

2026:PHHC:016680



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

**CWP-8010-2018 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 04.02.2026**

**KULDIP SINGH**

**... PETITIONER**

**VS.**

**FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER PUNJAB AND ORS.**

**... RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER**

Present: Mr. Ravi Malhotra, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

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

Mr. B.S.Mann, Advocate and  
Mr. P.S.Chahal, Advocate, for  
Mr. G.S.Nagra, Advocate,  
for respondent No.4.

\*\*\*\*

**HARSH BUNGER, J. (ORAL)**

Prayer in the present writ petition filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *Certiorari* for quashing of order dated 02.01.2014 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Collector, Jalandhar; order dated 05.04.2016 (Annexure P-2) passed by the learned Commissioner, Jalandhar Division, Jalandhar and order dated 01.09.2017 (Annexure P-3) passed by the learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab.

2. Briefly, upon demise of Shri Swaran Singh, previous Lambardar of village Talwandi Bharo, Tehsil Nakodar, District Jalandhar; proceedings for filling up the said vacancy were initiated, wherein

petitioner-Kuldip Singh and respondent No.4-Santokh Singh were also candidates.

2.1 The learned Tehsildar, Nakodar recommended the candidature of the present petitioner for appointment to the said post, whereas the learned Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Nakodar, recommended the candidature of respondent No.4-Santokh Singh, and the matter was placed before the the learned Collector, Jalandhar.

2.2. The learned Collector, Jalandhar, after considering the relative merits and demerits of the candidates, found respondent No.4-Santokh Singh as more suitable candidate and appointed him as Lambardar (General Category) of village Talwandi Bharo, Tehsil Nakodar, District Jalandhar, vide order dated 02.01.2014 (Annexure P-1).

2.3. Feeling aggrieved against the aforesaid order dated 02.01.2014 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Collector, Jalandhar, petitioner preferred an appeal before the learned Commissioner, Jalandhar Division, Jalandhar; however, the same was dismissed vide order dated 05.04.2016 (Annexure P-2).

2.4 Still dissatisfied with the aforesaid order dated 05.04.2016 (Annexure P-2) passed by the learned Commissioner, Jalandhar Division, Jalandhar, petitioner preferred a revision (ROR No.421of 2016) before the learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab, which also came to be dismissed vide order dated 01.09.2017 (Annexure P-3).

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

4. The two arguments raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner are that the petitioner owns more land (107 kanal 13 marlas) than respondent No.4, who is stated to own 44 kanal of land and secondly, that the petitioner is younger in age, being 41 years old, than respondent No.4, who is stated to be 51 years of age (on the date when matter was considered by the learned Collector, Jalandhar).

5. I have considered the aforesaid submissions raised on behalf of petitioner and perused the paper-book.

6. As regards the first contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner, no doubt the petitioner owns more land than respondent No.4; however, the requirement of holding land is only for the purpose of security towards government revenue collected by the concerned Lambardar. In “Gurpreet Singh Vs. Financial Commissioner (Revenue), Punjab”, 2017 (1) RCR (Civil) 233, this Court had observed that land revenue stood abolished in both the States of Punjab and Haryana long back, thus owning land by the candidates for the post of Lambardar would not be of much significance any further. Even otherwise, respondent No.4 owns 44 kanals of land, which does not make him ineligible for the post of Lambardar.

7. As regards the plea of the petitioner that he is younger in age than respondent No.4, suffice it to say that the age of a person is to be considered in the context of his physical ability and capacity to discharge his duties as a headman of the village. No such plea has been raised that the respondent No.4 is incapacitated from discharging the functions of a Lambardar, in view of his old age. There is nothing on record suggestive of the fact that any complaint was made against respondent No.4 that he is not able to render his services properly owing to his old age. Similar view was

taken by this Court in the case of “*Ram Kumar Vs. The Financial Commissioner, Haryana and others*”, 2013 (2) RCR (Civil) 1038.

8. Considering the totality of circumstances, I see no compelling reason, which may warrant interference by this Court in the order dated 02.01.2014 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Collector, Jalandhar appointing respondent No.4-Santokh Singh as Lambardar, which has been further affirmed by learned Commissioner, Jalandhar Division, Jalandhar vide order dated 05.04.2016 (Annexure P-2) as well as by learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab vide order dated 01.09.2017 (Annexure P-3). Resultantly, the instant civil writ petition fails and same is accordingly dismissed.

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

**(HARSH BUNGER )  
JUDGE**

**04.02.2026**

smriti

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No