

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14060/2025

Tata Aia Life Insurance Company Limited, Through Its Authorized Signatory Mr. Mohd. Akram Fareed Age About 34 Years Having Its Registered Office At 14Th Floor, Tower A, Peninsula Business Park, Senapati Bapat Marg, Lower Parel, Mumbai - 400013 And Branch Office At 5Th Floor, Fortune Height, Subhash Marg, Opposite Ot Icici Bank, Panch Batti, C Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302001.

----Petitioner

Versus

Nenu Singh S/o Poonam Singh Ji, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Roydawas, Guda Kalan, Tehsil Sojat, District Pali, Rajasthan - 306103.

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Arpit Mehta
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Shashi Kant

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP MATHUR

Order

10/02/2026

1. By way of the present writ petition, the petitioner-company has challenged the award dated 15.05.2025 (Annexure-1) passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat, Pali in Case No. 41/2024.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner-company submitted that during the pendency of the present writ petition, a demand draft amounting to Rs. 11,34,890/- has been issued by the concerned branch of the petitioner-company in favour of the sole respondent.
3. It was further submitted that in view of the subsequent events that have taken place, nothing survives for adjudication in the present writ petition and the same has, therefore, been rendered infructuous.

4. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the sole respondent—Nenu Singh—submitted that though it is correct that a demand draft of Rs. 11,34,890/- has been issued by the bank, however, due to a typographical error, the same has been issued in the name of “Nanu Singh” instead of “Nenu Singh”.

5. He, therefore, prayed that the petitioner-company be directed to issue a fresh demand draft in favour of the sole respondent by correcting his name as “Nenu Singh”.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at the Bar, this Court prima facie finds that in view of the subsequent developments, the present writ petition has become infructuous. Accordingly, the same is dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

7. However, the petitioner-company is directed to issue a fresh demand draft in favour of the sole respondent by correcting his name as “Nenu Singh”. If required, the sole respondent shall return the demand draft already issued to him for issuance of a fresh demand draft.

(KULDEEP MATHUR),J