

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.6818 of 2016
Date of Decision:-04.08.2016

HDFC Standard Life Insurance Co. Ltd. and another

..... Petitioners

Vs.

Sheela Devi and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: - Mr.Puneet Tuli, Advocate, for
Mr.Sandeep Suri, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr.B.S. Mittal, Advocate,
for the respondents.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J. (ORAL)

This petition is filed in order to challenge the award of the
Permanent Lok Adalat (PUS), Sirsa.

On 31.5.2016, following order was recorded by this Court: -

*“Learned counsel for the petitioners, inter-
alia, contends that the claim set up by the
respondents before the Permanent Lok
Adalat was beyond its pecuniary jurisdiction
of ₹25 lakhs as respondent No.1 had asked
for ₹25 lakhs as insurance amount, ₹2 lakhs
as compensation and ₹15,000/- as litigation
charges. Though, the Lok Adalat has
awarded ₹25 lakhs with interest, but
according to the learned counsel for the
petitioners, it had no jurisdiction to entertain
the petition in which respondent No.1 had
claimed more than ₹25 lakhs. In support of
his claim, learned counsel for the petitioners*

has relied upon an order passed by this Court in CWP No. 10597 of 2012 (O&M) (State Bank of Patiala Vs. Ferozepur Foods Private Limited and another) decided on 13.1.2016, in which it has been held that the petition before the Lok Adalat was not maintainable if the value of the property in dispute was more than rupees ten lakhs (as it then was).

Notice of motion for 04.8.2016.

In the meantime, operation of the impugned order shall remain stayed.”

Learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that the petitioners are guilty of concealment of fact as on 20.3.2015, the Ministry of Law and Justice had issued notification increasing pecuniary jurisdiction of Permanent Lok Adalat to “one crore rupees”, whereas on 31.5.2016, it is argued by counsel for the petitioners that the pecuniary jurisdiction of Permanent Lok Adalat is ₹25 lakhs only.

In view of the above, present petition is hereby dismissed.

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

04.08.2016

Vivek

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No