IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

205 **LPA-1283-2017 (O&M)**
Date of Decision: 16.02.2026

Gurjant Singh

....Appellant

Versus

The Financial Commissioner and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: Mr. J.S.Bhandohal, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Rahul Rampal, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Jagjit Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

****

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 22.05.2017 passed in CWP-620-2016 by the learned Single Judge by which, the issue with regard to the appointment of *Lambardar* was remanded back to the Financial Commissioner for deciding the same afresh in accordance with law, keeping in view the allegation made against the appellant by respondent No.2 that he is an employee of the Government of Punjab in the department of Jail and is posted 70 kms away and his job is such that he cannot leave his place of posting.

2. The learned counsel for the appellant submits that though, certain

VARINDER PRASHAD
2026.02.18 18:06
I attest to the accuracy of this
document
PHHC

facts with regard to the appointment of *Lambardar* cannot be rebutted but the question is whether, any employee of the Government of Punjab is debarred from holding the post of *Lambardar*.

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

4. Once, the *Lambardar* is appointed to take care of the issues which arise qua the residents of the village and is expected to solve them without delay, his absence from village of such *Lambardar* creates problem.

5. In the present case, it is a conceded fact that the appellant is serving at the Central Jail, Patiala and keeping in view the nature of duties to be performed by him during his service, his presence at the place of posting is must. Once, this fact has gone unrebutted, nothing has come on record that how will it be possible for the appellant to discharge the duties of *Lambardar* while being posted 70 kms away from the village from which place of posting, it will be difficult for him to address the issue of the residents of the village being the *Lambardar*.

6. No other argument has been raised.

7. Keeping in view the totality of the circumstances, the order passed by the authorities concerned, which has been upheld by the learned Single Judge so as to remand the case back to the Financial Commissioner, needs no interference at the hands of this Court.

8. As no perversity has been shown in the impugned order dated 22.05.2017 passed by the learned Single Judge, no ground is made out for any

VARINDER PRASHAD
2026.02.18 18:06
I attest to the accuracy of this
document
PHHC

interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

9. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. Parties are directed to appear before concerned Financial Commissioner on 17.03.2026.

10. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

February 16, 2026
Varinder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No

VARINDER PRASHAD
2026.02.18 18:06
I attest to the accuracy of this
document
PHHC