



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

142

**LPA No.2856 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.09.2025**

SURINDER 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. Sureseh Kumar Aneja, Advocate for the appellant.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 11.08.2025 passed by learned Single Judge in CWP No.23074 of 2025 by which, the appointment of respondent No.4 as a Lamberdar of village Chak Kheyo Wali, Tehsil and District Fazilka has been upheld and the writ petition filed by the appellant who was petitioner before learned Single Bench, challenging the said appointment has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that keeping in view the fact that father and grandfather of the appellant were the Lamberdars, the appellant should have been appointed as a Lamberdar as he was having superior qualification and was meritorious enough to be appointed as a Lamberdar in preference to respondent No.4.

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

4. It may be noticed that none of the revenue authorities concerned, has found the appellant meritorious enough to be appointed as a Lamberdar.

**LPA No.2856 of 2025 (O&M)**

-2-

The recommendations which were made by the Tehsildar and the Sub-Divisional Magistrate were in favour of respondent No.4 i.e. Baldev Raj. After the Collector appointed Baldev Raj to the post in question, the said appointment was challenged by the appellant as well as by respondent No.5-Ravinder Kumar before the appellate authority and the appellate authority i.e. the Divisional Commissioner, set aside the appointment of respondent No.4 and appointed respondent No.5-Ravinder Kumar as a Lamberdar vide order dated 24.03.2025. The said order dated 24.03.2025 passed by Divisional Commissioner, Ferozepur was challenged before the Financial Commissioner (Appeals), Punjab by respondent No.4-Baldev Raj as well as by Ravinder Kumar-respondent No.5. The Financial Commissioner set aside the order dated 24.03.2025 passed by the Divisional Commissioner, Ferozepur and reinstated respondent No.4 as a Lamberdar vide order dated 26.05.2025, which order was impugned by the appellant before the learned Single Judge. The learned Single Judge after appreciating all the facts that except for the Divisional Commissioner, Ferozepur, respondent No.4 has been the unanimous choice for the post of Lamberdar of the village concerned by all the other authorities concerned, and accordingly, dismissed the writ petition, which led to the filing of the present appeal.

5. As per the settled principles of law, the appointment of a candidate to the post of the Lamberdar, candidate chosen and appointed on said post by the revenue authorities needs no interference unless and until, the said candidate is found to be ineligible to be appointed on said post. In the present case, at no given point of time, starting from the recommendation made by Tehsildar up to the Financial Commissioner's, no authority has found the



LPA No.2856 of 2025 (O&M)

-3-

appellant to be more suitable than respondent No.4 to be appointed as a Lamberdar. Though, the Divisional Commissioner, Ferozpur found respondent No.5 to be more meritorious than respondent No.4 and vide order dated 24.03.2025, appointed respondent No.5 to the said post but even the said order was set aside by the Financial Commissioner vide order dated 26.05.2025 which order has been upheld by the learned Single Judge.

6. Merely, because the appellant claims to be younger than respondent No.4, same is not a valid ground so as to override the selection of respondent No.4 as a Lamberdar. Once the claim raised by various candidates has been considered and amongst all those candidates, respondent No.4 has been found to be more meritorious than the appellant along with the fact that respondent No.4 is eligible to be appointed to the said post, hence, keeping in view the fact that no perversity has been pointed out in any of the orders passed by the authorities as well as the learned Single Judge, especially when no hereditary right can be claimed to be appointed as Lamberdar, no ground is made out to allow the present appeal and the hence, the same is dismissed.

7. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

September 22, 2025

Syahi-70

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