

DESH RAJ VS DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KURUKSHETRA AND OTHERS

Present: Applicant-respondent No.5 in person.

Mr. Varun Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**IOIN-1-CWP-24458-2021**

Office note perused.

Registry has reported that in the final order dated 29.08.2025, case number has been mentioned as CWP-24458-2001, instead of CWP-24458-2021.

Accordingly, the error, being typographical, is rectified. The number of the writ petition be read as CWP-24458-2021.

The Registry is directed to carry out necessary corrections in the number of order dated 29.08.2025.

IOIN stands disposed of.

**RA-CW-405-2025 in CWP-24458-2021**

Applicant-respondent No.5 (Satbir Kaur), has filed the instant application, under Order 47 Rule 1, read with Section 151 of the Civil Procedure Code, seeking review of the order dated 29.08.2025, on the ground that, vide order dated 10.02.2022, an interim order was granted, thereby, restraining respondents No.3 to 5 from creating third party rights qua the property in question.

Applicant-respondent No.5, who is appearing in person, submits that owing to the interim order (supra), she is unable to sell the land in question to repay the hefty amount of loan which has been taken by her husband, and interest thereon, is also increasing gradually. She has raised other issues, as well, including that of a misuse of her cheque book.

This Court has considered the submissions.

Before arriving at a conclusion, it is imperative to take note of the background of the case, briefly. The non-applicant/petitioner, who is a senior citizen, had filed the writ petition, thereby, assailing the order dated 02.11.2021, passed by the learned Appellate Authority, vide which, his application on original side, under Section 23 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007, was dismissed. Eventually, since this Court found that there were certain procedural errors and omissions in the impugned order, therefore, the matter was remitted to the learned Presiding Officer, Maintenance Tribunal Pehowa, to decide the same afresh, after affording due opportunity of hearing of the parties concerned, vide order dated 29.08.2025, and the interim order (supra) was not ordered to continue.

Apparently, the instant review application is a misplaced motion. No doubt, the applicant-respondent No.5 may have a genuine grievance, which is sought to be raised in the application, and carries legal force, but the same cannot be addressed in the present proceedings. Further, the relief sought for, does not fall within the parameters of the review. Therefore, this Court is of the view that no ground is made out to review the order dated 29.08.2025, and the application is **dismissed**.

However, liberty is reserved to applicant-respondent No.5 to approach the apt Forum/Court for redressal of her grievance.

**(KULDEEP TIWARI)**  
**JUDGE**

**19.09.2025**  
AK Sharma