

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

WP(C) No. 2500/2025
CM No. 5744/2025

Danish Sharma

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Maneesh Rampal, Advocate.

Vs

Chairman District Legal Services Authority Udhampur & Ors.

..... Respondents

Through:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY DHAR, JUDGE

ORDER
06.10.2025

1. The petitioner, through the medium of the present writ petition, has called in question award dated 08.03.2025 passed by the National Lok Adalat held at District Court Complex, Udhampur on 08.03.2025 whereby the claim petition filed by the injured through his father has been settled by awarding a sum of Rupees Eight lacs (Rs. 8,00,000/-) as compensation to the injured.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused record of the case.

3. It has been contended in the petition that the impugned award was passed by the Lok Adalat, which was passed in presence of father of the injured as well as in presence of his counsel. It has been contended that the counsel had conveyed that in addition to the compensation that may be awarded by the Lok Adalat, the injured would also be getting some more money from the owner of

the offending vehicle. It has also been submitted that the petitioner is under debt of Rs. 4,00,000/- to Rs. 5,00,000/- which he has spent on the treatment of his son. It has been further submitted that father of the injured (the petitioner) was made to nod in agreement before the Bench of Lok Adalat though he was not in agreement with the terms of the compromise.

4. If we have a look at the impugned award, it bears the signatures of father of injured (the petitioner) through whom he had filed the claim petition before the Tribunal. It also bears the signatures of the counsel for the petitioner. Besides this, even the mobile cell number of the father of the injured is mentioned in the award. The petitioner has not disputed his signature or that of his counsel, which appear on the award. The Lok Adalat, which passed the award, was presided over by two Judicial Officers of the rank of the District and Sessions Judges. In these circumstances, the contention of the petitioner that he nodded in agreement to the settlement without knowing the consequences of the same, appears to be nothing but an attempt to re-open a settled issue.

5. If the awards of Lok Adalats are allowed to be re-opened at the asking of a disgruntled litigant, who has been misled in believing that he will get exorbitant amount of compensation, then the very foundation of alternative dispute resolution mechanism is going to crumble. There is a sanctity attached to the proceedings recorded by a Lok Adalat. Unless it is shown with supporting material that a litigant has been misled into entering into a compromise before the

Lok Adalat, the High Court while exercising its supervisory jurisdiction would be loathe to interfere.

6. It is not a case where the Lok Adalat award has been passed on the basis of concession or agreement made by the counsel for the claimant without the presence of the claimant but it is a case where the petitioner himself has participated in the proceedings before the Lok Adalat and signed the award. Now he seeks to turn around and resile from the settlement. Such tactics are required to be curbed with iron hand so that any attempt on the part of greedy litigants to re-open settled issues is nipped in the bud.

7. The petitioner, who happens to be a non-earning minor person aged fourteen years having suffered 30% permanent disability, has been awarded a sum of Rupees Eight Lacs (Rs. 8,00,000/-) as compensation which, by no stretch of reasoning, can be termed as inadequate. Thus, even on merits, the grievance of the petitioner is not justified.

8. For the foregoing reasons, I do not find any merit in the instant petition. The same is, accordingly, **dismissed**.

(SANJAY DHAR)
JUDGE

JAMMU
06.10.2025
Shivalee

Whether the order is speaking: Yes/No
Whether the order is reportable: Yes/No