

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

Sr. No.123

Civil Writ Petition No.5471 of 2022

Date of Decision : March 23, 2022

Nampreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Financial Commissioner Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

In a lambardari case, the private respondent was appointed as Lambardar by the Collector. The petitioner's appeal and revision have failed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the Collector himself found the petitioner to be more meritorious and yet he appointed the private respondent as the Lambardar. Thus, the decision was perverse and should have been interfered with.

The argument is not entitled to be accepted as a perusal of the order of the Collector shows that even though he found that the petitioner was more educated and younger in age, he preferred the private respondent for the reason that the petitioner was unable to give correct answers to questions regarding duties of the Lambardar. Thus, there is no perversity in the order of the Collector and the Financial Commissioner was justified in upholding the same on the ground that the choice of the Collector must be respected.

In view of the above, the writ petition has no merit and is dismissed.

March 23, 2022

Ankur

**(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No