

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

Sr. No.109

**CWP-35351-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision : 12.05.2022**

Gurteg Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

Financial Commissioner (Appeals) Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Arihant Jain, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Goyal, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

Respondent No.4 was appointed Lambardar of the village by the Collector. Appeal and revision filed by the petitioner have failed and thus, the present writ petition has been filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the order of the Collector was perverse because he had failed to take into consideration the respective merits of the parties. Respondent No.4 had been appointed only on account of recommendations of a Minister. The Courts below have erred in not taking into consideration these arguments.

A perusal of the order of Collector shows that *inter se* merits of the parties have in fact been taken into consideration and a finding has been returned that all candidates are literate. Respondent No.4 has been preferred because he has more recommendations in his favour than the other candidates and thus, the order cannot be said to be perverse. It is settled law that choice of the Collector in appointment of Lambardar has to be respected.

The learned Financial Commissioner has also held so, thus, I find no illegality or irregularity in the order.

The writ petition has no merit and is dismissed.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

12.05.2022
Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes/ No