



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

113

**LPA-43-2025 (O&M)****Date of Decision: 15.01.2026**

RAVINDER PAL SINGH

...Appellant

Versus

FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER REVENUE PUNJAB AND ORS

...Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Rajinder Singh Batta, Advocate,  
for the appellant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)**

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 08.08.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP-21798-2023, by which the writ petition filed by respondent No.4 herein-Chanchal Singh challenging the order dated 02.11.2022 passed by learned Divisional Commissioner, Jalandhar, remanding of the case back to the Collector, Jalandhar, for deciding the appointment to the post of Lambardar of village Patoo Kalan, Tehsil Shahkot, District Jalandhar, has been set aside and Chanchal Singh, who was appointed as Lambardar, has been allowed to continue.

2. Learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the appellant, argues that the basis of the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge is that the appellant herein along with other candidates had withdrawn their candidatures, which fact is not correct, whereas at no given point of time, the appellant had withdrawn his candidature in favour of Chanchal Singh to be



appointed as a Lambardar and therefore, the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge, accepting the writ petition of Chanchal Singh, so as to set aside the orders dated 02.11.2022 and 17.07.2023 passed by the Divisonal Commissioner and Financial Commissioner, Punjab, are incorrect.

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

4. It may be noticed that the candidates, who had applied for the post of Lambardar, were duly heard by the Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Collector, District Jalandhar and while appointing respondent No.4- Chanchal Singh as a Lambardar, vide order dated 03.09.2019, certain facts have been mentioned in the order itself. Ravinder Singh, i.e. the appellant along with the other candidates, withdrew their respective applications for Lambardari in favour of Chanchal Singh and one of the candidates never appeared and therefore, the claim of only two candidates were adjudicated for appointment to the post of Lambardar, i.e. Chanchal Singh, respondent No.4 herein and one Kulwinder Singh. The relevant paragraph of the order passed by the District Collector, District Jalandhar in this regard is as under:-

“In this court Candidate Kulwinder Kaur along with her counsel Sh. B.S. Lalli, candidate Chanchal Singh along with his counsel Sh. Raman Kumar Bhardwaj were present. Candidate Gurdev Singh, Avtar Singh, Kulwinder Singh, Ravinder Pal Singh, Sarabpreet Singh and candidate Gurnam Singh were present themselves. During proceedings, candidate Ravinder Pal Singh, Sarabpreet Singh, Gurnam Singh, Avtar Singh and



candidate Kulwinder Kaur withdrew their respective applications for lambardari in favour of Chanchal Singh son of Sohan Singh. During proceedings candidate Gurdev Sighh was absent. That is why in this case, remaining two candidates were listened to.”

5. Once, the appellant had himself withdrawn his candidature along with the other candidates in favour of Chanchal Singh, raising the grievance with regard to his non-appointment to the post of Lambardar, has rightly been rejected by the learned Single Judge.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant raises a disputed question of fact before this Court in appeal by stating that he never withdrew his candidature in favour of Chanchal Singh, it may be noticed that in case, the said argument is accepted, then the question which surfaces is why once the candidature of the appellant was not considered by the District Collector, District Jalandhar, on the ground that he has withdrawn his application in favour of Chanchal Singh, was not challenged immediately.

7. It has already come on record that appointment of Chanchal Singh was challenged by the appellant after a period of more than one year, which fact itself shows that the appellant had withdrawn his candidature before the Deputy Commissioner, District Jalandhar, for appointment to the post of Lambardar and that too, in favour of Chanchal Singh. Further, respondent No.4-Chanchal Singh is working for the last more than 05 years and no complaint has been brought to the notice of this Court that he is not competent to do so or has misused his authority.

8. The appointment to the post of Lambardar is an honorary job and once a person has already been appointed to said post and is working



for the last 05 years, merely that the appellant wants to challenge the same would be no ground to remand the case back to authorities concerned.

9. No ground is made out for interference by this Court as learned counsel for the appellant has failed to point out any perversity in the impugned order 08.08.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

10. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

( HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI )  
JUDGE

( VIKAS SURI )  
JUDGE

January 15, 2026  
*harish*

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