

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

112

2025.PHHC.147959-DB



**LPA No. 2780 of 2025(O&M)**

**Date of decision: 29<sup>th</sup> October 2025**

**Gurpreet 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. S.K. Singla, Advocate for the appellant.

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J(Oral)**

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order passed by the learned Single Judge, in CWP No. 8956 of 2025 dated 11.08.2025 by which the order passed by the authorities namely the Commissioner as well as the Financial Commissioner dated 27.07.2022 and 01.08.2024 (Annexure P-3 and P-10 respectively) have been upheld, by which the case was remanded back to the District Collector, Bathinda, for deciding the issue afresh as to who is the better candidate between the appellant herein and the private respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that once the District Collector, Bathinda after due appreciation of facts has appointed the appellant as a 'Lambardar', of Village Jiwan Singh Wala, Tehsil Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, merely that the respondent is having higher qualifications than the appellant is no ground to remand the case back and therefore the order passed by the Commissioner dated 27.07.2022 (Annexure P-3), is liable to be set aside as the same has wrongly been upheld by the Financial Commissioner vide order dated 01.08.2024 (Annexure P-10) as well as by learned Single Judge vide judgment dated 11.08.2025.

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

4. It may be noticed that the Collector had assigned only one reason for selecting the appellant which was that the appellant is younger in age. While giving the said reason, the Collector has ignored the relevant qualifications and capability to be a better 'Lambardar' of other competing candidates. Merely that a contender is younger in age, cannot, by itself, be a valid ground to grant him the post of 'Lambardar' overlooking the other relevant factors such as the qualifications and capability to hold the post of Lambardar in a better way. Further it may be noticed that another candidate, who was Shaminder Singh was even younger than the appellant, who was ignored and therefore, the reason given by the Collector to appoint Gurpreet Singh was even factually incorrect.

5. The said consideration given by the Commissioner to remand the case back has been upheld by the Financial Commissioner as well as by the learned Single Judge needs no reconsideration.

6. Therefore, once the authorities have remanded the case back for fresh consideration, as the reason given to appoint the appellant was not only factually incorrect but could not be sustained, hence, there arises no occasion for interference at the hands of this Court in the present appeal as order passed by the authorities as well as the learned Single Judge, has not been proved as preverse either to the facts or law.

7. Dismissed.
8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)  
JUDGE

29<sup>th</sup> October 2025  
reema

(VIKAS SURI)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No