

LPA-399-2015 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

224

LPA-399-2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision :02.04.2026

Manjinder Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Financial Commissioner (Revenue) Punjab,
and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Puneet Sharma, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Yatin Bunker, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate for respondent No.4.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to impugned order dated 21.02.2015 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in CWP-9681-2014 whereby, the writ petition filed by the appellant herein challenging the appointment of respondent No.4 as Lambardar of village Batarla has been dismissed.

2. It may be noticed that respondent No.4 was appointed as Lambardar of the village Batarla, which appointment was challenged by the appellant herein before the Collector, Commissioner and thereafter before the Financial Commissioner, Punjab but he remained unsuccessful and

appointment of respondent No.4 was upheld by all the three revenue authorities.

3. Feeling aggrieved against the said orders dated 09.12.2009, 20.07.2010 & 22.11.2012 (Anenxures P/2, P/3 & P/5 respectively) passed by the Revenue authorities, the appellant herein had filed a writ petition wherein also, he remained unsuccessful as the said orders passed by the revenue authorities concerned appointing the respondent No.4 as Lambardar of the village Batarla, were upheld.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant argues that there has to be a comparative assessment of the candidates while making the appointment of Lambardar and it is only then that the appointment should have been made by the revenue authorities concerned whereas, in the present case, there was no comparative assessment among the candidates which was duly done.

5. On being asked to enumerate grounds on which the appeal has been filed, the learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is more suited candidate than respondent No.4, being more academically qualified than respondent No.4 and also that he is a grandson of a freedom fighter and he has been engaging himself in various social welfare activities and development works of the village.

6. It may be noticed that though, the appellant is claiming himself to be more academically qualified than respondent No.4 but, for the purpose of discharging the duties of the Lambardar, one should be having good contact and relations with the villagers so as to solve their problems and to achieve their trust. In the present case, it is a conceded fact that respondent No.4 has been discharging the duties of the Lambardar of the village

LPA-399-2015 (O&M)

-3-

concerned for the last 17 years and no complaint has been received against him. Hence, merely that the appellant is more academically qualified than respondent No.4 and is a grandson of freedom fighter, the same cannot be a ground to dislodge a validly appointed Lambardar.

7. Further, there is no disqualification which was attached to the appointment of respondent No.4 and in the absence of any such disqualification, the trust posed by the Revenue authorities upon respondent No.4 which trust continues to operate even after a period of 17 years, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the order passed by the learned Single Bench of this Court and the appeal is accordingly dismissed.

8. Civil miscellaneous application pending, if any, is also disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

April 02, 2026
aarti

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No