

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 6170 of 2015
Date of decision : September 18, 2015

Subhash
..... Petitioner
Versus

Branch Manager,PACL Limited
..... Respondent

CR No. 6171 of 2015

Radhe Sham
..... Petitioner
Versus

Branch Manager,PACL Limited
..... Respondent

CR No. 6172 of 2015

Rajkumari
..... Petitioner
Versus

Branch Manager,PACL Limited
..... Respondent

CR No. 6173 of 2015

Gurcharan Lal
..... Petitioner
Versus

Branch Manager,PACL Limited
..... Respondent

CR No. 6174 of 2015

Rajender
..... Petitioner
Versus

Branch Manager,PACL Limited
..... Respondent

CR No. 6184 of 2015

Rajender

..... **Petitioner**

Versus

Branch Manager, PACL Limited

..... **Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. S. S. Sahu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

This order of mine shall dispose of Civil revision Nos. 6170 to 6174 and 6184 of 2015 as the question of law and fact involved is common.

The petitioners invoked the jurisdiction of Permanent Lok Adalat/Public Utility Services under Section 22-C of Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 for settlement of dispute viz-a-viz refund of policy. The policy admittedly contains clause 8 prescribing a resolution of dispute through arbitration. The aforementioned authority by taking into consideration clause 8 declined to entertain the petition being not maintainable. As per the terms and conditions of the policy the retired judicial officer is the arbitrator and the place of arbitration would be at Delhi.

The grievance of the petitioner can only be adjudicated by seeking reference to the Arbitrator. In case, the

respondent-PACL do not choose to appoint the arbitrator, the petitioner can, well, within the provisions of Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, seek remedy by sending a notice and appointment of a different arbitrator.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the aforementioned order.

With the aforementioned observations, the revision petitions stand dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

September 18 , 2015
archana