



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT  
JODHPUR**

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1646/2026

1. Ram Niwas Bhadu S/o Shri Phusa Ram Bhadu, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Shri Rampura District Bikaner Raj.
2. Nand Ram Thalor S/o Shri Narsi Ram Thalor, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Sajanwasi Vpo Udsar Tehsil Nokha District Bikaner Raj.
3. Lokesh Dubey S/o Shri Paras Nath Dubey, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Ward No. 18 Teja Ji Jat Dharmshala Ke Pass Bhagat Singh Colony Nokha District Bikaner Raj.
4. Dharendra Kumar Shrivastava S/o Shri Akhileshwar Prasad Shrivastava, Aged About 49 Years, R/o 206 Ward No. 01 Behind Hanumant Happy School Maloo Chowk Nokha District Bikaner Raj.
5. Rajuram Godara S/o Shri Ramnarayan Godara, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Godara Bas Kesar Desar Jatan District Bikaner Raj.
6. Parbhash Choudhary S/o Shri Ram Kumar, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Pura Ki Dhani Sabalpura District Sikar Raj.
7. Santosh Kumar S/o Shri Purkha Ram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Po Singjuroo Nokha District Bikaner Raj.
8. Bhiyam Ram S/o Shri Nanuram Tard, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Bidasariya Masoori Po Mansoori District Bikaner Raj.
9. Hari Kishan S/o Shri Mohan Lal Tard, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Ward No.14 Padal Bass Jasrasar Tehsil Nokha Jasrasaar District Bikaner Raj.
10. Pradeep Tiwari S/o Shri Ghanshyam Tiwari, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Ward No. 14 Padal Bass Jasrasar Tehsil Nokha Jasrasaar District Bikaner Raj.
11. Sharwan Ram Jandu S/o Shri Bhoma Ram Jandu, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Teetari Po Jodhiyasi District Nagur Raj.
12. Sanwar Lal Sahu S/o Shri Sahi Ram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Ward No. 13 Rampura Basti Suratsinghpura District Bikaner Raj.
13. Satpal Jakhar S/o Shri Pabu Ram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Ward No. 01 Saloodiya Po Saloondiya District Bikaner Raj.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj. Govt. Of Raj. Jaipur
2. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Bikaner District Bikaner
3. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Nokha





District Bikaner

4. The District Collector, Bikaner
5. Bhom Singh Inda S/o Shri Bheem Singh Inda, R/o Village Post Bhalu Kallan Tehsil Sekhala District Jodhpur Raj.

-----Respondents

---

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Lakshya Singh Udawat.  
For Respondent(s) :

---



**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MUNNURI LAXMAN**

**Order**

**05/03/2026**

1. Heard at admission stage.
2. The present writ petition has been filed challenging the joining order dated 06.11.2025 (Annex.-8).
3. The facts of the case disclosed that the petitioners, are Village Development Officers ('VDO') and the private respondent is the Block Development Officer ('BDO'), who was allegedly initially suspended for various reasons. The said suspension order has been challenged before this Court by filing a writ petition. This Court had refused to interfere in the said suspension order. It is alleged that suppressing this order, the private respondent obtained an order from the Rajasthan Administrative Tribunal ('RAT') and basing on the said Tribunal Order, the private respondent allowed to join on the said post and the said order has been challenged in the present writ petition.
4. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the order of the Tribunal was obtained by suppressing the order of refusal of this Court to interfere in the



suspension order. It is also his submission that the petitioners as a locus-standi to challenge the suspension order as the private respondent was holding public office without his entitlement.

5. The present writ petition is misconceived. The petitioners have no locus-standi. If any order from the Tribunal is obtained by fraud, it is the Authorities, who are effected by such an order is entitled to move to Tribunal and seek appropriate order. The petitioners being the subordinate officers to the private respondent, they cannot challenge the joining order on the ground that the private respondent was not entitled to hold the post, As long as, the order of the Tribunal was in force, the private respondent is entitled to hold the office, therefore, the contentions of the writ petitioner are misconceived.
6. Consequently, there is no reason to interfere in the present writ petition, the same is, therefore, dismissed.
7. Misc. application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

**(MUNNURI LAXMAN),J**

72-PKS/--04.03.2026

