



CWP-14985-2024

1

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

(206)

CWP-14985-2024

Date of Decision : 22.04.2025

Phool Singh @ Sanju

...Petitioner

Versus

Permanent Lok Adalat and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Hardeep Singh Dhillon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Haryana for respondent No.1.

Mr. Vivek Saini, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3-UHBVNL.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, a challenge is thrown to the impugned award/order dated 06.06.2024 (Annexure P-1), passed by the learned Permanent Lok Adalat, Ambala, wherethrough, the application dated 19.09.2023 (Annexure P-7), for restoration of the petition filed under Section 22-C of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987, bearing Case No.LA/01/07.01.2021, dated 06.01.2021 was dismissed.

2. The petitioner has approached the learned Permanent Lok Adalat, Ambala, by filing an application under Section 22-C of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987, which was dismissed in default. Even, the application for restoration was dismissed, on account of delay. The basic grievance which the petitioner has raised before the learned Permanent Lok Adalat concerned, is that the petitioner has suffered electrocution, due to the fault on the part of the distribution licensee concerned, and he filed the application for grant of adequate compensation.

3. This Court has confronted the petitioner, as to how come the



CWP-14985-2024

2

application before the learned Permanent Lok Adalat concerned, is maintainable, specifically, in the circumstances when the distribution licensee has already framed a policy and constituted an authority, to adjudicate the issue of compensation, on account of electrocution suffered by any private individual.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner clearly admits that the application moved before the learned Permanent Lok Adalat concerned, was in fact, a misconceived motion, therefore, he does not wish to press the application before the learned Permanent Lok Adalat concerned, rather, he submits that he may be granted the liberty to approach the authorities concerned, as per the policy adopted by the distribution licensee concerned, for redressal of his grievance.

5. The prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is not opposed by the learned counsel for the distribution licensee concerned. He submits that in case the petitioner approaches the Sub Divisional Officer concerned, by moving apt motion, under the policy, his case would be considered on merits.

6. In view of the above, the petitioner is at liberty to file an application before the authority concerned. In case, such an application is filed by the petitioner, the latter, in view of the adopted policy, shall decide the application of the petitioner, on its own merits.

7. Consequently, the instant petition is **disposed of**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

April 22, 2025
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No