

2026.PHHC.049953



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

CWP-9556-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 30.03.2026

Gurpreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Vishal Mehta, 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 01.10.2020 (Annexure P-2) passed by the learned Collector, Tarn Taran; order dated 08.09.2021 (Annexure P-4) passed by the learned Divisional Commissioner, Jalandhar; and order dated 29.07.2024 (Annexure P-7) passed by the learned Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

2. Briefly, upon demise of Sh. Ghasita Singh, previous Lambardar of Village Khera, Teshil and District Tarn Taran, proceedings for filling up the said vacancy were initiated, wherein petitioner Gurpreet Singh and respondent No.4 Gurmeet Singh were also the candidates.

2.1 The learned Tehsildar, Tarn Taran, as well as the learned Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Tarn Taran, recommended the candidature of respondent No.4 – Gurmeet Singh for the aforesaid vacant post of Lambardar and placed the matter before the learned Collector, Tarn Taran.

2.2 The learned Collector, Tarn Taran, upon considering the relative

merits and demerits of all the candidates, found respondent No.4 – Gurmeet Singh as the most suitable candidate and, accordingly, appointed him as the Lambardar of Village Khera, vide order dated 01.10.2020 (Annexure P-2).

2.3 Feeling aggrieved against the aforesaid order dated 01.10.2020 (Annexure P-2), the petitioner preferred an appeal before the learned Divisional Commissioner, Jalandhar, however, the same was dismissed vide order dated 08.09.2021 (Annexure P-4).

2.4 Still dissatisfied, the petitioner filed a revision petition (ROR No.88 of 2022) before the learned Financial Commissioner, Punjab, which also came to be dismissed vide order dated 29.07.2024 (Annexure P-7).

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

4. Heard.

5. In the present case, respondent No.4 was appointed as the Lambardar of Village Khera by the learned Collector, Tarn Taran, vide order dated 01.10.2020 (Annexure P-2).

6. Here, it would be apposite to state the relative merits of the petitioner and respondent No.4, which can be summed up as under:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Particulars</i>	<i>Petitioner (Gurpreet Singh)</i>	<i>Resp. No.4 (Gurmeet Singh)</i>
1.	<i>Age</i>	<i>35 years</i>	<i>37 years</i>
2.	<i>Educational qualification</i>	<i>10+2</i>	<i>10+2</i>
3.	<i>Land holding(s)</i>	<i>2 Kanal (as per petitioner's claim)</i>	<i>1 Acre</i>
4.	<i>Recommended by</i>	<i>-----</i>	<i>Tehsildar, Tarn Taran and Sub Divisional Magistrate, Tarn Taran</i>

7. A bare perusal of the above chart reveals that respondent No.4 has an edge over the petitioner, inasmuch as his name was recommended by the lower revenue officers. As regards the age of the petitioner and respondent No.4, there is hardly any difference, and their educational qualifications are also similar. Moreover, respondent No.4 owns more land than the petitioner.

8. 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.4. In my considered view, the same is in consonance with the well settled law that in the matter of appointment of Lambardar, the choice of learned 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 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.**”*

9. 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.

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

30.03.2026

Apurva

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

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