



CWP-16143-2021

-1-

206

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

\*\*\*\*\*

CWP-16143-2021

Date of Decision: 23.07.2024

Pardeep Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER**

Present : Mr. Vijay Kumar Sheoran, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Upasana Dhawan, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Surinder Gaur, Advocate  
for respondent No.4.

\*\*\*

**HARSH BUNGER, J. (Oral)**

1. The present Writ Petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari for setting aside the orders dated 18.06.2021, 02.04.2019, 13.12.2018, 02.03.2017 (Annexures P-5, P-4 P-3 and P-2 respectively) and for restoration of order dated 08.11.2016 (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for respondent No.4 are *ad idem* that the present case would be covered by decision dated 29.08.2023, passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP-18932-2023**, wherein the following observation was made:

*“I have heard counsel for the petitioner and have  
perused the file.*



CWP-16143-2021

-2-

*On analysis of the antecedents of both, the petitioner and respondent No.4, it has been found that petitioner, namely, Ravi Kumar and his father Sardara Ram @ Sardara Singh were found in illegal possession over the Gram Panchayat land as is evident from the demarcation report dated 03.07.2017. It has been observed by the authorities below that this report was never challenged further and thus, the findings attained the finality.*

*On the other hand, respondent No.4, namely, Pardeep Kumar had been found to have concealed the material facts for obtaining the OPH Ration Card wherein he has stated that he did not own any agricultural land, however, it has been found that he possessed 15 kanals of land.*

*Thus, the antecedents of both the candidates were found to be doubtful for the appointment of the post of Namberdar, who is the headman of the village. Reputation of the candidates to be appointed cannot be compromised and hence, the Collector is not bound to appoint the candidate, who is prima facie not found suitable. Thus, the view taken by the Collector, which is affirmed by the Appellate and Revisional authority, in rejecting the candidature of both the petitioner and respondent No.4 with the direction to initiate fresh procedure for the appointment of the Namberdar does not suffer from any perversity. Petitioner and respondent No.4 would also be at liberty to participate in the fresh appointment process.*

*Hence, finding no infirmity in the impugned orders, the same is hereby dismissed.*

August 29, 2023

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE”



CWP-16143-2021

-3-

that the instant Writ Petition be disposed of in terms of order dated 29.08.2023, passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP-18932-2023**.

- 4. Learned State counsel does not oppose the aforesaid course of action.
- 5. Keeping in view aforesaid submissions, the instant petition is disposed of in terms of order dated 29.08.2023, passed in **CWP-18932-2023**.
- 6. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

23.07.2024  
Himani

(HARSH BUNGER)  
JUDGE

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