

2026:PHHC:049819



121

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

**CWP-3491-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.03.2026**

Sandeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Financial Commissioner (Revenue), Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Ms. Garima Modi, Advocate
for the petitioner,

Mr. Nirmaljit Singh Diwana, Senior DAG, Punjab.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

Petition herein is, *inter alia*, seeking a writ in the nature of Certiorari for setting aside order dated 03.08.2022 (Annexure P-2) passed by the learned Collector, Fatehgarh Sahib; order dated 20.03.2024 (Annexure P-4) passed by the learned Divisional Commissioner, Patiala; and order dated 05.12.2024 (Annexure P-5) passed by the learned Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

2. Briefly, upon demise of Sh. Amrik Singh, previous Lambardar (General) of Village Sirhind, Teshil and District Fatehgarh Sahib,

proceedings for filling up the said vacancy were initiated, wherein petitioner – Sandeep Singh and respondent No.6 – Jasvir Singh were also the candidates.

2.1 The learned Assistant Collector, IInd Grade, Fatehgarh Sahib, as well as the learned Assistant Collector, Ist Grade, Fatehgarh Sahib, recommended the candidature of respondent No.6 – Jasvir Singh for the aforesaid vacant post of Lambardar and placed the matter before the learned Collector, Fatehgarh Sahib.

2.2 The learned Collector, Fatehgarh Sahib, after considering the relative merits and demerits of all the candidates, found respondent No.6 – Jasvir Singh as the most suitable candidate and, accordingly, appointed him as the Lambardar of Village Sirhind, vide order dated 03.08.2022 (Annexure P-2).

2.3 Being aggrieved, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the learned Divisional Commissioner, Patiala, however, the same was dismissed vide order dated 20.03.2024 (Annexure P-4).

2.4 Still dissatisfied, the petitioner filed a revision petition (ROR No.750 of 2024) before the learned Financial Commissioner, Punjab, which also came to be dismissed vide order dated 05.12.2024 (Annexure P-5).

3. In the aforementioned circumstances, petitioner has filed the present writ petition before this Court, seeking relief(s) as noticed hereinabove.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the revenue authorities below have erred in law and fact in appointing respondent No.6 – Jasvir Singh as the Lambardar of Village Sirhind, without duly

considering the better merits of the petitioner. It is contended that the petitioner is younger in age and possesses higher educational qualification than respondent No.6. It is further submitted that certain notices (Annexure P-7) have been issued against respondent No.6 regarding encroachment upon public land.

4.1 With the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is more suitable for appointment as Lambardar of Village Sirhind and, therefore, prays that the impugned orders be set aside.

5. Heard.

6. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner was asked to demonstrate whether any eviction order has been passed against respondent No.6 in pursuance to notices (Annexure P-7); however, she failed to do so. It has also not been shown that any eviction proceedings are pending against respondent No.6. In this view of the matter, no cognizance can be taken of the alleged eviction notices (Annexure P-7).

7. As regards the higher educational qualification of petitioner is concerned, no doubt he is a Post Graduate, whereas, respondent No.6 is only Matric pass; however, respondent No.6 cannot be held ineligible to be considered for the post of Lambardar on this ground alone; as under the Punjab Land Revenue Rules, no minimum educational qualification is prescribed for appointment to the post of Lambardar. Moreover, the learned Collector, upon interacting with the candidates, found respondent No.6 to be the most suitable candidate for appointment to the said post, which reflects the conscious and considered decision of the learned Collector in appointing respondent No.6 as Lambardar.

8. As far as the age aspect is concerned, no doubt, the petitioner is comparatively younger than respondent No.6; and the age of a candidate is a relevant factor for appointment to the post of Lambardar, however, the age of a person is to be considered in the context of his physical ability and capacity to discharge his duties as a headman of the village. No such plea has been raised that respondent No.6 is incapacitated from discharging the functions of a Lambardar, in view of his age. There is nothing on record suggestive of the fact that any complaint was made against him that he is not able to render his services properly owing to his older age.

9. In the instant case, apparently, all the revenue authorities, i.e. the Collector, the Divisional Commissioner and the Financial Commissioner, have taken a concurrent view in favour of respondent No.6.

10. It is a well settled law that in the matter of appointment of Lambardar, the choice of learned Collector is not be lightly interfered with, even if two views are possible, unless there is any patent illegality or perversity therein. In this regard, reference can be made to a recent judgment dated 09.07.2025 passed by a Division Bench of this Court in *LPA No.2217 of 2024* titled as “**Murti Devi Vs. State of Haryana & Ors.**”, wherein it has been observed as under:

*“8. Moreover, it is a settled position that choice of the Collector in respect to appointment to the post of Lambardar should not be set aside until and unless there is patent illegality or perversity pointed out therein. Interference is also not called for only on the ground that two views may be possible. In this respect gainful reference can be made to judgments of this High Court in **Neeraj Kumar Vs. State of Haryana and others, 2013 (4) RCR (Civil)** and **Sukhminder Singh Vs. the Financial Commissioner and others 1992 PLJ 325.**”*

11. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I find no compelling reason to interfere with the impugned orders. Resultantly, the instant writ petition fails and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.
12. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

27.03.2026
Apurva

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No