

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

115

CWP No.19747 of 2022

Date of Decision:- 05.09.2022

SURJIT PAL

....Petitioner

vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....Respondents

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present:- Ms. Amandeep Soni, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

The Collector appointed respondent No. 5 as Lambardar. Appeal and revision filed by the petitioner have been dismissed and thus, the present writ petition has been filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order of the Collector was perverse as he had not taken into consideration the fact that the petitioner had actively participated in various social welfare measures. This aspect has also been ignored by the appellate and revisional authorities. Thus, the impugned orders deserve to be set aside.

A perusal of the order passed by the Collector shows that comparative merits and demerits of the parties have been considered by him while passing the impugned order dated 28.11.2017. It is settled law that the choice of the Collector has to be respected unless and until the same is shown to be perverse. No perversity exists and, thus, the impugned orders do not call for any interference.

The writ petition has no merit and is dismissed.

September 05, 2022

poonam

(SUDHIR MITTAL)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No