

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

123

**CWP No.18819 of 2021
Date of Decision: 21.09.2021**

Lt. Col. (Retd.) Sukhdev Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Nishan Singh Chahal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Sudhir Mittal, J.(Oral)

The petitioner is aggrieved because the private respondent has been appointed as Lambardar and his appeal and revision have been dismissed.

Perusal of the order of the Collector shows that the petitioner was not residing in the village. Considering the merits and demerits of the contesting candidates, he decided to appoint respondent No.4 as Lambardar. The order does not suffer from any infirmity or perversity and thus, the Commissioner and Financial Commissioner were justified in dismissing the appeal and revision.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the Financial Commissioner has erred in dismissing the revision on the ground that the petitioner is 75 years of age. It is submitted that at the time of passing of order by the Collector, he was much younger and therefore, the age should not have been a consideration at all.

The argument is misconceived because the Collector has not considered the age against the petitioner. By the time, the matter reached before the Financial Commissioner, the petitioner has reached the age of 75 years. In consideration of this aspect by the Financial Commissioner cannot be faulted.

For the aforementioned reasons, the writ petition has no merits and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

The writ petition is dismissed.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

21.09.2021
D.Bansal

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No