

LPA-1603-2025 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

243

LPA-1603-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision :19.05.2026

Darshan Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab  
and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Rahul Rampal, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Vikram Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.4.

\* \* \*

**Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)**

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 21.04.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP-9864-2025 by which, the order dated 23.05.2024 passed by the learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab remanding the case back to the authority concerned for fresh adjudication with regard to the better suited candidate for appointment as a Lambardar of the village in question, has been set aside and the order dated 23.04.2018 passed by the learned District Collector, Rupnagar appointing the respondent No.4 herein as Lambardar, has been upheld.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the learned



District Collector did not appoint the appellant herein as Lambardar only on the ground that appellant was alleged to have encroached upon land of Khasra No.84, which is *Gair Mumkin Rasta*, which fact was incorrect and therefore, the reason given by the authority concerned for ousting the appellant for appointment as Lambardar, is incorrect.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that the said reason if taken out, the appellant is a better suited candidate as compared to the respondent No.4 for appointment as Lambardar, which fact has been ignored by the learned Single Judge while passing the impugned order dated 21.04.2025.

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

5. Learned Single Judge has already recorded a finding that in case issue of alleged encroachment is not taken into consideration and when the record of the appellant as well as respondent No.4 is evaluated, it cannot be said that respondent No.4 in any way is less than the appellant.

6. Learned Single Judge has further gone to hold that once, learned District Collector has recorded a finding appointing respondent No.4 herein as a Lambardar, no interference can be called for unless and until there is any ineligibility attached.

7. Learned counsel for the appellant has not been able to point out any ineligibility qua the appointment of respondent No.4 herein, who is concededly working as Lambardar of the village in question as of now.

8. Further, the judgment of the learned Single Judge can only be interfered with in case, the same is perverse either on facts or law and in the present case, no perversity either on facts or law has been brought to the

**LPA-1603-2025 (O&M)**

**-3-**

notice of this Court by the learned counsel for the appellant so as to direct that the respondent No.4, who was appointed as a Lambardar by the learned Collector should not continue as a Lambardar.

9. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances recorded hereinbefore, no ground for interference is made out by this Court and the present appeal is accordingly dismissed.

10. Civil miscellaneous application pending, if any, is disposed of.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)**  
**JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)**  
**JUDGE**

**May 19, 2026**

*aarti*

*Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes*

*Whether reportable : No*