IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 22ND DAY OF MARCH, 2022

BEFORE

WRIT PETITION NO.6729/2016(GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

- 1. MRS DEPHNY GLADYS LOBO
- 2. MR FREDERICK LOBO

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. O. SHIVARAMA BHAT, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- ASST COMMISSIONER AND PRESIDENT SENIOR CITIZEN MAINTENANCE TRIBUNAL, MANGALURU SUB DIVISION, MANGALURU-575001
- 2. SMT CAROBINA FERRAO GUREIN

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. RAMESH GOWDA, AGA FOR R1; SRI. GAJENDRA G., ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS INITIATED BY THE R-1 VIDE ANNX-A AND ETC.

THIS WRIT PETITION COMING ON FOR HEARING THIS DAY, THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCE/PHYSICAL HEARING, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER

The short point calling for consideration in this writ petition is whether a person who is not an Indian citizen can maintain a petition before the Sub Divisional Magistrate under the provisions of The Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (for short 'the Act') and at the instance of such person whether the Sub Divisional Magistrate can initiate proceedings?

- 2. The petitioners have approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution seeking quashing of the entire proceedings in ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಸಿಸಿಆರ್.103/15-16 (Annexure-A).
- 3. The impugned proceedings has been initiated by the respondent No.1 at the instance of respondent No.2

against the petitioners herein. The passport of respondent No.2 is produced at Annexure-B. It shows that respondent No.2–Carobina Ferrao Guerin is a British citizen. Her photograph is also affixed to the passport. It is therefore evident that she is not an Indian citizen as the Constitution of India does not provide for dual citizenship. Sub-section (h) of Section 2 of the Act defines 'Senior Citizen' and it reads as follows:

"h. "senior citizen" means any person being a citizen of India, who has attained the age of sixty years or above;"

4. It is evident that one of the essential elements for being designated a 'Senior Citizen' for the purposes of the Act is the person being an Indian citizen. The passport at Annexure-B clearly shows that respondent No.2 at whose instance proceedings has been initiated by the respondent No.1, is not an Indian citizen. In that view of the matter, respondent No.1 had no jurisdiction to initiate the proceedings under the Act. Accordingly, same is liable to be quashed.

5. Accordingly, a writ of certiorari is issued against the entire proceedings in ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಸಿಸಿಆರ್.103/15-16 (Annexure-A) and same is quashed. Writ Petition is allowed and *rule-nisi* issued is made absolute.

Sd/-JUDGE

DR