



Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 S. 22-C, (1), Proviso - Jurisdiction - Dispute -  
Genuineness of the claim itself is in dispute - Nature of dispute - Relating to an  
offence - Insurance - Burglary -

[PRINT / DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

**Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 S. 22-C, (1), Proviso - [jurisdiction](#) - Dispute - Genuineness of the claim itself is in dispute - Nature of dispute - Relating to an offence - [insurance](#) - Burglary - In this case, the genuineness of the claim itself is in dispute - Where the parties have taken extreme positions, the same prima facie may not be the subject matter of conciliation which provides for a non binding [settlement](#) - For the said purpose, the dispute under the criminal procedure and/or the nature thereof would also play an important role - Whereas Respondent states that the burglary has taken place, the appellant denies and disputes the same - In a criminal case, the accused shall be entitled to raise a contention that no offence has taken place. If the criminal court form an opinion that an offence had taken place, which otherwise is a non-compoundable one, the term “relating to an offence” should be given wider meaning - The terms “relating to” an “offence” appearing in Proviso 1 must be interpreted broadly, and as the determination before the Permanent Lok Adalat [will](#) involve the question as to whether or not an offence, which is non-compoundable in nature, has indeed been committed, this case falls outside the jurisdiction of the Permanent Lok Adalat.**

read here [2008 PLRonline 0104](#)

Tags: [LSA S. 22-C\(1\)](#)