



CWP-37992-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

119

CWP-37992-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.04.2026

Hardeep Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Karnail Singh Ahhi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

HARSH BUNGER J. (Oral)**CM-6122-CWP-2026:**

Prayer in the present application is for placing on record documents as Annexures P-7 to P-11.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and documents as Annexures P-7 to P-11 are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CWP-37992-2025:

Petition herein is, *inter alia*, seeking a writ in the nature of Certiorari, for setting aside the order dated 21.03.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Collector, Ludhiana; order dated 10.01.2024

**CWP-37992-2025 (O&M)****-2-**

(Annexure P-2) passed by learned Commissioner, Patiala Division, Patiala and order dated 21.04.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed by learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab.

2. Briefly, upon demise of Sh. Harmel Singh, previous Lambardar (General category) of village Hariyan, Tehsil and District Ludhiana, proceedings were initiated for filling up the said vacancy, wherein present petitioner (Hardeep Singh) and respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) were also the candidates.

2.1. It appears that the learned Naib Tehsildar, Koomkalan, as well as the learned Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Ludhiana (East), recommended the candidature of respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) for appointment to the aforesaid vacancy and placed the matter before the learned Collector, Ludhiana.

3. The learned Collector, Ludhiana, after considering the relative merits and demerits of the candidates, found respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) as a suitable candidate and accordingly, vide order dated 21.03.2023 (Annexure P-1) appointed him as the Lambardar of village Hariyan, Tehsil and District Ludhiana.

3.1 Feeling aggrieved against the learned Collector's order, the present petitioner preferred an appeal before the learned Commissioner, Patiala Division, Patiala. Similarly, another candidate namely Satwant Singh also challenged the learned Collector's order by filing a separate appeal before the learned Commissioner. Both the aforesaid appeals came to be

**CWP-37992-2025 (O&M)****-3-**

dismissed by learned Commissioner, Patiala Division, Patiala vide order dated 10.01.2024 (Annexure P-2).

3.2 Still aggrieved, the petitioner preferred a revision petition (ROA No.20 of 2024) before the learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab. Similarly, another candidate namely Satwant Singh also preferred his separate revision (ROR No.379 of 2024) before the learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab.

3.3 Both the above-referred revision petitions came to be dismissed by learned Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab, vide common order dated 21.04.2025 (Annexure P-4).

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

5. Before this Court, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has raised only one submission that respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) does not have clean antecedents as he was involved in various criminal matters, although, he stands acquitted in the said cases, but on account of his involvement in the criminal matters, respondent No.5 is not a fit candidate to be appointed as Lambardar.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the paperbook with his able assistance.

7. As regards the contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is concerned, no doubt, the respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) was involved in four criminal cases, however, it has come on record that he

**CWP-37992-2025 (O&M)****-4-**

already stands acquitted in all the four cases. It is further noticed that the factum of involvement of respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) in criminal matters was duly considered by all the Revenue Authorities below and the same has not influenced their decision in appointing respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) as the Lambardar. All the Courts below have concurrently found respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) to be a suitable candidate for the post of Lambardar.

8. It is well-settled position that in the matter of appointment of Lambardar, the choice of the learned Collector is not to be lightly interfered with, even if two views are possible, unless there is any patent illegality or perversity.

9. Concededly, as on date there is no criminal case pending against the respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) and in all the cases in which he was arrayed as an accused, he already stands acquitted. The choice of the learned Collector has been further affirmed by the learned Commissioner as well as the learned Financial Commissioner.

10. Keeping in view, the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, especially the fact that all the Revenue Authorities below despite noticing that respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) was involved in criminal cases, but stands acquitted therein, have chosen to appoint him as the Lambardar; now, at this stage, if the respondent No.5 (Sukhdev Singh) is to be removed from the post of Lambardar only on the ground of his involvement in the criminal cases (although he already stands acquitted



CWP-37992-2025 (O&M)

-5-

therein), the same would be injustice to him; accordingly the aforesaid contention raised on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner is rejected.

11. No other argument has been raised.
12. Keeping in view the above, I see no compelling reasons, which may warrant any interference in the orders passed by the Revenue Authorities below. Resultantly, the instant writ petition fails and the same is accordingly *dismissed*.
13. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

22.04.2026
ankit

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No