

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Letters Patent Appeal No. 963 of 2016 (O&M)
in CWP No. 26473 of 2015
Date of decision: 2.6.2016

Kulbir Singh @ Kulvir Singh

.. Appellant

v.

Kewal Singh and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU.

Present: Mr. Arun Kumar Bakshi, Advocate for the appellant.

...

Rajesh Bindal J.

Challenge in the present intra-court appeal is to the order passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the writ petition challenging the orders passed by the Collector, Commissioner and Financial Commissioner with reference to the appointment of respondent No. 1 as Lambardar of village Sarhali, Tehsil Phillaur, District Jalandhar, was dismissed.

Learned counsel for the appellant sought to argue by referring the comparative merits of the two candidates, namely, the selected (respondent No. 1) and the rejected (appellant).

After hearing learned counsel for the appellant, we do not find any reason to consider that issue at this stage when the issue had threadbare been considered from the stage of Collector onwards and at no stage the appellant could succeed to convince the authorities/court. The learned Single Judge has also dismissed the writ petition observing that even if there are two views possible, it is not for the court to interfere, if the possible view is taken by the authorities.

While concurring with the view expressed by the learned Single Judge, we do not find any merit in the present appeal. The same is, accordingly, dismissed. Consequently, the application for condonation of delay is also dismissed.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge

(Harinder Singh Sidhu)
Judge

2.6.2016
mk