



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

106

**LPA-3164-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 21.01.2026**

RAVINDER KUMAR

...Appellant

Versus

**FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER (APPEALS) PUNJAB AND OTHERS
... Respondents**

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

**PRESENT: Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate
for the appellant.**

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 25.07.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby, the order passed by the Financial Commissioner, holding that the appointment of the respondent No. 4 Baldev Raj as Lambardar has been upheld.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant argues that the appellant is younger in age and better qualified and therefore, he should be given preference over the respondent No. 4, which preference was rightly given by the Commissioner, but the same has wrongly been set-aside by the Financial Commissioner, which order has erroneously been upheld by the learned Single Judge.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have gone

**LPA-3164-2025 (O&M)**

through the case file with his able assistance.

4. It may be noticed that the lambardar has to perform the duties in an honorary capacity. The choice is to be left to the authorities and can only be interfered with in case the candidate sought to be appointed has incurred any disqualification. In the present case, learned counsel for the appellant has not been able to show that the appointment of respondent No. 4 by the Collector suffered from any irregularity, or that respondent No. 4 has incurred any disqualification.

5. The order passed by the Commissioner has been set-aside by the Financial Commissioner on the ground that the reason given by the commissioner to set-aside the appointment of respondent No. 4 was that the appellant was younger in age. Merely being younger in age, cannot be a ground to set-aside the appointment of respondent No. 4, as, the same would amount to holding that a person an elder in age stands disqualified in case a younger candidate is competing against him or her. Further, findings have been recorded by the learned Single Judge, that in the last two years, the respondent No. 4 has been discharging his duties and no complaint has come on record to show that due to his age, he has been incapable of discharging his duties on the post in question.

6. Keeping in view the totality of circumstances of the present case, where no disqualification is shown to have been incurred by respondent No. 4, coupled with the fact that respondent No. 4 was the choice candidate for the post of lambardar at all levels starting from Naib Tehsildar, Sub Divisional Magistrate/ Collector, except the Commissioner, hence, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.



LPA-3164-2025 (O&M)

- 7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.
- 8. Pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

21.01.2026

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