

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

258

CR-5478-2015

Date of Decision:09.08.2017

Gram Panchayat Darieywal

.....Petitioner

Versus

Ranjit Singh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK.

Present: Mr.G.S.Virk, Advocate,
for Mr.G.S.Nagra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

None for the respondents.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J.(Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the order dated 02.06.2015 (Annexure P-6) passed by the learned Permanent Lok Adalat, petitioner-Gram Panchayat has approached this Court, by way of present civil revision petition, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, for setting aside the impugned order.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Before proceeding further, operative part of the impugned order deserves to be referred here and the same be reads as under:-

“Consequently, we accept the application and hold that applicant has got a right of 24 hour electricity supply from respondents No.1 and 2 without any hindrance on the part of respondent No.3 within ten days from the date of receipt of this order. However, respondent No.1 shall ensure the safety of the passers-by without causing any damage to

the sewerage system. Parties are left to bear their own costs.”

A bare perusal of the impugned order would make it crystal clear that no prejudice of any kind whatsoever has been caused to the petitioner-Gram Panchayat, by passing the impugned order by the learned Permanent Lok Adalat. As the operative part of the impugned order reproduced above would show that official respondent Nos.2 and 3 were directed to ensure electricity supply to respondent No.1, it does not appeal to reason as to how the Gram Panchayat can oppose such a prayer made by respondent No.1. Having said that, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the learned Permanent Lok Adalat was well within its jurisdiction to pass the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld, for this reason also.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner could not point out any patent illegality or perversity in the impugned order passed by the learned Permanent Lok Adalat, which may warrant interference at the hands of this Court, while exercising its revisional jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. The impugned order has been found based on sound reasons and the same deserves to be upheld, for this reason as well.

No other argument was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that the present revision petition is misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out.

Resultantly, with the above-said observations made, instant revision petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

August 09, 2017
seema

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No