



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(231)

CWP-16161-2022

Date of decision:- 03.02.2026

PARVINDERJIT SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

PERMANENT LOK ADALAT AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Ms. Mannat Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Bhatia, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Mr. Rajneesh Malhotra, Advocate and
Ms. Manvi Verma, Advocate
for respondent No.3-SBI Life.

1. Without examining the dispute on merits, above-mentioned writ petition is being disposed of as Permanent Lok Adalat, Public Utility Services (for short "Lok Adalat") has not adhered to the prescribed procedure.
2. The question to be examined is as to whether a Lok Adalat can adjudicate a *lis* on merits without formulating the possible terms of settlement and communicating them to the parties. This question has been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Canara Bank V/s G.S. Jayarama, (2022) 7 SCC 776*. Interpreting the provisions of Section 22-C of the Legal Services



Authorities Act, 1987 (for short “1987 Act”), Apex Court has held that when Lok Adalat is of the opinion that a possibility of settlement exists, it shall formulate the terms of such settlement and present them to the parties under Section 22-C(7) of 1987 Act. If the parties are agreeable to the settlement, Lok Adalat shall pass an award incorporating those terms and provide a copy to each party. However, in case, parties do not agree to the terms of settlement, Lok Adalat has been conferred with the jurisdiction to decide the dispute on merits under Sub-Section (8) of Section 22-C, *ibid*, unless the dispute relates to any offence.

3. A perusal of the impugned award dated 29.12.2021, Annexure P-8, passed by Lok Adalat shows that efforts were made for amicable settlement and conciliation was attempted, but neither terms of possible settlement were formulated, nor made known to the parties in writing. Therefore, there has been a clear breach of the mandatory procedure laid down under Section 22-C(7) of 1987 Act. Counsel representing the contesting respondents is not in a position to dispute this position.

4. Consequently, impugned award is set aside. Matter is remitted to the Lok Adalat, Panchkula, for decision afresh after adhering to the obligatory procedure prescribed under the statute.

5. Writ petition is disposed of.

6. Parties are directed to appear before the Lok Adalat, Panchkula, on 19.02.2026 at 10:00 A.M. for further proceedings in accordance with law. Lok Adalat shall make an endeavour and conclude the proceedings as expeditiously



as possible, preferably within a period of six months from the date of appearance of the parties.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

03.02.2026
parul verma

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No