

230

2026:PHHC:050394-DB



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

LPA-724-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision : 01.04.2026

Jaswant Singh

....Appellant

Vs.

Financial Commissioner and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. N.P.S.Mann, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Yatin Bunger, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Rajan Singh Dadwal, Advocate for the respondent No.4.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(Oral)

The present appeal has been filed to challenge the order passed by the authority concerned by which the respondent No.4 was appointed as a Nambardar of the village Sidhwan Bet, Tehsil Jagraon, District Ludhiaina, which order has been upheld by the learned Single Judge vide order dated 02.08.2022 passed in CWP-16815-2022.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the reason which has been given by the authorities that due to his job profile, he will not be present in the village is incorrect, as though the appellant is working as a stamp vendor but, the job is such that it is not likely that he will remain out of the village for a long so as to cause prejudice to the villagers with regard to the discharge of the responsibilities as Nambardar.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the court premises is within the village and therefore, the only reason given for not accepting the

claim of the appellant as a Nambardar is incorrect, which factum has been ignored not only by the revenue authorities, but even by the learned Single Judge.

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

5. It may be noticed that the appointment of Nambardar was made about a decade ago. The respondent is already working for the last ten years. Further, the job profile of the appellant is that he has to remain within the court premises being a stamp vendor. That, has weighed with the mind of the authorities while choosing the other candidate as a Nambardar. The said assessment on the part of the revenue authorities cannot be treated as incorrect.

6. Further, for the last ten years, the respondent is already discharging the duties with Nambardar without there being any complaint, hence, merely on the assertion that the appellant is better suited than the respondent, cannot be accepted as of now so as to dislodge the respondent No.4 from the post of Nambardar especially when no disqualification tagged to the respondent No.4 has been brought to the notice of this Court.

7. The appeal stands dismissed.

8. Pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

01.04.2026

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes

LPA-724-2022 (O&M)

3

Whether Reportable :

No