

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

**Civil Writ Petition No.3681 of 2015
Date of Decision: 02.03.2015**

Paras Ram

..... Petitioner

Vs.

Financial Commissioner, Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Tapan Kumar Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The unsuccessful candidate for the post of Lambardar for Village Alipur Shikargarh, Tehsil and District Faridabad, Haryana is invoking the writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution assailing the order dated 25.09.2012 (**P-1**), passed by the learned District Collector, Faridabad whereby respondent No.4-Mahesh Chand has been appointed as Lambardar; further challenge is to the order dated 08.11.2013 (**P-3**), passed by learned Commissioner, Gurgaon whereby his appeal along with the appeal of the another unsuccessful candidate namely Subhash has been dismissed and order dated 20.10.2014 (**P-5**), passed by learned Financial Commissioner, Haryana whereby the revision petition has also been dismissed.

Having heard learned Counsel for the petitioner at length, this Court finds no grounds to interfere with the aforementioned impugned orders (**P-1**), (**P-3**) and (**P-5**).

It is not in dispute that the post of the Lambardar for the Village fell vacant on the death of the previous incumbent, namely, Sh. Om Parkash. After following due process of law, the candidature of three applicants, namely, Paras Ram/petitioner, Mahesh Chand and Subhash were considered. On comparative evaluation, the learned District Collector, Faridabad found Sh. Mahesh Chand to be the most suitable candidate for appointment as Lambardar. The said Mahesh Chand apart from being 45 years of age, being a matriculate and owner of 21 Kanals of land is also the son of the deceased Lambardar. He has also been found active in participating in the social activities of the village. In this view of the matter, the view taken by the District Collector, Faridabad and upheld by the Appellate and Revisional Authority cannot be held to be perverse.

In view of the above, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

March 02, 2015
Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE