



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

205

LPA-1323-2024 (O&M)

Decided on : 06.11.2025

RANJIT SINGH

. .Appellant.

Versus

**THE FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER, APPEAL-I, PUNJAB CIVIL
SECRETARIAT, PUNJAB, CHANDIGARH AND ORS**

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

**PRESENT: Mr. Prabhjyot Singh Chahal, Advocate and
Mr. G. S. Nagra, Advocate for the appellant.**

Mr. Rahul Rampal, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 10.05.2024 passed by the learned Single Bench in CWP No. 6533 of 2016 by which, appointment of respondent No. 4 to the post of Lambardar has been upheld, whereas appellant has been denied appointment to said post even though he was selected by Collector, Nawashahar vide order dated 19.08.2008 which is incorrect.

2. Certain facts needs to be noted for the correct appreciation of the issue in hand.

3. The appellant- Ranjit Singh was appointed as Lambardar of Village Jindowal by the Collector vide order dated 19.08.2008 against which order an appeal was preferred by one Hardev Singh before the Commissioner and the Commissioner accepted the said appeal on



23.05.2011 and to remand the case back to the Collector so as to consider the claim of said Hardev Singh afresh for the post of Lambardar of the village concerned.

4. On an appeal preferred by the appellant before the Financial Commissioner against the order dated 23.05.2011, the same came to be dismissed vide order dated 11.02.2016 (Anneuxre P-13) and the aforementioned orders passed by the Commissioner as well as the financial commissioner were assailed by the appellant by filing of CWP No. 6533 of 2016.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the said order passed by the Commissioner as well as Financial Commissioner was upheld by the the learned Single Judge vide impugned order dated 10.05.2024 and though during the pendency of the writ petition, Hardev Singh i.e. respondent No. 4 died unfortunately and therefore considering that his claim qua appointment to the post of Lambardar stood extinguished which fact has been ignored by the learned Single Judge which passing of the impugned order. .

6. Learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that respondent No. 4 Hardev Singh had died during the pendency of the writ petition.

7. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

8. Once, there was a vacancy for appointment to the post of Lambardar against which the appellant was appointed and concededly the appellant is not disqualified for appointment to said post under any provision of law and the case was only remanded back by the Commissioner as well as the Financial Commissioner, to consider the claim of respondent



No. 4- Hardev Singh, and upon the death of respondent No. 4-Hardev Singh, his claim stood extinguished which fact has escaped the notice of the learned Single Judge.

9. Keeping in view the factum of death of respondent No. 4-Hardev Singh during the pendency of the writ petition, no fresh consideration can be given to his claim and keeping in view the fact that the no disqualification has been attached with the appointment of the appellant as Lambardar, hence, the appellant will remain continued to work on the post of Lambardar of the village concerned. Order passed by the authorities concerned and the learned Single Judge for reconsideration of the claim is set-aside in view of the facts mentioned hereinbefore.

10. The present appeal is disposed of in above terms.

11. Pending civil miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

06.11.2025

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*