

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5738/2026

1. Assistant Engineer (F-iii), Office Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited, Sangha Setu Near Puliya, Sanganer, Jaipur (Raj).
2. Executive Engineer (Sixth), Office Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited, Sangha Setu Near Puliya, Sanganer, Jaipur (Raj).
3. Superintending Engineer, (J.N Vrat- Dakshin), Office-Heerapura Power House, Jagdamba Nagar Road, Jagdamba Nagar, Girdharipura, Jaipur-302021.

----Petitioners-Non-Applicants

Versus

Shravan Lal Jat Son Of Shri Roduram Jat, Resident
Devkishanpura, Tehsil-Chaksu, District-Jaipur (Raj.).

----Respondent-Applicant

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Sagar Jindal
For Respondent(s)	:	

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAMEER JAIN

Order

22/04/2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners has filed present writ petition against the award dated 25.09.2025 passed by the learned Permanent Lok Adalat (PLA). It is submitted that the learned PLA vide the impugned award, directed for installation of transformer at a private place.
2. The relevant portion of the impugned order dated 25.09.2025 (para-8) which is reproduced as under:

"8.इस प्रकार यह स्पष्ट है कि विपक्षीगण द्वारा ट्रांसफार्मर स्थानांतरित करने हेतु प्रार्थी से कुल 1,17,816/- रुपये की राशि जमा कर ली गयी है और उसके बावजूद ट्रांसफार्मर को अन्यत्र स्थान पर स्थानांतरित नहीं किया गया है। विपक्षीगण द्वारा ट्रांसफार्मर स्थानांतरित नहीं करने का कारण मौके पर

विवाद होना बताया गया है, किन्तु विपक्षीगण के एस्टीमेट के अनुसार सम्पूर्ण राशि परिवादी द्वारा विपक्षीगण को जमा कराने के बावजूद विपक्षीगण द्वारा बताये गये उक्त कारण कि मौके पर ट्रांसफार्मर स्थानान्तरण के कारण विवाद है के आधार पर ट्रांसफार्मर को अन्यत्र स्थानांतरित नहीं किया जाना उचित नहीं कहा जा सकता। जब विपक्षीगण द्वारा ट्रांसफार्मर स्थानांतरित करने हेतु नियमानुसार परिवादी से राशि प्राप्त कर ली गयी तो यह विपक्षीगण का दायित्व है कि वह मौके से ट्रांसफार्मर को स्थानांतरित करे और यदि मौके पर विवाद की स्थिति होती है तो इस संबंध में नियमानुसार कार्यवाही करे, विपक्षीगण चाहे तो शासन प्रशासन... पुलिस का नियमानुसार सहयोग प्राप्त करे।”

3. In the said order it is noted that the learned PLA arrived at the conclusion and has observed following facts:

(i) That the Officer concerned visited the site, made a report upon which a sum of Rs.1,17,816/- was deposited by the consumer, for shifting of the transformer which was accepted by the department.

(ii) That the fact as stated herein that the said transformer is directed to be installed upon a private land, was not averred before the learned PLA.

4. Upon perusal of the material available on record and hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, at this stage, this Court cannot intervene in the issue of private/public land as the same was never pleaded by the petitioners before the fact ascertaining authority, therefore, no interference is called for.

5. It is also observed that against the award passed by the learned PLA, contrary to the scheme of Section 22C and 22E of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987 orders are being challenged, in routine, in ignorance of quantum which is a frustration of primary scheme and objective of the Act of 1987. In the matter at hand, it is noted that the impugned order is a well speaking reasoned order, and that there is no palpable perversity, and infirmity with law.



6. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SAMEER JAIN),J

DEEPAK /4