



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**



S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19981/2025

1. Sristi Singhal D/o Satyendra Singhal, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Gandhi Chowk, Main Market, Mandawar, Dausa, Rajasthan- 321609.
2. Hina Jain D/o Ramesh Chandra Jain, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village- Jashma, Tehsil- Bhupal Sagar, District- Chittorgarh, Rajasthan-312202.
3. Nitika Singh D/o Mahaveer Singh, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of 112 B, Janta Colony, Pali, Rajasthan-306401.
4. Alok Godara S/o Omveer Singh, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of 22, Shyam Vihar, Station Road, Chomu, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 303702.
5. Ritika Pareek D/o Jugal Kishore Pareek, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of 27, Laxmi Colony, Near Tonk Phatak, Tonk Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302015.
6. Vikash Baswana S/o Ramniwas Baswana, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village- Chantra Mangra, Nagaur, Rajasthan-341021.
7. Astha Yadav D/o Rudal Yadav, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Bhind Road, Pushkar Colony, Gola Ka Mandir, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh-474005.
8. Priyanka Foujdar D/o Nawab Singh, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of B-72 Jawahar Nagar, Bharatpur, Rajasthan-321001.
9. Praveen Jahanara D/o Sh. Shamimuddin, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of House No. 152, Rishi Galve Nagar, Galta Gate, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
10. Deepak Kumar Verma S/o Rameshwar Lal, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Sanjay Colony, Gordhanpura, Phulera, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303338.
11. Harman Singh Bajwa S/o Surinder Mohan Singh Bajwa, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 5, House No. 211, Kasba Mohalla, Dasuya, Hoshiarpur, Punjab-144205.
12. Kritika Sharma D/o Kailash Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of 38-A C.g.m. Nagar, Kalyan Pura, Sanganer, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302020
13. Dilip Kumar Meena S/o Jagdish Prasad Meena, Aged





About 28 Years, Resident Of Village- Padla, Post- Jatwara, Tehsil-Mandawar, Dausa, Rajasthan-321609.

14. Saurav Kataria S/o Ram Lal Saini, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 6, Dhani Bijyawali, Shrimadhapur, Neem Ka Thana, Rajasthan-332715.
15. Anju D/o Ram Krishan, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village- Hajipur, Post-Billaheeri, Tehsil- Kotkasim, District- Alwar, Rajasthan-301702.
16. Vijay Kumar Meena S/o Hansraj Meena, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village- Bhamoowas, Tehsil-Lalsot, Dausa, Rajasthan-303503
17. Amit Meena S/o Bhanwar Lal Meena, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of 86, Ganesh Vihar Colony, Kacholiya Road, Chomu, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303702
18. Roshan Meena D/o Ram Kishan Meena, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 3, Molaipura, Tonk, Rajasthan-304001
19. Vaibhav Pandey S/o Awadesh Pandey, Resident Of 12/14, Clive Road, Civil Lines, Prayagraj, Uttarpradesh-211001.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

Connected With

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20287/2025

Nimisha Bissa, W/o Tanay Jain, Aged About 29 Years, R/o B-83, Flat No. 401, Ganesh Marg, Bapu Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302015

----Petitioner



Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Director, Department Of Prosecution, Secretariat, Jaipur-302005, Rajasthan
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission (Rpsc), Through Its Secretary, Ghooghra Ghati, Ajmer, Rajasthan

-----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20422/2025

Yatendra Singh Sisodiya Son Of Mahendra Singh Sisodiya, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of C/o Mahendra Singh Sisodiya, 15, Kishore Villa, Devi Nagar, Navratan, Bhuwana, Po Bhuwana, Dist-Udaipur Rajasthan-313001

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Ajmer, Rajasthan-305001

-----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20453/2025

Dharamsheel Sharma S/o Sh. Dharmendra Kumar Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Mandawari, Tehsil Lalsot, District Dausa (Raj.)-303504

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur





Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20572/2025

1. Poonam Sharma D/o Vishnu Prakash Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of 2355, Khajane Walon Ka Rasta, 2Nd Crossing, Chandpole Bazar, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302001
2. Chanda Nayak D/o Ram Narayan Nayak, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of 54/10, Surya Marg, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302020.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20661/2025

1. Arvind Kumar S/o Harphool Bairwa, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of C-43, Ambedkar Nagar, Alwar, Rajasthan-301001
2. Ankita Jain D/o Sanjiv Kumar Jain, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of C9, Nand Vihar, Rohta Road, Near Godwin Public School, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh- 250002

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302005
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302005





3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

-----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20667/2025

Stuti Dave D/o Satish Dave, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Plot No. 63-A, Guru Jambeshwar Nagar B, Queens Road, Gandhi Path, Vaishali Nagar ,jaipur , Rajasthan-302021

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Home, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Directorate Of Prosecution, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, District Ajmer, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 105/2026

Sachidanand S/o Sanjay Kumar Singh, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of H.no. 871, K.h. No. 14/20 Gali No. 33, Chandan Vihar West Sant Nagar, Burari, North Delhi, Delhi - 110084.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

-----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 188/2026

Piyush Balot Son Of Shri Ram Kailash, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of A-506, Ramkrishna Apartment, Sector-14, Shipra Path, Mansarovar, Jaipur, Rajasthan - 302020.

-----Petitioner





1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Home Department (Prosecution Wing), Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan - 302005.
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission (Rpsc), Through Its Secretary, Ghooghara Ghati, Jaipur Road, Ajmer, Rajasthan - 305001.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 189/2026

1. Pooja Bagaria D/o Madan Lal Bagaria, Aged About 26 Years, R/o D-134, Suncity Projects, Sikar Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302013
2. Divya Singh D/o Pashupati Nath Singh, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Gadarpura Road, Opposite Budhi Mata, Dholpur, Rajasthan-328001
3. Mahesh Kumar Meena S/o Rampal Meena, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Ward No. 1, Meeno Ka Mohalla Vpo- Rajnota, Tehsil Paota, District- Kotputli Behror, Rajasthan-303110
4. Harshita Nagarwal D/o Shivratan Verma Nirmal, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Quarter No. 18, Police Line, Tonk, Rajasthan-304001
5. Pooja Suwalka D/o Vishnu Suwalka, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Ricco Area Raila, Tehsil- Banera District- Shahpura, Rajasthan-311024
6. Madina Banu D/o Liyakat Ali Khan, Aged About 49 Years, R/o 96, Aashan Ke Pas, Phulia Khan District-Shahpura, Rajasthan-311407
7. Neetu Kumari Goyal D/o Rajender Kumar Jain, Aged About 42 Years, R/o A-702, Aashirwad Anandam Complex, Near Agni Shaman Kendra, R.k. Puram Kota, Rajasthan-324005

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No.





7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur,
Rajasthan-302005

3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur
Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 205/2026

Akshita Gupta D/o Ashok Gupta, Aged About 29 Years, Resident
Of 138, Tikkarmal Ka Rasta, Kishanpole Bazaar, Jaipur, Rajasthan
- 302001

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary,
Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok
Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution,
Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No.
7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur,
Rajasthan - 302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur
Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 285/2026

1. Nishad Vyas S/o Shyam Sunder Vyas, Aged About 28
Years, R/o 33-A, Ganeshpuri, Kalyanpura, Sanganer,
District Jaipur - 302020, Rajasthan.
2. Mayank Mishra S/o Vinod Kumar Mishra, Aged About 27
Years, R/o 29/f, Railway Colony, Tugalakabad, Pul Pehlad,
Po- Pul Pehladpur, Delhi - 110044.
3. Bhawana S/o Ashok Kumar, Aged About 40 Years, R/o
Villa No. B-58, Awadhpuri, Dhawas, District Jaipur,
Rajasthan- 302021.
4. Bharti Pareek D/o Rajesh Vyas, Aged About 26 Years, R/o
33-A, Ganeshpuri, Kalyanpura, Sanganer, District Jaipur,
Rajasthan- 302020.
5. Bharat Vyas S/o Shyam Sunder Vyas, Aged About 27
Years, R/o 33-A, Ganeshpuri, Kalyanpura, Sanganer,
District Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302020.





6. Ashish Meena S/o Dharmendra Kumar Meena, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Bharala, Post Mahawa, Tehsil Neemkathana, District Sikar, Rajasthan- 332713.
7. Karamvir Kaur D/o Baldev Singh, Aged About 39 Years, R/o House No. 467, Guru Nanak Colony, District Sangrur, Punjab- 148001.
8. Nishant S/o Suresh Kumar, Aged About 30 Years, R/o House No.666, Sector 15, District Sonipat, Haryana- 131001.
9. Prateek Sharma S/o Hari Shankar Sharma, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Near Post Office, Main Market Shahbad, Village And Post Shahbad, District Baran, Rajasthan- 325217.
10. Sakshi Shrivastava D/o Subodh Shrivastava, Aged About 33 Years, R/o 364, Padam Villa Nearby Ig Residence, Krishna Colony, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan- 321001.
11. Aakib Javed S/o Manjoor Ali, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Mohalla Gersariyan, Behind Masjid, Phar Bazar, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
12. Aditya Tiwari S/o Mahesh Kumar Tiwari, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Ramnath Sadan Gali, Pareek Chowk, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
13. Ankita Purohit D/o Daya Shankar Purohit, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Near Banisar Well, Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
14. Ankita Soni D/o Shyam Kumar Soni, Aged About 35 Years, R/o B-5/4, Patel Nagar, Pawanpuri, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334003.
15. Bhagyalaxmi Purohit S/o Bharat Kumar Purohit, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Pushkarna Stadium Ke Samne, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334004.
16. Bhavesh Dadhich S/o Ramesh Dadhich, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Near Bk School, Inside Jassusar Gate, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
17. Deendayal Saini S/o Sanwar Mal Saini, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Near Krishna Bus Stand, Shri Dulichand Guest House, Sardar Shahar, District Churu, Rajasthan- 331403.
18. Hemant Vyas S/o Bhanwar Lal Vyas, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Benisar Kunwa Near Jugal Bhawan Raghunath





Mandir Ke Pass, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.

19. Himanshu Bhojak S/o Anil Kumar Bhojak, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Gangashahar Road, Opp Transport Gali, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
20. Jogendra Singh Bhati S/o Narayan Singh Bhati, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Near Junglat Chowki, Desuri, District Pali, Rajasthan.
21. Manoj Choudhary S/o Hawasingh Choudhary, Aged About 34 Years, R/o House No. 236, Behind Veshnodham Mandir, Jaipur Road, Veshno Vihar Colony, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
22. Mohit Patel S/o Ram Lal Patel, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Manwa Khera, Tehsil Girwa, District Udaipur, Rajasthan- 313002.
23. Nutan Saini D/o Kesari Singh Saini, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Amarsar Well, Sadul Colony, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
24. Pankaj Vyas S/o Sampurna Nand Vyas, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Harsho Ka Chowk, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
25. Pooja Kothari D/o Umesh Kumar Kothari, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Chandko Ki Gali, Dammani Chowk, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
26. Priti Pareek S/o Mahendra Pareek, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Devi Bhawan, Behind Bheirudan Banglow, Rani Bazar, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
27. Rajesh Vyas S/o Kunj Lal Vyas, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Inside Nathusar Gate, Near Pharsolai Talai, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
28. Raman Kumar S/o Vijay Singh, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Ward No. 9, Village Saliwala, Sangaria, District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan- 335063.
29. Rashi Ratawa S/o Lalit Ratawa, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Inside Gogagate, Dargar Street, Infront Of Ramdev Temple, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
30. Rishi Raj Acharya S/o Ramchandra Acharya, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Surano Ka Mohalla, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.





31. Shreedhar Joshi S/o Lila Dhar Joshi, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Outside Nathusar Gate, Near Baba Ramdev Park, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
32. Shruti Vyas D/o Gopal Das Vyas, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Braham Puri Chowk, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
33. Suman Kumari D/o Ganga Ram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Bhawanipura Pokaran, Ward No. 19, Pokaran, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan- 345021.
34. Tripti Dadheech S/o Mahesh Kumar, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Inside Jassusar Gate, Behind Nsp College, District Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334001.
35. Vikas Rakhecha S/o Narendra Kumar, Aged About 27 Years, R/o 2/38, Jai Narayan Vyas Colony, District Nagaur, Rajasthan- 341001.
36. Yogesh Dave S/o Kailash Kumar Dave, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Badi Brahmpuri, Bhatund, District Pali, Rajasthan- 306707.
37. Varsha Shridhar D/o Devendra Shridhar, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Krishnpuram Colony, Shivpuri, Madhya Pradesh - 473551

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Government Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, District Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302005.
2. The Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Government Secretariat, District Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302005.
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan- 305001.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 517/2026

1. Laxmi Pankaj D/o Ratan Lal Dhanetia, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Plot No. 56, Shankar Nagar, Behind Pinkcity Hospital, Murlipura Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302039.
2. Ritika Verma D/o Ramkumar Verma, Aged About 26





Years, R/o Room No. 86 Kasturba Girls Hostel, University Of Rajasthan, Jaipur-302004.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 660/2026

Aparna Vasistha D/o Sohan Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of 93, Shri Ram Nagar B, Jhotwara, Jaipur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Ajmer, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 769/2026

Saurabh Aswal S/o Sh. Jagdish Prasad Aswal, Aged About 26 Years, R/o B-222 Phase 4, Jhalana Doongri, Jaipur (Raj.)-303504

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-





Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.

2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

-----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 775/2026

1. Vandana Nehra D/o Jalesingh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village- Jatwas, Post-Hasampur, Tehsil- Neem Ka Thana, Sikar, Rajasthan-332718
2. Nidhi Bansal D/o Rajinder Kumar, Aged About 34 Years, R/o House No. 107, Sector 3, Hanumangarh Town, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan-335513
3. Hardika Upadhyay D/o Anil Upadhyay, Aged About 25 Years, R/o F18, Azad Nagar, Near Maha Pragya Circle, Bhilwara, Rajasthan-311001
4. Vivek Dhaka S/o Sultan Singh Dhaka, Aged About 33 Years, R/o House No. 117, Village Basani, Post Bairas, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Sikar Rajasthan-332311
5. Yashoda Prajapat D/o Dhan Raj, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Ward No. 37, Bhojalali Road, Sujangarh, Churu, Rajasthan-331507.
6. Pallavi D/o Harmesh Chand, Aged About 27 Years, R/o 31, Golden City, Patran Road, Ward No. 4, Dirba, Sangrur, Punjab-148035.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001





----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 776/2026

Niket Shah S/o Ramesh Kumar Shah, Aged About 29 Years, R/o House No. 1293, Phase -1, Urban Estate, Dugri Road, Ludhiana, Punjab-141013.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 777/2026

Taruna Sharma D/o Purushottam Sharma, Aged About 37 Years, R/o 74, Kumawat Colony, Ajmer Road, Sodala, Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302006

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarura, Rajasthan- 305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 778/2026

Pragati Mishra S/o Rajesh Kumar Mishra, Aged About 27 Years, R/o 128/268, H Block, Kidwai Nagar, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh-208011





----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarura, Rajasthan- 305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 783/2026

Babita D/o Shubram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o A-23, Hasan Khan Mewat Nagar, Alwar, Rajasthan-301001

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 784/2026

Sagar Agrawal S/o Manoj Kumar Gupta, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Plot No. 96, Spm Nagar, Near St. Paul Sr. Sec. School, Bharatpur, Rajasthan-321001.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution,





Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005

3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 785/2026

Shipra Joshi D/o Hemant Kumar Joshi, Aged About 28 Years, R/o 40, Rajendra Nagar, Nimbahera, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan-312601

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Govt. Secretariat, C-Scheme, Ashok Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Director Prosecution, Directorate Of Prosecution, Prosecution Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Room No. 7116-17, Food Building, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005
3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ghooghara Ghati, Madarpura, Rajasthan-305001

----Respondents

WITH THE PETITIONS ENUMERATED IN SCHEDULE

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Tanveer Ahamed with
Mr. Mohit Sharma
Mr. Bhawani S. Saini with
Mr. Shivam Awasthi
Mr. Lokesh Saini
Mr. Tanay Jain with
Mr. Sachin Sharma
Mr. Prakhar Sharma
Mr. Brahma Nand Sandu
Mr. Parth Sarthi Sandu
Mr. Abhimanyu Singh Sandu
Mr. Anshuman Saxena
Mr. Divyansh Saini
Mr. Pradeep Mathur
Mr. Mohit Khandelwal with
Mr. Pranav Sharma
Mr. Keshav Dadhich
Mr. Harendar Neel
Mr. Amogh Gupta
Mr. Rohan Gupta



Mr. Naman Yadav
Mr. Amit Kumar
Mr. Ram Pratap Saini with
Mr. Aamir Khan
Mr. Kuldeep Singh Rathore
Mr. Ishan Verma

For Respondent(s) : Mr. M.F. Baig with
Mr. Govind Gupta
Mr. Ashutosh Gupta (IAS), Chief
Controller Exam, RPSC present in
person
Mr. Bhunesh Sharma, AAG with
Mr. Vishnu Dutt Sharma &
Ms. Epsa Nangalia
Mr. Somitra Chaturvedi, Dy. G.C.



HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAMEER JAIN

Judgment

REPORTABLE

1	Arguments concluded on	16.01.2026
2	Judgment reserved on	16.01.2026
3	Full judgment or operative part pronounced	Full Judgment
4	Pronounced on	27/01/2026

1. In the present batch of writ petitions, the scope of the controversy involved, albeit not limited to but is broadly and predominantly defined by the challenge raised regarding the arbitrariness inflicted upon the petitioners in checking the copies of Mains examination for recruitment on the post of Assistant Prosecution Officer in pursuance of advertisement dated 07.03.2024. Consequently, considering the fact that the writ petitions warrant adjudication on common questions of law and fact; with the consent of learned counsel appearing on behalf of all the parties, **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19981/2025** titled as **Srishti Singhal and Ors. vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors**, is



being taken up as the lead case. It is cautiously clarified that any discrepancies in the present batch of writ petitions, pertain purely to the factual narratives contained therein and not vis-à-vis the questions of law to be determined by this Court; the instant judgment shall be applicable on all the petitions connected herein/henceforth (inclusive on the petitions enumerated in the Schedule endorsed herein) on *mutatis mutandis* basis.

2. The lead petition is filed with the following prayers:

"(i) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, particularly a writ in the nature of **Certiorari**, quashing and setting aside the impugned result dated 10.12.2025 declared by the respondent-Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer for the Main Examination of Assistant Prosecution Officer (Home Department- Prosecution) pursuant to Advertisement No. **19/ परीक्षा/ A.P.O./ Prosecution Deptt./ EP-I/2023-24**, to the extent it declares only four candidates qualified;

(ii) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, particularly a writ in the nature of **Certiorari**, quashing and setting aside the **evaluation process adopted by the** respondent- Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer for the Main Examination of Assistant Prosecution Officer (Home Department- Prosecution) pursuant to Advertisement No. **19/ परीक्षा/ A.P.O./ Prosecution Deptt./ EP-I/2023-24**, and the same be declared **faulty, arbitrary, illegal and accordingly same be ordered to be set right.**

(iii) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of **Mandamus**, directing the respondents to undertake a **fresh, fair and transparent evaluation** of the answer scripts of the Main Examination of Assistant Prosecution Officer, by bring the same on record and adopting a rational moderation/normalization mechanism and by rectifying errors, if any, in model answers or evaluation standards;

(iv) Any other appropriate writ, order, or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper be passed in favour of the petitioner.

(v) Costs of the writ petition may kindly be awarded in favour of the petitioner."

SUBMISSIONS BY LEARNED COUNSEL REPRESENTING THE PETITIONERS:





3. At the outset, it was cautiously clarified that the present writ petitions have been jointly filed by the petitioners, who are similarly situated persons and are aggrieved by the same impugned action/order, giving rise to common cause of action and involving identical and substantial questions of law and facts, and that the filing of the present joint petitions is in consonance with the Rajasthan High Court Rules, 1952, which permit joinder of parties and joint proceedings where the cause of action and reliefs are common.

4. It was further contended that the present batch of writ petitions has been filed assailing the result dated 10.12.2025 declared by the Rajasthan Public Service Commission (RPSC) in respect of the Mains Examination conducted for recruitment to 181 posts of Assistant Prosecution Officer (hereinafter referred to as "APO"), pursuant to advertisement dated 07.03.2024, issued under the Rajasthan Prosecution Subordinate Service Rules, 1978, as amended by notification dated 09.02.2024 and Rajasthan Scheduled Areas Subordinate, Ministerial and Class – IV Services (Recruitment and other Service Conditions) Rules, 2014. It was contended that the impugned result is *ex facie* arbitrary, irrational and unconstitutional.

5. It was further submitted that the petitioners are not unsuccessful candidates in the strict sense, but are candidates who had successfully qualified the Preliminary Examination and were placed within the zone of consideration, being among fifteen times the number of advertised posts. Accordingly, approximately 2,700 candidates (181 × 15) appeared in the Mains Examination.





It was further submitted that the Mains Examination comprised of Paper-I (Law) carrying 300 marks and Paper-II (Language – English and Hindi) carrying 100 marks, with a prescribed minimum qualifying standard of 40 per cent in each paper.

6. Learned counsel submitted that to the utter shock and dismay of the petitioners, the impugned result dated 10.12.2025 declared only four candidates as having qualified the Mains Examination, thereby rendering 177 out of the 181 advertised posts effectively vacant. It was urged that such an abnormally low success rate is demonstrative of serious infirmities in the process of paper setting and evaluation and is manifestly arbitrary, unreasonable and irrational.

7. It was further contended that the arbitrariness of the evaluation process becomes more apparent in light of the fact that a majority of the petitioners have secured more than 40 per cent marks in the Rajasthan Judicial Services Mains Examination, 2025, which is acknowledged to be far more rigorous and of a higher standard than the present Examination. This comparative performance, according to learned counsel, clearly evidences grave irregularities and arbitrariness in the evaluation methodology adopted by the RPSC in the present recruitment.

8. Consecutively, learned counsel submitted that the evaluation methodology adopted by the respondent-RPSC was neither fair nor transparent and was carried out in a concealed manner. The shocking and unprecedented outcome of the Mains Examination, wherein only four candidates were declared qualified, itself establishes substantive unreasonableness and





unfairness, thereby warranting judicial review of the examination process and the resultant declaration.

9. On these grounds, it was submitted that the petitioners are entitled to appropriate reliefs, including re-evaluation, moderation, or award of grace marks. It was emphasized that the advertisement itself categorically reserves liberty in favour of the respondent-RPSC to adopt methods such as scaling, moderation and normalization in order to achieve the object of the recruitment process. Therefore, exercise of such powers at this stage would neither be impermissible nor arbitrary, but would rather advance fairness, transparency and uniformity among all candidates.

10. It was subsequently contended that adoption of re-evaluation or moderation would be reasonable and justified, particularly in view of the fact that recruitment to the post of Assistant Prosecution Officer has been undertaken after a gap of nearly ten years, as the last such recruitment was conducted in the year 2015. At present, nearly 60 per cent vacancies are stated to be existing in Courts below the level of Chief Judicial Magistrate (CJM). Learned counsel submitted that criminal cases triable before the CJM Courts involve offences punishable up to seven years, and therefore, failure to fill up the advertised posts defeats public interest, adversely impacts the criminal justice delivery system and virtually nullifies a large-scale public recruitment exercise.

11. In support of the submissions made insofar, learned counsel placed reliance upon various judgments passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, amongst others, **Pranav Verma & Ors.**





v. Registrar General of the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh, Writ Petition (Civil) No.565/2019; State of Punjab & Ors. v. Manjeet Singh & Ors., (2003) 11 SCC 559; Ramesh Kumar v. High Court of Delhi & Anr., (2010) 3 SCC 104; and Dinesh Kumar v. Chairman, UPSC, (2019) 6 SCC 312. Reliance was also placed upon a recent judgment of the Punjab and Haryana High Court in **Rustam Garg v. Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh & Ors., passed in CWP No.17608/2019**, wherein it was held that in cases of arbitrariness, evaluation of answer sheets by a fresh expert examiner can be directed.

12. Learned counsel further relied upon the ratio encapsulated in **Tej Prakash Pathak & Ors. v. Rajasthan High Court & Ors., Civil Appeal No.2634/2013**, to contend that the “rules of the game” cannot be changed after issuance of the advertisement. Additionally, reliance was placed upon the judgment of this Court in **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17538/2016, Chandra Shekhar Sharma & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Anr.**, to submit that, in order to give meaningful effect to the recruitment process, methods such as moderation or scaling can be adopted, even if not expressly provided in the Rules or elsewhere, so long as such measures subserve the ends of justice and fairness.

SUBMISSIONS BY LEARNED COUNSEL REPRESENTING THE RESPONDENTS AND THE OFFICERS PRESENT IN COURT:

13. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent–Rajasthan Public Service Commission had vehemently





opposed the maintainability of the present batch of writ petitions, as at the outset, it was averred that the petitions are misconceived and do not warrant interference in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court, as the scope of judicial review in matters pertaining to selection and evaluation in competitive examinations is extremely limited and cannot be invoked in the absence of any specific pleadings or proof of *mala fides*, bias, or extraneous considerations in the selection process.

14. In the present case, no allegation of *mala fides* are levelled against the respondent Commission, nor against any member of the expert body involved in the process of paper setting or evaluation. Moreover, the present batch of petitions are barred by the doctrines of acquiescence and estoppel; as the candidates, having participated in the selection process with full knowledge of the applicable rules, syllabus, examination scheme and the prescribed minimum qualifying marks, cannot now be permitted to turn around and challenge the result merely because they have failed to secure the minimum qualifying standards. It was emphasised that neither the advertisement nor the statutory rules governing the recruitment were ever challenged by the petitioners at any stage prior to or during the selection process.

15. Learned counsel further submitted that the concept of moderation or scaling is generally resorted to in cases where there are multiple papers evaluated by different evaluators or where varying standards of evaluation may arise due to plurality of examiners. However, in the present case, however, there was uniformity and singleness with respect to the evaluator, and a





rational, uniform and fair method of evaluation was consciously adopted. Therefore, the question of applying moderation or scaling does not arise.

16. Subsequently, it was contended that no valid comparison can be drawn between the present examination and any other examination, including the Rajasthan Judicial Services Examination, as the two examinations operate in entirely different domains and are not comparable in the absence of any empirical data or statistical analysis. Any such comparison, based merely on general observations or passing remarks, is wholly misconceived and legally untenable.

17. It was further submitted that the evaluation process was conducted in a fair, transparent and objective manner, with uniform standards applied to all candidates. There were no irregularities in the conduct of the examination or in the evaluation of answer scripts. Learned counsel submitted that, in terms of the notification dated 09.02.2024, minimum qualifying marks were consciously prescribed with the object of maintaining merit and ensuring selection of candidates possessing adequate and requisite knowledge for the post of APO, which involves handling criminal cases where the State is a principal litigant. Thence, the candidates who failed to secure the prescribed minimum marks demonstrably did not meet even the minimum standards required for the post, notwithstanding the fact that the question papers were moderate in nature and strictly in accordance with the prescribed syllabus.





18. In support of the submissions made insofar, reliance was placed upon a catena of judgments, amongst others, **Taniya Malik v. Registrar General of the High Court of Delhi**, reported in **(2018) 14 SCC 129, A.P. Public Service Commission v. Baloji Badhavath & Ors., Civil Appeal No.2244 of 2009**, and **Dr. Basaviah v. Dr. H.L. Ramesh & Ors., Civil Appeal No.6057 of 2010**.

19. Learned counsel representing the respondent-RPSC placed the entire relevant record before this Court, including answer sheets of both selected and unsuccessful candidates, for the Court's perusal and consideration. It was explained by the Officer present in Court, during a portion of proceeding held in camera for the purpose of confidentiality, that a fair, transparent, objective and rational approach was adopted at every stage of the examination process, including framing of question papers, constitution of panels of subject experts and evaluators, internal control mechanisms, cross-verification processes and determination of the marking pattern. It was further submitted that the with a view to preserving the secrecy and confidentiality of the working mechanisms of the respondent Commission, which conducts a large number of examinations for various posts, the modus of evaluation, internal processes and methodologies cannot be placed in the public domain.

20. It was pointed out that, for the first time, the examination deviated from a multiple-choice objective pattern to a subjective mode of evaluation, for the reason that rotten knowledge gets replaced by detailed, inter-linked knowledge and





with minds who can give a better shape to the case; and keeping this in view, minimum qualifying marks were consciously prescribed to ensure a better, merit-based selection process.

21. Learned counsel also referred to the submissions advanced on behalf of the State, wherein it was categorically contended that, as per the applicable rules, re-evaluation, moderation or scaling is not permissible. It was further submitted that the State as well as the respondent Commission are not inclined to fill up the vacant posts by lowering the prescribed standards or by granting relief to unsuccessful candidates who have secured marks below the stipulated minimum. Lastly, it was contended that the reliance placed by the learned counsel for the petitioners upon the judgments, as mentioned herenabove, is incorrect, as the relied upon judgments carry distinguishable factual nitty-gritty. On these premises, it was urged that the writ petitions deserve to be dismissed.

DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS:

22. This Court has bestowed its anxious consideration to the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has meticulously examined the records produced by the respondent–Rajasthan Public Service Commission, including the answer sheets and evaluation material, through an in-camera process. At the outset, before proceeding to record its opinion on the merits of the controversy, this Court considers it appropriate to delineate certain undisputed and incontrovertible facts:





22.1 The Rajasthan Public Service Commission (RPSC), vide advertisement dated 07.03.2024, invited applications for recruitment to 181 posts of Assistant Prosecution Officer (APO).

22.2 The recruitment process was governed by the Rajasthan Prosecution Subordinate Service Rules, 1978, as amended by notification dated 09.02.2024 (Annexure-1).

22.3 As per the advertisement and the amended Rules, the selection process consisted of two stages, namely:

(i) Preliminary Examination (objective type); and

(ii) Main Examination (written), comprising two papers:

(a) Paper-I: Law (300 marks), and

(b) Paper-II: Language (Hindi & English) (100 marks).

22.4 It was categorically specified in the advertisement, the Rules as amended, and the syllabus published on the official website that the Mains Examination would be conducted on a subjective written pattern, and not on an objective or multiple-choice basis. The minimum qualifying marks prescribed were 40% in each paper, with a relaxation of 5% for candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

22.5 It is an admitted position that, pursuant to the amendment of the year 2024, the pattern of the written examination was altered from objective to subjective for the first time. The Mains Examination consisted of 20 questions carrying 5 marks each, 10 questions carrying 10 marks each, and 5 questions carrying 20 marks each. The said pattern was explained before this Court by the Chief Controller of Examination, who was present during the proceedings.





23. Consequent upon the facts noted hereinabove, this Court considers it appropriate to further delineate its reasoning as, it is trite law that the power of judicial review in matters of recruitment and selection is not that of an appellate authority. Courts are concerned with the decision-making process, and not with the decision itself. The settled principle 'judicial review is concerned with the manner in which the decision is made and not the merits of the decision' stands reiterated time and again by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The maxim *acta exteriora indicant interiora secreta* meaning- external acts indicate internal intent, applies with full force, as the contemporaneous record placed before this Court reflects a fair, structured and reasoned evaluation mechanism, negating the allegation of arbitrariness.

24. **Evaluation Process and In-Camera Examination of Records:** This Court has perused, in camera, the instructions issued to the evaluators/examiners, the evaluated answer sheets of both successful and unsuccessful candidates, and the explanatory material placed on record by the respondent-RPSC. Upon such examination, it clearly emerges that each question was evaluated by the same set of examiners, thereby eliminating any possibility of variation or deviation in evaluation standards. The evaluators were issued detailed and structured instructions for award of marks, including reference to statutory provisions, citing of relevant sections, case laws, clarity of legal reasoning, and content of answers. Moreover, the evaluation process was supported by internal checks and cross-verification mechanisms. On selective perusal of answer sheets of handful of randomly





selected unsuccessful petitioners as well as selected candidates, this Court finds that the evaluation methodology adopted was rational, uniform, fair and transparent, and no material indicative of arbitrariness, irrationality or unfairness is discernible.

25. Notably, the writ petitions do not challenge the validity of the Rules as amended by notification dated 09.02.2024, nor is any allegation of *mala fides* levelled against the respondent-RPSC or any member of the expert bodies involved in the examination or evaluation process.

26. **Doctrine of Acquiescence and Estoppel:** It is undisputed that the petitioners participated in the recruitment process with full knowledge of the rules, syllabus, examination scheme and the minimum qualifying marks prescribed vide notification dated 09.02.2024 more specifically 'Amendment to Rule 22'. The advertisement and statutory rules were never assailed prior to declaration of the result. Therefore, it is opined that having taken a calculated chance in the selection process, the petitioners cannot, upon being unsuccessful, seek to challenge the outcome. Thence, the said action of the petitioners attracts the doctrine of estoppel by conduct, as a candidate who has acquiesced to the process cannot approbate and reprobate. The petitioners participated in the recruitment process with full knowledge of the rules, the amended examination pattern, and the minimum qualifying marks prescribed. At no stage prior to the conduct of the examination or declaration of results were these conditions challenged. Having accepted the terms of the advertisement and the Rules, the petitioners, upon being





unsuccessful, cannot turn around and seek re-evaluation, moderation, scaling, or award of grace marks. In this regard, this Court deems it apposite to place reliance upon the ratio of **Tajvir Singh Sodhi and Ors. vs. The State of Jammu and Kashmir and Ors.: 2023 INSC 309**, relevant extract from which is reproduced hereinbelow:



"13.1. It is therefore trite that candidates, having taken part in the selection process without any demur or protest, cannot challenge the same after having been declared unsuccessful. The candidates cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. In other words, simply because the result of the selection process is not palatable to a candidate, he cannot allege that the process of interview was unfair or that there was some lacuna in the process. Therefore, we find that the writ Petitioners in these cases, could not have questioned before a Court of law, the rationale behind recasting the selection criteria, as they willingly took part in the selection process even after the criteria had been so recast. Their candidature was not withdrawn in light of the amended criteria. A challenge was thrown against the same only after they had been declared unsuccessful in the selection process, at which stage, the challenge ought not to have been entertained in light of the principle of waiver and acquiescence."

(Emphasis supplied)

Further, reliance can be placed upon the dictum of **Taniya Malik (Supra)**, the relevant extract of which is reiterated hereinbelow:

"21. Even otherwise the petitioners have undertaken the exam with the stipulation of minimum cut-off marks in written and oral examination and then having failed, they cannot turn round and are estopped to contend to the contrary. This Court in K.H. Siraj has observed that when the candidates participated in the interview with the knowledge that for selection they have to clear the prescribed minimum pass marks, on being unsuccessful in interview, could not turn around and challenge that the



prescription of minimum marks was improper....."

(Emphasis supplied)

27. **Low Success Rate – No Presumption of Illegality:**

The principal plank of the petitioners' challenge rests upon the allegedly "shockingly low" number of qualified candidates.

However, mere numerical outcome cannot *ipso facto* render an examination arbitrary. In the ratio encapsulated in **Baloji**

Badhavath & Ors. (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court

categorically held that low pass percentage by itself does not justify interference unless the evaluation process is shown to be

vitiated by *mala fides* or patent arbitrariness. It can also be noted

that vacancies cannot be filled at the cost of merit, eligibility, or

statutory standards. The relevant extract from **Baloji Badhavath**

& Ors. (supra) is reproduced hereinbelow:

"It was furthermore held:

*"14. Time is now ripe for Courts to lay down the limits to the lowering of standards for the purpose of compensatory preference. **The intensity of compensatory preference cannot be at the expense of even-handedness and merit and cannot proliferate to such an extent as to prove fatal to the basic proficiency and efficiency.** The intensity must vary depending on the nature of the compensatory discrimination whether it is primarily for individual benefit or whether the quality of public service is directly affected. Krishna Iyer, J., observed in State of Kerela v. N.M. Thomas that "to relax basic qualification is to compromise with the minimum administrative efficiency and is presumably barred by Art. 335".*

Lowering of standards for the purpose of compensatory discrimination is limited to competing commitments to efficient administration.





Public interest demands concern for quality and prohibits waiver or abandonment of quality.

In *Janki Prasad v. State of Jammu & Kashmir*, the Supreme Court observed that the setting of absurdly low minimal scores made it a "travesty of selection".

(Emphasis supplied)

28. **Comparative Examination Argument - Rejected:**

The attempt of the petitioners to draw parity with performance in other examinations, including the Rajasthan Judicial Services Examination, is legally untenable. The settled principle of *comparatio est odiosa*, meaning that comparison is odious applies to the case at hand, as two distinct examinations conducted for different services, with different objectives and standards, cannot be equated in absence of empirical data. It is opined that merit across different examinations is irrelevant and impermissible for testing validity of a selection process, for various reasons, as that of difference in syllabi, mode of examination, selection pattern, wants of the recruitment process, conducting authority, evaluators' perspective etc.

29. **Public Interest and Filling of Vacancies:** The submission that public interest demands filling up of vacant posts cannot override prescribed standards of merit; as this Court is of a stern opinion that public interest lies not merely in filling vacancies, but in ensuring competent and meritorious selection, particularly for prosecutorial posts involving administration of criminal justice. In this regard, reliance can be placed upon the dictum of **Dr. Basaviah (supra)**, wherein it is categorically stated that Courts should be slow to interfere with the opinions



expressed by the experts (as in the matter at hand the evaluators); and that it would be normally wise and safe for the Courts to leave the decisions of academic matters to the experts, who are more familiar with the problems they face, than the Courts generally do.

30. Proceeding further, in order to address the contentions raised on behalf of the petitioners in more effective and meaningful manner, this Court considers it appropriate to advert to and apply the ratio laid down in **Taniya Malik (supra)**, which is of binding relevance to the present controversy. Accordingly, the same is noted and examined hereunder:

30.1 **Plea for application of moderation technique to the instant examination:** The prayer seeking re-evaluation, moderation or scaling is equally untenable. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the judgment of **Sanjay Singh v. U.P. Public Service Commission: (2007) 3 SCC 720**, has categorically drawn the guidelines whereby any Court can affirm the plea of moderation of scores before it, and the matter at hand explicitly falls out of the said ambit. The records placed before this Court demonstrate that the evaluation was conducted uniformly by a single evaluator following a rational and consistent methodology. It is well settled that re-evaluation or moderation cannot be ordered as a matter of course unless the rules expressly so permit or exceptional circumstances are made out. In this regard reliance can be placed upon the following extract from the ratio encapsulated in **Taniya Malik (supra)**:



"13. This Court in Sanjay Singh has laid down moderation to be appropriate where there are multiple examiners of the same subject. It has also been observed that where a number of candidates are limited and only one examiner will evaluate, it is to be assumed that there will be uniformity in valuation. That is only where several examiners evaluate the same subject. There is difference in average marks and range of marks awarded. There is "hawk-dove" effect. Some examiners are liberal and they award more marks; some examiners are strict and they give fewer marks, the same may be moderated. There may be variance in degree of strictness and liberality. It is in order to remove the subjectivity or variability, that the provision of moderation is adopted. It is not the situation in the instant case, hence, the decision in Sanjay Singh rather than buttressing negates the plea of moderation, urged on behalf of the petitioners."

(Emphasis supplied)

30.2 Relaxation of minimum per cent to be scored, as the seats are lying vacant: It is noted that merely by the fact that seats are lying vacant, it could not be a satisfactory or cogent ground to relax the minimum marks for an examination that is already complete. The same shall amount to changing the rules of the games, and contrary to the settled principle of law, as laid down in the dictum of **Tej Prakash Pathak and ors. vs. Rajasthan High Court and ors.: 2024 INSC 847**. The relevant extract to substantiate the view of this Court in this regard, from the judgment of **Taniya Malik (Supra)** is reproduced hereinbelow:

"19. In our considered opinion, it is desirable to have the interview and it is necessary to prescribe minimum passing marks for the same when the appointment in the higher judiciary to the post of District Judge is involved. The interview is the best method of judging the performance, overall personality and the actual working knowledge and capacity to perform otherwise the standard of judiciary is likely to be compromised. A





written examination only tests academic knowledge, which is some time, gained without possessing overall qualities, practical experience of practice and law. In written exam, even the person with no caliber who takes decision by cramming may obtain better marks. When the Judges of the High Court too are appointed by adjudging the performance and intellect, an interview would be indispensable for judicial post. As ultimately, they also come to adorn the chair of a Judge and Judges of subordinate and higher judiciary to deliver justice to masses, the criteria of experience of practice for direct recruitment of 7 years whether actually gained can be adjudged only by interview, communicating skills and by elucidation of certain aspects which would not be possible by written exam alone. In *Siraj (supra)*, it was emphasized that interview is the main fulcrum for judging the suitability of the candidate for appointment as District Judge in the higher judiciary. In our opinion that is absolutely necessary. When we consider past practice earlier when the written examination was not prescribed, the High Court used to select the candidates for higher judiciary only by the method of interview. Now additional safeguards of written examination have been added. The importance of interview for the post of the higher judiciary has increased than ever before it is absolutely necessary to weed out unworthy elements/crammers and in our considered opinion it is not only appropriate but also absolutely necessary to prescribe the minimum pass marks so as to weed out unworthy element so as to segregate grain from the chaff. There is a vast difference between having the experience that is required for a Judge that cannot solely be adjudged on the basis of written performance, and for which overall personality, intelligence test is absolutely necessary. Without that it would not be appropriate to make appointments in judiciary. **Thus in our opinion the prescription of minimum 45% marks for reserved category candidates could not be said to be uncalled for. Merely by the fact that some more posts were advertised and they are lying vacant, it could not have been a ground to relax the minimum marks for interview after the interview has already been held. It would not have been appropriate to do so and the High Court has objected to relaxation of minimum passing marks in viva voce examination in its reply and as the power to relax is to be exercised by the High Court and since it has opposed such a prayer on reasonable ground and the institutional objective behind such prescription, we are not inclined to direct the High Court to relax the minimum marks."**

(Emphasis supplied)





31. Lastly, this Court deems it necessary to observe that the judgments relied upon by learned counsel appearing for the petitioners are clearly distinguishable on facts as well as in law, when examined in the backdrop of the peculiar factual matrix and the finer nuances of the present case. Illustratively, **Pranav Verma (supra)**, was rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in exercise of powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, in circumstances where the evaluation process suffered from lack of uniformity, absence of structured marking instructions, involvement of multiple evaluators, and demonstrable arbitrariness—none of which are present in the case at hand. *In toto*, the relied upon judgments were rendered in circumstances where demonstrable arbitrariness, lack of uniformity in evaluation, involvement of multiple evaluators without adequate guidelines, or patent procedural irregularities were established on record. In contradistinction, the present case discloses no such infirmities, inasmuch as the recruitment process was conducted strictly in accordance with the statutory rules, the evaluation was undertaken by a uniform set of expert examiners following a rational and structured methodology, and no mala fides or illegality has been alleged or proved. Accordingly, the precedents relied upon by the petitioners do not advance their case and are inapplicable to the facts and issues arising for consideration herein.

CONCLUSION :

32. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the present writ petitions do not warrant





any interference in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for the reason in precise as that, the recruitment process for the post of APO was conducted strictly in accordance with the Rules of 1978, as amended by notification dated 09.02.2024, and the terms of the advertisement dated 07.03.2024, including the prescribed examination scheme and minimum qualifying marks; that the petitioners, having participated in the selection process with full knowledge of the rules and without protest, are barred by the doctrines of acquiescence and estoppel from challenging the process after having failed to secure the minimum qualifying marks; that upon in-camera scrutinization of the original records, this Court finds that the evaluation was carried out by uniform expert evaluators following a rational, fair and transparent methodology, and no arbitrariness, irregularity or mala fides is established; that the mere fact that a limited number of candidates qualified cannot, by itself, invalidate the examination; that the comparison sought to be drawn with other examinations is misconceived, and the refusal of the respondent-RPSC and the State to grant re-evaluation, moderation, scaling or grace marks, or to dilute the prescribed standards to fill vacant posts, is a conscious policy decision falling within their exclusive domain and is neither arbitrary nor unreasonable. The judgments relied upon by the petitioners are distinguishable on facts, whereas the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Taniya Malik (supra)** and other binding precedents squarely governs the present controversy.





33. Accordingly, the writ petitions are devoid of merit and are hereby dismissed. Accordingly, the present batch of writ petitions fails to hold any merit and is hereby dismissed *in limine*. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of. No orders are passed as to costs.

34. The records made available to the Court for perusal, are directed to be returned promptly; for which appropriate application be filed by the respondents before the Registrar (Judicial).

(SAMEER JAIN),J

JKP/DEEPAK/

**SCHEDULE**

Sr. No.	Title	Reserved on
1.	SBCWP No.1358/2026	21.01.2026
2.	SBCWP No.20956/2025	22.01.2026
3.	SBCWP No.1140/2026	22.01.2026
4.	SBCWP No.1248/2026	22.01.2026

