

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P. (C) No. 4110 of 2026

Reliance General Insurance Company Limited
Versus
The State of Jharkhand & Others
With
W.P. (C) No. 4111 of 2026

.... **Petitioner(s).**

... **Respondents.**

Reliance General Insurance Company Limited
Versus
The State of Jharkhand & Others

.... **Petitioner(s).**

... **Respondents.**

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. A.K. Das, Sr. Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Amrit Raj Kisku, AC to GA-V

02/ 18.06.2026: In this case, the award of the Lok Adalat is under challenge.

2. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Dilip Mehta Vs. Rakesh Gupta & Others*** reported in ***2025 SCC OnLine SC 2737*** in paragraph No. 10 mandated that the only recognized forum to challenge the order passed by the Lok Adalat is the High Court exercising supervisory jurisdiction. Paragraph Nos.9 and 10 read as under:

"9. This Court has, in a series of decisions, explained the consequence of this statutory finality. In State of Punjab v. Jalour Singh (Supra), it was held that where an award is made by a Lok Adalat in terms of a settlement between the parties, it is final and binding and executable as a decree, and that no appeal lies against it. It was further held that any challenge to such an award must be brought before the High Court in proceedings under Articles 226 or 227 of the Constitution of India and only on limited grounds such as lack of consent, jurisdictional error or fraud. In Bhargavi Constructions v. Kothakapu Muthyam Reddy (Supra), this Court applied the same principle to a civil suit which sought to impeach a Lok Adalat award and held that a civil suit to set aside such an award is not maintainable and that the only proper remedy is a writ petition before the High Court.

10. The principle that emerges is that the statutory finality attached to a Lok Adalat award leaves no room for an appellate or plenary civil remedy against the award treated as a decree. The award may be executed as a decree, but its validity cannot be reopened through an ordinary civil suit or by treating some other civil proceeding as a vehicle for setting it aside. The only recognised avenue of challenge is the constitutional jurisdiction of the High Court, which is supervisory and exceptional in nature."

3. Considering the said submission, the objection is overruled.
4. Office is directed to list these cases under the appropriate heading for

fresh filing after fresh stamp reporting.

I.A. No.1739 of 2026 in W.P.(C) No.4110 of 2026

I.A. No.1740 of 2026 in W.P.(C) No.4111 of 2026

5. Since the petitioner does not want to press these Interlocutory Applications filed for amendment, both Interlocutory Applications are dismissed as not pressed.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

18th June, 2026
Madhav/-