) Ponnayyan, 2) Rajkumar, 3) Sinu Kumar, 4) Siju K Bhanu (the petitioner of this writ petition) and 5) Sureshkumar. This case was also charge sheeted and is under trial before the Hon'ble JFMC-II, Neyyattinkara, as vide CC-No. 35/2011. The next hearing of the case is on 08.12.2023. The two crime cases occurred 13 years before and there are civil cases also before the Munsiff Court, Neyyattinkara.

It is submitted that, Bhanu and Kamila lived together at Manchavilakam till 08.08.2022. Then the petitioner (the son of Bhanu) took Bhanu, to his house at Jagathy in Thiruvananthapuram City leaving Kamila, his mother alone in the house at Manchavilakam. Sri. Bhanu, who is staying with his son, Siju, and found that he is too old and is ailing. He cannot speak fluently and is in need of constant support. It was felt that he has a poor memory of things, yet he said that he is satisfied with the life of his son and there is no problem for him living there. The petitioner had appointed a caretaker to look after Bhanu. The petitioner is working as a teacher at GV Raja Higher secondary School. He is also willing to look after his mother, if she is ready to come to his house at Jagathy.

On enquiry conducted at Manchavilakam, where



Kamila, the wife of Bhanu is living, it is revealed that there is no threat prevailing to Bhanu and Siju in that area. Kamila is also very aged and is ailing. At present she is living along with her daughter. She cannot perform her activities independently. Though Kamila stuck to the point that her husband should be brought to the house at Manchavilakam, she is not willing to go to the house of her younger son at Jagathy where her husband is staying.

It is most humbly submitted that, even though both the husband and wife are living separately, at present they are safe at their progeny's house. Both husband and wife are ailing and dependent on others as they cannot perform their daily activities on their own."

14. It is thus obvious from the afore reports that the Social Justice Officer, who was accompanied by a competent team, has found, on personal interaction and observation with and of the senior citizen, that though he is suffering from dementia, his company with his wife brings him happiness and that he shared "good moments with her". He also saw that the senior citizen is residing in a room with a caretaker, and opines that this is not apposite, because he wants the company of his family, particularly his wife, in the winter years of his life. The Officer has thus recommended that the Senior Citizen be allowed to stay with his wife at the family home at Neyyattinkara, especially because Smt.Kameela has made it very clear that she cannot stay in the house of Sri.Siju K.Bhanu.



15. Coming to the report filed by the District Police Chief, Thiruvananthapuram (Rural), it has been stated unequivocally therein, that the apprehensions projected by Sri.Siju K.Bhanu, in going to his family house at Neyyattinkara, are apocryphal and based on no valid or verifiable cause at all. The Police Officer explains that the cases and Crimes, cited by Sri.Siju K.Bhanu, relates to instances more than a decade ago; and that, in any event, even if he is to face any threat, he will be offered sufficient and effective protection to stay in or visit his family house.

16. The germane facts and rival contentions being so recorded, one will have to put the matter in perspective.

17. Even being dementia afflicted and his memories fading, the senior citizen clearly finds solace with his wife – as the Social Justice Officer puts it in his report, “they shared good moments”. He must never be denied this, whatever Sri.Siju K.Bhanu may say in justification.

18. The right of Smt.Kameela – the wife of the senior citizen – for his custody and consortium is inviolable and absolute. Her son, Sri.Siju K.Bhanu can never deny this.



19. As far as Sri.Siju K.Bhanu is concerned, he alleges that his father is not being taken care of by his mother — she herself being unwell — or by his sister, who is now residing at their family house at Neyyattinkara. He asserts that only he can do his father well, which he wants to; but that he is unable to visit — much less stay — at the family house to take care of him. He explains that it is, therefore, that he took his father to his house at Jagathy, Thiruvananthapuram, where he is well looked after by a full-time caretaker, appointed by him.

20. That said, Smt.Kameela doubts the intentions of her son – Sri.Siju K.Bhanu, in taking away her husband and asserts that he has done so for confutative reasons and to keep them away from each other in winter years of their lives, when they require each other's consortium the most.

21. Even if this Court is to disregard the afore suspicion impelled by Smt.Kameela and to give him some latitude, Sri.Siju K.Bhanu will have to establish good cause to justify the separation of his parents at their age. For this, he only says that he faces threats from some persons in the locality of his family house; and then offers that his mother will also be taken care of by him, should she agree to stay in his house.



22. Unfortunately, for certain specific reasons cited, Smt.Kameela refuses to stay permanently in her son's house; also asserting that she and her husband are to live in their own house and nowhere else.

23. It is here that the report of the District Police Chief becomes extremely crucial. As said above, he reports that there is absolutely no threat to Sri.Siju K.Bhanu at the locality of his parent's house at Neyyattinkara and that the instances of conflict alleged by him with certain persons there, happened more than thirteen years ago, though some of the cases are still pending. The Officer also undertakes to offer all necessary protection to Sri.Siju K.Bhanu, to visit or even to stay at the afore house.

24. Therefore, now, the air is clear; and Sri.Siju K.Bhanu certainly can take care of his father at the family house at Neyyattinkara, if he is so intending.

25. Pertinently, since the report of the Social Justice Officer says that the senior citizen is being taken care of by a full-time caretaker in the house of Sri.Siju K.Bhanu, the latter can certainly continue to provide such service to his father, even



at the family home, should he find it difficult to stay there or to remain there constantly – which, perhaps, he cannot, since he affirms to be working as a teacher in Higher Secondary school.

In the afore circumstances:

(I)(a) W.P.(C) No.22758/2023 is allowed; and the jurisdictional Social Justice Officer is hereby directed to accompany the senior citizen to his family house at Neyyattinkara, forthwith. If there should be any obstruction, the Social Justice Officer can requisition the help of the Station House Officer of the local Police Station; and the said Authority will be obliged in law to provide all necessary assistance for this purpose. The learned Government Pleader is directed to intimate these directions to the said Station House Officer.

(b) The Social Justice Officer will, thereupon, visit the senior citizen every week and will file monthly reports before this Court, through the learned Government Pleader, for a period of three months, or for such extended period as this Court may subsequently fix.

(c) List these matters for consideration of the first of the afore reports on 13.11.2023.



(II)(a) W.P.(C) No.18335/2023 is dismissed as regards the prayer against Ext.P12 order of the Maintenance Appellate Tribunal; but with liberty reserved to the petitioner – Sri.Siju K.Bhanu, to appoint the same caretaker as presently available; or a different one, to be in charge of his father.

(b) Sri.Siju K.Bhanu is also at liberty to stay at or to visit the family house at Neyyattinkara to see and be with his father, subject to his mother's wishes; for which, if he is to seek protection against any local threat with the jurisdictional police station, it shall be afforded without any delay. The District Police Chief, Thiruvananthapuram (Rural) is directed to intimate this to the Station House Officer of such station, immediately.

Sd/- DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN
JUDGE

stu

**APPENDIX OF WP(C) 22758/2023**

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 17.10.2022
FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND
RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.J1/9756/2022 DATED
19.11.2022 OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 08.02.2023
IN W.P.(C)NO.39535/2022 OF THIS HON'BLE
COURT
- Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.DCTVM/2239/2023-A4
DATED 31.05.2023 OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED
01.07.2023 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER
BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P6 TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 01.07.2023
ISSUED ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER TO THE
4TH RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P7 TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 07.07.2023
GIVEN BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

- Exhibit R1 The copy of the medical prescription issued
by Dr. S.R,Chandra, SK Hospital, TVM dated
29/8/2022.
- Exhibit R2 The Copy of a Scan report dated 29/8/2022
issued by SK Hospital Thiruvananthapuram
- Exhibit R3 The Copy of the Medical Certificate dated
05/12/2022 issued by Dr SR Chandra,SK
Hospital, Thiruvananthapuram
- Exhibit R4 The Copy of the unique Disability ID card
showing the type of Disability as Mental



illness issued by the Govt. of India dated 14/02/2023.

- Exhibit R5 The copy of the case details of AS 273/2022 in the Additional District Court, Neyyattinkara
- Exhibit R6 The true copy of the case details of CC252/2012 in Judicial First Class magistrate Court 2 Neyyattirikara.
- Exhibit R7 The copy of the final Report of CC252/2012 dated 25/05/2010 submitted by Parassala Police station in the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court 2, Neyyattinkara
- Exhibit R8 The copy of the petition dated 10/10/2022 filed by my mother in Vanitha Commission
- Exhibit R9 The call record of the phone call between my mother, father and sister on 14.8.2022. In the CD named 'Audio and Video Exhibits by R3 CD in wpc 22758/2023
- Exhibit R10 The Video clipping shot on 19.9.2022 and sent to the R4, the SHO in the Marayamuttom on 20.09.2022
- Exhibit R11 The CCTV visual on 17/6/2023 in which the policemen came to In the implement the Exhibit P4 order.
- Exhibit R12 The video shows my father's abnormal behavioral condition
- Exhibit R13 The video shows my father's abnormal behavioral condition
- Exhibit R14 The video shows my father's abnormal behavioral condition
- Exhibit R15 The video shows my father's abnormal behavioral condition



- Exhibit R16 The Copy of the complaint filed in Hon'ble Lokayukta Thiruvananthapuram no: 96/2023 B dated 20/5/2023
- Exhibit R17 The phone call between me and the ADM TVM on 12.5.2023
- Exhibit R18 The copy of the sent email letter from backsfarm@gmail.com to shomarayamtmtvmrl.pol@kerala.gov.in dated 12/08/2022
- Exhibit R19 The true copy of the application pending before the Mental Health Authority dated 01.11.2022
- Exhibit R20 The true copy of the letter from the Mental Health Authority dated 11.11.2022, No. A/460/2022/SMHA.
- Exhibit R21 The true copy of the Application pending before R2 dated 22/06/2023

**APPENDIX OF WP(C) 18335/2023**

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF THE MEDICAL PRESCRIPTION ISSUED BY DR. S.R.CHANDRA, S.K.HOSPITAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DATED 29/8/2022
- Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF THE SCAN REPORT DATED 29/8/2022 ISSUED BY S.K. HOSPITAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
- Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 05/12/2022 ISSUED BY DR. S. R. CHANDRA, S.K.HOSPITAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
- Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF THE UNIQUE DISABILITY ID CARD SHOWING THE TYPE OF DISABILITY AS MENTAL ILLNESS ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
- Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 17/10/2022 FILED BY THE PETITIONER'S MOTHER, THE 3RD RESPONDENT BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P6 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 19/11/2022 PASSED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P7 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 08/02/2023 IN WPÂ© 39535/2023 OF THE HONOURABLE HIGH COURT
- Exhibit P8 TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT OF FACTS FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 1 ST RESPONDENT ON 13/03/2023
- Exhibit P9 TRUE COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL STATEMENT FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 1 ST RESPONDENT ON 27/04/2023
- Exhibit P10 TRUE COPY OF OF THE APPLICATION DATED 15/02/2023 FILED BY THE PETITIONER FOR APPOINTING HIM AS THE GUARDIAN OF THE PETITIONER'S FATHER UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITY ACT BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT



Exhibit P11 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 29/03/2023
ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE
PETITIONER

Exhibit P12 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 31/05/2023
PASSED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT