

other candidates under all circumstances only for discharging a particular duty for the nation.

5. Once the Revenue Authority has given a finding that, keeping in view the facts, the private respondent has better knowledge of the duties to be discharged while working as a Lambardar and that too in a more proficient manner as compared to the appellant, this Court, in an appeal, would not like to dislodge the said findings unless proved to be perverse.

6. Learned counsel for the appellant is not able to prove that the reasons given by the Collector to appoint the private respondent as a Lambardar, who has already been discharging the duties for the last 15 years as of now, are perverse so as to set aside his appointment as Lambardar and to appoint the appellant in his place.

7. Hence, once the reasons given by the revenue authorities that the respondent is a better candidate have gone unrebutted, coupled with the fact that no disqualification attached to respondent No.1 has been shown and brought to the notice of this Court, and also that the respondent has been working as Lambardar for the last 15 years hence, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

8. Present appeal stands dismissed.

9. The present application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

05-02-2026
Sapna Goyal

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Note: Whether speaking/reasoned: YES
Whether reportable : NO