IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

138 **CWP-11688-2026**

Bajaj Allianz General Insurance Company Ltd. …Petitioner
(now known as Bajaj General Insurance Company Ltd.)

Versus

Permanent Lok Adalat (PUS), Sonipat & others ...Respondents

CWP-11685-2026

Bajaj Allianz General Insurance Company Ltd. …Petitioner
(now known as Bajaj General Insurance Company Ltd.)

Versus

Permanent Lok Adalat (PUS), Sonipat & others ...Respondents

Date of Decision: 20.04.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Sachin Ohri and Mr. Sachin Gupta, Advocates,
for the petitioner.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from CWP-11688-2026.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking quashing of order dated 30.01.2026 whereby learned Permanent Lok Adalat, Sonipat (for short 'PLA') has directed to pay Rs.60,000/- to the claimant along with interest @ 9% p.a.

3. Respondent No.2-claimant got his crop insured through Syndicate Bank-respondent No.3 from petitioner-Bajaj Allianz General Insurance Company Ltd. (for short 'insurance company'). Crop was

insured by Insurance Company under the Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojna (PMFBY). The respondent-bank re-deposited deducted insured amount in the account of insured. Inundation in agricultural fields led to destruction of crop. The respondent filed application under Section 22C of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 (for short '1987 Act') before learned PLA seeking compensation. Petitioner claimed that applicant was not insured with petitioner-Insurance Company and is not liable to pay the compensation. Bank was supposed to enter farmer's data on the PMFBY portal on the basis of which insurance company could issue policies. Without portal data entry, there was no question of issuing a policy to the applicant by the insurance company. Learned PLA has held that bank has confirmed that premium was forwarded to insurer, however, insurer failed to perform its duty. The applicant is covered under PMFBY.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Insurance Company submits that both the petitions may be disposed of in terms of order dated 29.01.2026 passed by this Court in a bunch of writ petitions filed by the petitioner itself having lead case titled as **'Bajaj General Insurance Limited Vs. Amit & others' CWP-1192-2026**. Issue involved herein is squarely covered by the aforesaid order.

5. In the wake of statement of learned counsel for the petitioner-Insurance Company, both the petitions stand disposed of in terms of order dated 29.01.2026 passed by this Court in ***Amit*** (supra).

20.04.2026 **(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)**
Vimal **JUDGE**

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