

CWP-4662-2013

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

210

**CWP-4662-2013 (O&M).
Decided on: February 16, 2017.**

State Bank of India

.. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

Permanent Lok Adalat and others

.. Respondent(s)

*** * ***

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.M.S.BEDI
* * ***

**PRESENT Mr.Rakesh Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

**Mr.Harinder Pal Singh Ishar, Advocate,
for respondent no.2.**

**Mr.Rajneesh Malhotra, Advocate,
Ms.Monica Jangra, Advocate,
for respondent no.3.**

M.M.S. BEDI, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner has vehemently contended that order passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat (Public Utility Services), Faridabad, is contrary to the provisions of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987 and the same is without jurisdiction.

I have carefully considered the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner in context to the definition in Section 22-A of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987, regarding the cases in which the

CWP-4662-2013

Permanent Lok Adalat (Public Utility Services) can exercise powers.

A perusal of Section 22-A (b) (iv) of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987, indicates that in the matters of Insurance services the Permanent Lok Adalat, shall have jurisdiction.

It is further contended that the cognizance could not have been taken by the Permanent Lok Adalat as only in case a compromise is arrived at between the parties, the dispute can be decided by the Permanent Lok Adalat, accordingly. In this context, a perusal of Section 22-C (8) of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987, indicates that where the parties failed to reach an agreement under Section 22-C (7) of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987, the Permanent Lok Adalat shall have jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the matter on merits.

Counsel for the petitioner has also raised a contention that State Bank of India is an independent entity and has no concern with SBI Life Insurance Company Limited which may be a sister concern and any liability of the SBI Insurance Company cannot be foisted on the State Bank of India. I find no force in the said contention.

No ground is made out for interference.

The petition is dismissed.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

February 16, 2017.

rka

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable:

Yes / No
Yes / No