



CWP-3339-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

121

CWP-3339-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.04.2026

Bahadur Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Harmanjit Singh Jugait, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nirmaljit Singh Diwana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

HARSH BUNGER J. (Oral)

1 Petition herein is, *inter-alia*, seeking a writ in the nature of Certiorari, for setting aside the order dated 09.12.2020 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned Collector, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali); order dated 14.10.2022 (Annexure P-4) passed by learned Commissioner, Rupnagar Division, Rupnagar and order dated 21.11.2025 (Annexure P-3) passed by learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab.

2. Briefly, upon demise of Sh. Baljit Singh, previous Lambardar of village Jheurheri, Tehsil and District S.A.S. Nagar, proceedings were initiated for filling up the said vacancy, wherein present petitioner (Bahadur Singh) and respondent No.4 (Angrej Singh) were also the candidates.

2.1. The learned Tehsildar as well as the learned Sub Divisional Magistrate, Mohali, recommended the candidature of respondent No.4



CWP-3339-2026 (O&M)

-2-

(Angrej Singh) for appointment to the aforesaid vacancy and placed the matter before the learned Collector, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali).

2.2 Learned Collector, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) after considering the relative merits and demerits of the candidates found respondent No.4 (Angrej Singh) to be more suitable candidate and accordingly appointed him as the Lambardar of village Jheurheri, Tehsil and District S.A.S. Nagar, vide order dated 09.12.2020 (Annexure P-5).

2.3. Feeling aggrieved against the aforesaid order dated 09.12.2020 (Annexure P-5), present petitioner preferred an appeal before the learned Commissioner, Rupnagar Division, Rupnagar, which came to be dismissed vide order dated 14.10.2022 (Annexure P-4).

2.4. Still aggrieved, the petitioner (Bahadur Singh) preferred a revision petition (ROR No.53 of 2023) before the learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab, which has also been dismissed vide order dated 21.11.2025 (Annexure P-3).

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

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the paperbook with his able assistance.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has raised only one argument that the respondent No.4 (Angrej Singh) has illegally encroached upon the Panchayat land. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner was asked to point out from any material/document on record, which would indicate the unauthorized possession of respondent No.4 on

**CWP-3339-2026 (O&M)****-3-**

any Government/Panchayat land; however, he has failed to refer to any such material/document. In view of the above, the aforesaid contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is found to be without any merit and the same is accordingly rejected.

6. Apparently, respondent No.4 (Angrej Singh) has been appointed as Lambardar by the learned Collector, and the choice of the learned Collector, has been further affirmed by learned Divisional Commissioner as well as learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab. All the Revenue Authorities below have concurrently found respondent No.4 (Angrej Singh) as a suitable candidate for appointment to the post of Lambardar. It needs no reiteration that in the matter of appointment of Lambardar, choice of Collector is not to 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 the judgment rendered by Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in LPA No. 2217 of 2024 titled as ***"Murthi Devi Vs. State of Haryana & Ors.,"*** decided on 09.07.2025; the relevant extract of the same reads 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"***



CWP-3339-2026 (O&M)

-4-

7. I have gone through the order dated 09.12.2020 (Annexure P-5) passed by the learned Collector which has been further affirmed by the Appellate as well as Revisional Authority, and I find no illegality or perversity therein, which may which may warrant any interference in the orders passed by the Revenue Authorities below. Resultantly, the instant writ petition fails and the same is accordingly **dismissed**.

8. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

27.04.2026
ankit

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No