



**CM-268-LPA-2025 and CM-269-LPA-2025 in/and
LPA-122-2025**

1

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

**(110) CM-268-LPA-2025 and
CM-269-LPA-2025 in/and
LPA-122-2025
Date of Decision : September 08, 2025**

Maninderjit Singh

.. Appellant

Versus

Harbhajan Singh and others

.. Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Ankur Bansal, Advocate, for the appellants.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

CM-268-LPA-2025

Present application has been filed for condonation of delay of 20 days in filing the present appeal.

Keeping in view the averments made in the application, which are duly supported by an affidavit, the application is allowed and delay of 20 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

LPA-122-2025

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 24.10.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP No.29027 of 2024 titled as Harbhajan Singh vs. Financial Commissioner (Appeal) and others



**CM-268-LPA-2025 and CM-269-LPA-2025 in/and
LPA-122-2025**

2

by which, the order passed by the Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab dated 28.08.2024 (Annexure P-6), appointing the appellant herein as Lambardar by dislodging the respondent Harbhajan Singh, has been set aside and Harbhajan Singh has been declared as Lambardar.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant argues though, respondent No.1 herein who was petitioner before the writ Court, was recommended to be appointed after considering the claim as a Lambardar of the village Prempur, Tehsil Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur and the Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Collector appointed him on 01.05.2018 against which order, an appeal was preferred by the appellant herein before the Commissioner Jalandhar Division, Jalandhar, which was also dismissed on 06.10.2021 and ultimately, a revision petition was filed before the Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab, which was allowed on 28.08.2024 by which, the appointment of respondent No.1 as Lambardar was set aside and the appellant herein was appointed as Lambardar of the village concerned, which order passed by the Financial Commissioner has been set aside by the learned Single Judge only on the ground that the order passed by the Collector could not have been interfered with and no appointment can be made by the Financial Commissioner.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the learned Single Judge evaluated the merits of the two candidates and found respondent No.1 as more meritorious and the learned Single Judge exceeded its jurisdiction.



**CM-268-LPA-2025 and CM-269-LPA-2025 in/and
LPA-122-2025**

3

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

5. It may be noticed that the initial choice for appointment as a Lambardar of the village Prempur, Tehsil Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur was respondent No.1 by the authorities concerned. His name was recommended by the Tehsildar in preference to the appellant, which recommendation was accepted by the Collector and even the Commissioner, Jalandhar Division, Jalandhar accepted the appointment of respondent No.1 as Lambardar which was only interfered with by the Financial Commissioner vide order dated 28.08.2024. The learned Single Judge has considered the said aspect and has held that even where two views are possible, unless and until the appointed candidate suffers from ineligibility, the appointment should not be interfered with.

6. Further, the learned Single Judge, took pain to evaluate the claim of appellant herein as well as respondent No.1 Harbhajan Singh and came to the conclusion that respondent No.1 Harbhajan Singh was more suitable, who was the first choice of the authorities concerned.

7. Keeping in view the said fact, the order dated 28.08.2024 passed by the Financial Commissioner appointing the appellant as Lambardar was set aside by the learned Single Judge.

8. The order dated 24.10.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge is perfectly valid and legal and does not suffer from any infirmity either on facts or law.



**CM-268-LPA-2025 and CM-269-LPA-2025 in/and
LPA-122-2025**

4

9. Further, the argument of the learned counsel for the appellant was that the appellant was younger in age than the respondent No.1 and was suitable, it was in response to the said argument, the evaluation was done by the learned Single Judge qua both the candidates, which cannot be treated as beyond jurisdiction.

10. No other argument was raised.

11. Keeping in view the above, as no perversity in the order passed by the learned Single Judge has been pointed out by the learned counsel for the appellant, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

12. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

13. Civil miscellaneous application pending if any, also stands disposed of.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

September 08, 2025

harsha

**(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No