

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

**CWP No.20871 of 2016**

**Date of Decision: 03.11.2023**

**Kashmir Singh**

**..... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab and others**

**..... Respondents**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

**\*\*\***

Present: None for the petitioner.

Ms. Anju Sharma Kaushik, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Parwinder Singh, Advocate  
for respondent No.5.

**\*\*\***

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.**

Present writ petition has been filed for quashing the orders dated 30.11.2010 (Annexure P-1), 26.09.2012 (Annexure P-3), 04.08.2016 (Annexure P-5) passed by respondents No.4, 3 and 2 respectively whereby respondent No.5 has been appointed as Lambardar of village Kahma, Tehsil and District SBS Nagar, inspite of the fact that he is a person of criminal background, less educated than petition, more than 70 years old and has been appointed with a political influence. Further prayer has been made for appointing the petitioner as Lambardar of the village being much more meritorious.

Notice of motion was issued in this case by this Court on 05.10.2016 and since then it is pending adjudication. It is apparent that

the petitioner was not represented on 14.09.2017, 19.01.2018 and then on 12.04.2019. On 17.10.2023, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner prayed for an adjournment, which was opposed by learned counsel for respondent No.5. He submitted that respondent No.5 was appointed by the Collector and his appointment thereafter was upheld by the Appellate and Revisional Court. He was submitted that respondent No.5 is working as Lambardar since 2011. He further submitted that adjournment was being prayed for only to prolong the matter. However, in the interest of justice, one last opportunity was granted to learned counsel for the petitioner to address arguments and the case was adjourned for today.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has filed an adjournment slip on the ground that he is having some personal difficulty today.

Learned counsel for respondent No.5 has opposed the same and submitted that adjournment slip has been filed without informing him.

This Court finds no reason to adjourn the case and is of the opinion that the petitioner is not keen to pursue his case. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed for non prosecution.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

03.11.2023  
*rittu*

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |