

CWP No.23175 of 2015

[1]

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.23175 of 2015
Date of decision:06.11.2015**

Vinod Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

The Financial Commissioner and others

...Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Sarju Puri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

The petitioner has challenged the appointment of respondent No.4 to the office of Lambardar of village Jamalpur, Tehsil Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though both recommending authorities recommended the name of the petitioner to the Collector but respondent No.4 has been chosen without taking into consideration the respective merits of the parties and the order passed by the Collector has been upheld by the Financial Commissioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the petitioner, who is younger in age and more educated than respondent No.4, should have been appointed as Lambardar.

CWP No.23175 of 2015

[2]

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and examining the available record, I am of the considered opinion that there is no perversity in the order of the Collector, whose choice can be challenged only in case of perversity, otherwise it has to be maintained and has rightly been done by the Financial Commissioner.

Consequently, finding no merit in the present writ petition, the same is hereby dismissed though without any order as to costs.

November 06, 2015

*vinod**

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge