

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

Sr. No.110

**CWP-25214-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision : 05.04.2022**

Satish Kumar

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The Collector appointed respondent No.6 as the Lambardar. Appeal and revision filed by the petitioner have not succeeded and thus, the present writ petition has been filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that respondent No.6 is 65 years old, whereas, the petitioner is 43 years old and thus, the authorities below were not justified in appointing him as the Lambardar.

It is settled law that the choice of the Collector has to be preferred unless and until the same is shown to be perverse. Respondent No.6 being appointed, even though, 65 years of age and older to the petitioner, cannot be termed to be a perversity. In exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, this Court does not sit in appeal over orders passed by the authorities below and does not re-appraise the respective merits of the parties. Thus, the impugned orders do not call for any interference.

The writ petition has no merit and is dismissed.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

05.04.2022

Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes/ No