

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

**CWP No.27829 of 2017
Date of Order: 07.12.2017**

Harbhajan Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Financial Commissioner (Appeals) Punjab and Ors.

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present : Mr. A.S. Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J (ORAL)

The petitioner has challenged the orders passed by the Collector, Commissioner, Jalandhar Division, Jalandhar and the Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab vide which respondent No.4 has been appointed as Lambardar of village Bhatnoora Kalan, Tehsil Bholath, District Kapurthala and the findings affirmed in appeal and the revision respectively.

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the Collector has wrongly ignored the petitioner only on the issue of age as the petitioner is 60 years of age whereas respondent No.4 is 32 years old. It is submitted that the petitioner is a sitting Panch of the Gram Panchayat, therefore he commands more influence in the Village than respondent No.4.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after examination of record, am of the considered opinion that there is no merit in this petition because it is the choice of the Collector qua appointment for the post of Lambardar until and unless there is perversity in his order. The

perversity would be if the evidence on record is not considered or evidence on record has been misread. The Collector has found that respondent No.4 is more suitable to the post of Lambardar because he is young man and would be in a position to discharge his functions as provided in Rule 20 of the Punjab Land Revenue Rules (Applicable to Punjab) more effectively.

In the absence of any perversity, I am not inclined to interfere with the impugned orders.

Dismissed.

December 07, 2017
manoj

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No