



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

CWP-12952-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.05.2026

M/s Brar Automotive

...Petitioner

Versus

United India Insurance Company Limited and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of Award dated 11.11.2025 (Annexure P-1) whereby learned Permanent Lok Adalat (Public Utility Services), Ferozepur (for short 'PLA') has rejected its application filed under Section 22C of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987 (for short '1987 Act') on the ground of maintainability.

2. The petitioner is a partnership firm engaged in the business of selling vehicles along with insurance policies of respondents No.1 to 3. It sold insurance policies upto December 2017. An amount of Rs.26,25,369/- became due for the period from 01.08.2017 to 31.10.2017 from respondents. Even after repeated requests on the part of petitioner, due amount was not released. It filed an application under Section 22C of 1987 Act before PLA. The matter was adjudicated on merits. PLA dismissed its application on the ground that the dispute does not fall

within the definition of “Public Utility Services” as per section 22-A (b) of 1987 Act.

3. Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that service rendered by petitioner falls within purview of “Public Utility Services” contemplated in Section 22A of 1987 Act. PLA kept petitioner’s matter pending for three years. It is unfair to reject petition on the ground of maintainability after keeping the matter pending for three years.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

5. From the perusal of record, it is evident that petitioner did not avail insurance services whereas rendered services to insurance company for commission. PLA has rightly rejected petitioner’s application on the ground that service rendered by petitioner does not fall within scope of “Public Utility Services” as contemplated by Section 22A of 1987 Act. The petitioner is supposed to avail alternative remedies.

6. ***Dismissed*** with liberty to the petitioner to avail alternative remedies as permissible by law.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

05.05.2026
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No