



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

LPA-2422-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20.08.2025

Sajjan Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab and others

...Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate,
for the appellant.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 02.07.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge, by which CWP-13041-2025, titled as *Bikar Singh vs. Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab and others* which has been allowed in favour of respondent No.4 and he has been declared as *lambardar* keeping in view the finding recorded by the Collector after comparing the merit between respondent No.4-Bikar Singh and the appellant herein, namely Sajjan Singh.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant argues that once the case was remanded back to the Collector by the Commissioner, Patiala Division, vide order dated 24.07.2019 and further affirmed by the Financial Commissioner, Punjab, no interference should have been given by the learned Single Judge and the authorities concerned should have been allowed to reconsider the fact as to which candidate is more meritorious to be appointed as *lambardar*



of the village concerned and therefore, interference by the learned Single Judge so as to set aside the said order is incorrect and the order dated 02.07.2025 may kindly be set aside and chance be given to both the candidates to raise their claim for being appointed as *lambardar* of the village concerned i.e. Rajindergarh.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have gone through the record of the case with his able assistance.

4. It may be noticed that a finding has been recorded by the learned Single Judge that the order passed by the Commissioner, which was further affirmed by the Financial Commissioner is factually incorrect and the reasons given to remand the case back to the Collector are non-existent. The said finding has gone unrebutted at the hands of the appellant. Once the basis of the order, as passed by the Financial Commissioner, has been found to be incorrect, the same has rightly been set aside by the learned Single Judge.

5. The question which has been raised in the appeal is that the authorities should have been allowed to again reconsider the claim of both the candidates for the post of *lambardar*. In this regard, it may be noticed that a finding has been recorded by the learned Single Judge that the Collector, after evaluating the claim of both the candidates, allowed respondent No.4-Bikar Singh to be appointed as *lambardar*, which evaluation of the Collector was correct but was wrongly set aside by the Financial Commissioner and that too, on the non-existent ground. Once due



consideration has been given to the claim of the appellant and respondent No.4-Bikar Singh was found more meritorious to be appointed as *lambardar*, which view of the Collector has been cemented by the learned Single Judge, no ground is made to take another view as the findings recorded by the learned Single has not been shown to be perverse either on facts or the settled principle of law.

- 6. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.
- 7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

August 20, 2025
harish

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No