



**CM-1869-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-746-2026**

1

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

(106)

**CM-1869-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-746-2026**

Date of Decision : May 22, 2026

Angrej Singh

.. Appellant

Versus

Financial Commissioner, Punjab, Chandigarh and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mrs. Gurnam Kaur Turka, Advocate, for the appellant.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

CM-1869-LPA-2026

Present application has been filed seeking condonation of delay of 24 days in filing the appeal.

Keeping in view the averments made in the application, which are duly supported by an affidavit, the application is allowed. Delay of 24 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

LPA-746-2026

1. Present appeal has been filed challenging the order dated 10.12.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP No.27747 of 2025, upholding the appointment of respondent No.4 as Lambardar.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant argues that once the matter was remanded back to learned Assistant Collector, all the candidates



**CM-1869-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-746-2026**

2

applying for said post were required to be served again for evaluating their merit, rather than evaluating the merit of the candidates on the basis of the record already available.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that as due consideration was not given to the claim of the appellant for appointment to said post, appointment of respondent No.4 as Lambardar was bad which fact has wrongly been appreciated not only by the Financial Commissioner, Punjab but also by the learned Single Judge.

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

5. It may be noticed that once the case had been remanded back for fresh consideration, same would mean that the authority concerned, on the basis of record available is to apply its mind so as to pass a fresh order that who is the suitable candidate out of the total applicants. Respondent No.4 was found to be suitable and was recommended and appointed.

6. Further, with regard to the claim of the appellant that he is better suited than respondent No.4, has also been considered by the Financial Commissioner, Punjab which is clear from the paragraph 7 of the order dated 10.12.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge wherein, it has been mentioned that the claim of the appellant was based upon a hereditary claim that his father was a Lambardar whereas, the such hereditary claim has already been held to be bad. Otherwise, finding has been given that under all respect, respondent No.4 was better suited, which finding has gone un-rebutted at the hands of learned counsel for appellant even today during the hearing.



**CM-1869-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-746-2026**

3

7. No other argument has been raised.
8. Keeping in view the above, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.
9. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

May 22, 2026
harsha

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No