

Sr. No.102

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

LPA-2210-2016(O&M)

Date of Decision: January 23, 2017

Amrik Singh

.....Appellant

VS.

Financial Commissioner Revenue, Punjab and anotherRespondents

**CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE DR. SHEKHER DHAWAN**

Present:- Mr.Gaurav Chopra, Advocate for the appellant.

-.-

MAHESH GROVER, J

In the present appeal the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 21.07.2016 has been questioned by the appellant who contends that he was more suited for the post of Lambardar.

Before us a comparative analysis has been projected that the appellant is 44 years of age as against respondent no.2 who is 65 years old. Apart from that no other meaningful distinction between his claim and that of respondent no.2 has been brought out and it has been contended that because the respondent no.2 is 65 years old, he is less suited for the assignment.

Learned Single Judge has opined that the Collector's choice has to be accepted in the matters of appointment of Lamberdar until and unless the order passed by the Collector has been found suffering from patent illegality or perversity.

We would wholly agree with this settled proposition of law and

since the appellant has failed to show any perversity or patent illegality in the order of the Collector which has been approved by the learned Single Judge, we decline interference. However, marginal delay of 58 days is condoned in the interest of justice for the reasons that have been specified in the application.

Dismissed.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

January 23, 2017
mamta

(SHEKHER DHAWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No