



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

\*\*\*\*

**115**

**CWP-19905-2025**

**Date of Decision: 23.03.2026**

BALA DEVI AND ANR.

...Petitioners

Vs.

PERMANENT LOK ADALAT & ORS.

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present:- Mr. Bhupender Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioners

Mr. Deepak Vashisht, DAG Haryana

\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking setting aside of award dated 10.01.2025 whereby Ld. Permanent Lok Adalat, Karnal (for short 'PLA') has dismissed their petition under Section 22C of Legal Services Authority Act, 1987 (for short '1987 Act').

2. As per petition, Sandeep Kumar s/o petitioners, a pillion rider, on 28.12.2016, was riding a motorcycle which was driven by his relative. At about 08:20 PM, when the motorcycle reached near Government School, Kunjpura, on account of big pothole on the road, motorcycle fell into the said big pothole and Sandeep Kumar jumped from the motorcycle and his head struck against an iron board advertising Karnal Group of Institutions, Kunjpura, Karnal. Sandeep Kumar succumbed to his injuries. He died in hospital on 01.01.2017. The



petitioners filed petition under Section 22C of 1987 Act before PLA seeking compensation. The respondent filed reply denying its liability on multiple grounds. PLA vide impugned order dated 10.01.2025 has rejected petitioners' claim on the ground that maintenance of public road does not fall within jurisdiction of PLA. The jurisdiction of PLA is confined to services prescribed under Section 22A(b) of 1987 Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that PLA kept pending petitioners' application for more than five years and abruptly dismissed on the ground of jurisdiction. If at this stage they approach any other Court, the question of limitation would arise.

4. From the perusal of order dated 10.01.2025 passed by PLA, it is evident that petitioners' application has been rejected on the ground of jurisdiction. PLA has held that maintenance of roads does not fall within services prescribed under Section 22A(b) of 1987 Act.

5. The petitioners have not pointed out any notification or judgment which has created jurisdiction of PLA for the redressal of issue involved herein. The matter remained pending before PLA for more than five years. Matter could not be adjudicated on merits because in the absence of jurisdiction, no Court can adjudicate the dispute. Petitioners' apprehension that if they approach any Court, the question of limitation would come in their way needs to be addressed. To allay their apprehension, it is hereby made clear that if they approach any Court of competent jurisdiction, the said Court would consider period of pendency of their application before PLA.



6. Disposed of.
7. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

**(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**March 23, 2026**  
*Deepak DPA*

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