

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

LPA No.338 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 11.08.2017

Baljinder Singh

....Appellant

Versus

Financial Commissioner, Punjab
and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

...

Present: Mr. Saurabh Kaushik, Advocate
for the appellant.

...

MAHESH GROVER, J. (Oral)

This appeal is directed against the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 15.12.2016 questioning the selection of respondent No.5 as a Lambardar. The said respondent was duly selected by the Collector and the learned Single Judge finding no perversity in the choice and reasoning of the Collector affirmed it.

Before us the solitary argument raised by the learned counsel for the appellant is that merely because the respondent No.5 is more educated than the appellant would be no ground to grant him a favourable consideration for appointment as a Lambardar.

We are afraid this argument does not enhance the case of the appellant in any manner. Apart from the fact that it is a settled proposition that the choice of Collector should not be interfered unless gross perversity is writ large on the face of it, the fact that the respondent No.5 was more educated would certainly entitle him to steal an edge over the appellant.

No other ground has been urged.

Dismissed.

However, delay of 5 days in filing the appeal is condoned for the reasons mentioned in the application.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

11.08.2017
dss

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

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