



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



**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15370/2025**

Ramprakash Kharlwa S/o Gopi Ram Kharlwa, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Santokpura Beraki, Post Bihajar, Tehsil Virat Nagar, District Kotputli-Behror, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
2. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Jaisalmer.
3. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

**Connected With**

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6868/2023**

Chandar Mohan Gurjar S/o Bhanwar Lal Gurjar, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village And Post Sonwa, Tehsil Tonk, District Tonk, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary Department Of Animal Husbandry, Govt. Secretariat, Rajasthan Govt. Jaipur.
2. The Director, Directorate Of Animal Husbandry, Tonk Rd, Lalkothi, Jaipur, Rajasthan - 302015.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, State Institute Of Agriculture Management Premises, Shreeji Nagar, Prithviraj Colony, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302018.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13602/2023**

Mahendra Ram Jat S/o Shri Ishwr Ram Jat, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village Krishanpura, Post Govindi, Tehsil Nawa, District Nawa, District Nagaur (Raj.)





----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Animal Husbandry Department, Tonk Road, Near Rajasthan Mahila Ayog, Jaipur
3. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Its Secretary, Having Its Office At Rajasthan Agriculture Management Institute Premises, Durgapura, Jaipur- 302018

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 462/2024**

Yogesh Malav S/o Gokul Prasad, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village And Post Digod, Khalsa, Tehsil Chhipa, Barod, District Baran, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Director, Directorate Of Elementary Education, Bikaner, (Raj.).
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, State Institute Of Agriculture Management Premises, Sitabari, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302018, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, District Kota, Rajasthan.
5. The Medical Superintendent, Maharao Bheemsingh And Government Medical University, District Kota, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 681/2024**

Rajesh Kumar S/o Bahadur Singh, R/o Village Magla Barela, Post Noh Bhachhmdi, Tehsil And District Bharatpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Director, Directorate Of Elementary Education,





Bikaner, (Raj).

2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj).
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, State Institute Of Agriculture Management Premises, Sitabari, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302018, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. The Medical Superintendent, Sawai Man Singh Hospital, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 683/2024**

Sohan Singh Chouhan S/o Jagdish Singh Chouhan, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Vpo Jhaparawas, Tehsil Sikrai, District Dausa, Rajasthan- 303501.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Director, Directorate Of Elementary Education, Bikaner, (Raj.).
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, State Institute Of Agriculture Management Premises, Sitabari, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302018, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. The Medical Superintendent, Sawai Man Singh Hospital, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 685/2024**

Aruna Verma D/o Kalu Ram, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village And Post Banwali, Ward No.9 Tehsil Sadulshahar, District Sriganganagar, Rajasthan.





----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Director, Directorate Of Elementary Education, Bikaner, (Raj.).
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, State Institute Of Agriculture Management Premises, Sitabari, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302018, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. The Medical Superintendent, Sawai Man Singh Hospital, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 690/2024**

Komal D/o Thavar Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village And Post Rewali, Tehsil Behror, District Kotputli, Behror, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Director, Directorate Of Elementary Education, Bikaner, (Raj.).
3. The Medical Superintendent, Sawai Man Singh Hospital, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Secretary, Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, State Institute Of Agriculture Management Premises, Sitabari, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302018, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 737/2024**

Antima Yadav D/o Prahalad Lal Ahir, Aged About 25 Years, R/o





Adarsh Nagar, Krishna Colony, District Tonk, Rajasthan 304001.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Director, Directorate Of Elementary Education, Bikaner (Raj.)
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, State Institute Of Agriculture Management Premises, Sitabari, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302018, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. The Medical Superintendent, Sawai Man Singh Hospital, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1544/2024**

Amiruddin S/o Shri Fariduddin, Aged About 29 Years, R/o 373, New Bus Stand Road, Gali Hasani, Ward No. 33 Chhawani, Tonk (Rajasthan)-304001.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Medical Superintendent, J.l.n. Hospital, Ajmer.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. The Director, Directorate Of Elementary Education, Bikaner, (Raj.).
4. The Secretary, Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, State Institute Of Agriculture Management Premises, Sitabari, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302018, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, District Nagaur.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4896/2025**

Harish Chander S/o Sohan Lal, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Vpo





Panniwali Jattan, Tehsil Sadulsahar, District Sriganganagar,  
Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Joint Director (School Education), Ajmer Division,  
Ajmer.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Education  
Secretary, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The Principal, Govt. Sr. Secondary School, Manka Tibbi,  
Hanumangarh.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14850/2025**

Subhash S/o Pancham Singh, Aged About 42 Years, R/o-Nidhera  
Kalan, Dholpur, (Raj.)-328023

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Panchyat Samiti, Rajakheda, Through Block Development  
Officer, Rajakheda, District Dholpur (Raj.)
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary,  
Secretariat Jaipur (Raj.)
3. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department  
Of Personnel, Secretariat Jaipur (Raj.)
4. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary,  
Department Of Social Justice And Empowerment,  
Secretariat Jaipur (Raj.)
5. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary,  
Department Of (Elementary Education) And Secretary  
Cum Commissioner, Secretariat Jaipur (Raj.)
6. Director Of Primary Education, Bikaner (Raj.)
7. Principal, Govt, Senior Secondary School, Basaiya Lalu,  
Dholpur (Raj.)

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15043/2025**

Mohd Naffes S/o Shri Akhtar Hussain, Aged About 33 Years,  
Resident Of Village Sablana, Tehsil Kama, District Deeg





Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Additional Superintendent Of Police, Special Operation Group (Sog), Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Cheif Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Bharatpur, Rajasthan.
4. Vikas Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Kama, District Deeg, Rajasthan.
5. Additional Director General Of Police, Ats And Sog, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15151/2025**

Nikita Mangal D/o Munna Mangal, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Champeshwar Colony, Ward No. 19, Chaksu, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Its Secretary, Agriculture Management Institute Building, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Joint Secretary (Admn.)-Ii, Public Health Engineering Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Chief Engineer (Admin), Public Health Engineering Department, Jal Bhawan-2, Civil Line, Jaipur.
4. The Executive Engineer, Public Health Engineering Department, Nagar Division,, Third (North), Jaipur.
5. The Superintendent Engineer, Public Health Engineering Department, Nagar Circle (North), Panipech, Jaipur.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15385/2025**

1. Pitamber Mishra S/o Nandkishor Mishra, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Ward No. 19, Outside Bissau Gate Ramgarh Shekhawati, District Sikar, State Rajasthan-331024.





2. Satish Kumar Saini S/o Moti Lal Saini, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Dhani-Bagawali, Vp Ninder Ward No. 1, Near Suncity, Grand Sikar Road, Jaipur, District Jaipur, State Rajasthan-302013.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Secretary, Rajya Krishi Prabandh Sansthan Parisar, Durgapura, Jaipur 302018
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary , Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj) 302005
3. Director, Secondary Education, Education Department, Lalgargh Palace Near Unnamed Road, Samta Nagar, Bikaner, 334001.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15387/2025**

1. Pankaj Kumar Jonwal S/o Dilip Kumar Jonwal, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Ward No. 18, Krishan Nagar, Shyalawas Khurd Bandikui, District Dausa, Rajasthan-303313.
2. Mahendar Yogi S/o Ramesh Chand Yogi, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Vpo Kemla, Nadauti, District Karauli, Rajasthan-322220.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)302005.
2. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Secretary, Rajya Krishi Prabandh Sansthan Parisar, Durgapura, Jaipur-302018
3. Director, Secondary Education, Education Department, Lalgargh Palace Near Unnamed Road, Samta Nagar, Bikaner, 334001.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15392/2025**

1. Manoj Kumar Meena S/o Shriram Meena, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Vpo-Toda Nagar Th. Laxmangarh District Alwar, Rajasthan-301413





2. Suraj Panchal S/o Kailash Chand Panchal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Vpo- Chhareda Th. Nangal Rajawatan District Dausa, Rajasthan-303505.
3. Manoj Kumar S/o Banwari Lal, Aged About 37 Years, R/o 43, Jyoti Nagar 200 Ft. Road District Alwar, Rajasthan 301001.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj). 302005.
2. Director, Elementary Education, Education Department, Lalgarh Palace Near Unnamed Road, Samta Nagar, Bikaner, 334001
3. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Secretary, Rajya Krishi Prabandh Parisar, Durgapura, Jaipur-302018.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15804/2025**

Ajay Pratap Yadav S/o Shankar Lal Yadav, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Ward No. 9, Nadi Wali Dhani, Devpura, Loharwara, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Jaisalmer.
2. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaisalmer.
3. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
5. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15832/2025**

Akhilesh Kumar Bind S/o Bhuwal Bind, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Bahadurpur, Post Mohammadabad, Ghazipur, Uttar Pradesh.

-----Petitioner





Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Joint Secretary (Admn.)-Ii, Public Health Engineering Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Its Secretary, Agriculture Management Institute Building, Durgapura Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Chief Engineer (Admin), Public Health Engineering Department, Jal Bhawan-2, Civil Line, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15947/2025**

Dharma Ram Meghwal S/o Hira Ram Meghwal, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Moriyana, Post Mori Kallan, Tehsil Riyan Bari, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
2. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Tonk.
3. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
5. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Tonk.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15950/2025**

Tulsi Kumari D/o Premaram, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Vpo Janewa East, Tehsil Deh, Jayal, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education , Nagaur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.





3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Nagaur.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15952/2025**

Ramresh Meena S/o Babu Lal Meena, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Daulatpura, Post Ghar, Tehsil Dooni, District Tonk, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Tonk.
2. The Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Tonk, District Tonk.
3. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
5. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
6. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Tonk.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15954/2025**

Ramesh S/o Surjan Ram, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Beniwalo Ki Dhani, Kheda Bagoriya, Dechi, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Secretary, Departemtn Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Joint Secretary And Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.





4. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Karauli.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15956/2025**

Manish Kumar Meena S/o Lahari Ram Meena, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Pali, Post Baharko Kalan, Tehsil Reni, District Alwar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Chief Engineer (Admin), Public Health Engineering Department, Jal Bhawan-2, Civil Line, Jaipur.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Joint Secretary (Admn.)-Ii, Public Health Engineering Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Its Secretary, Agriculture Management Institute Building, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15958/2025**

Dalip S/o Poonam Chand, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Shiv Colony, Ward No. 1, Churu, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Joint Director (Administration), Department Of Economics And Statistics, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Planning And Economics And Statistics, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
4. The Director And Joint Secretary, Directorate Of Economics And Statistics, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
5. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15959/2025**

Hantu Gurjar D/o Laxman Ram Gurjar, Aged About 29 Years, R/o





Village Rajpura Vas, Chandwaji, Tehsil Amer, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Joint Director (School Education), Ajmer Division, Ajmer.
4. The Additional Director General Of Police Ats And Sog, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
5. The Additional Superintendent Of Police, Special Operations Group, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15967/2025**

Prem Prakash Sharma S/o Madan Lal Sharma, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Heerapura, Post Dehlala, Tehsil Kotkhawada, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Tonk.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Director Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15971/2025**

Aslam Khan Pathan S/o Shri Aamad Khan Pathan, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Sawa, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan-312613

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Directorate Of Ayurved, Through Its Additional Director





Ashok Marg Mali Mohalla, Ajmer, Rajasthan-305001.

2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary Department Of Ayush (Ayurved, Homoeopathy And Unani) Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan Rajasthan Ayurved University, Jodhpur, Through Its Registrar, Nagour Road, Karwar, Jodhpur-342037

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16024/2025**

Mohan Lal Gurjar S/o Shivpal Gurjar, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mamtori Kalan, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Jaisalmer.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16061/2025**

Saurabh Sharma S/o Krishan Gopal Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Panchwati Nagar, Kunhadi, Kota, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Joint Secretary And Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.





4. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Kota.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16142/2025**

Ankur Tyagi S/o Bhoop Singh Tyagi, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Moosalpur, Dholpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Joint Secretary And Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Dholpur.
4. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16145/2025**

Dalip Singh S/o Mahavir Singh, Aged About 47 Years, R/o In Front Of Roadways Depot, Devipura, Sikar, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Sikar.
6. The Chief Block Education Officer, Samagra Shiksha, Dhod, Sikar.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16148/2025**

Pankaj Verma S/o Sanwar Mal, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Khetan





Sadan, Baicope Mall Ke Piche, Ranisati Road, Sikar, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of School Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Its Secretary, Agriculture Management Institute Building, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16202/2025**

Hajari Mal S/o Laxmi Narayan, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Vpo Dayalpura, Didwana, District Didwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Sikar.
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The Joint Director, School Education, Churu Division, Churu
5. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
6. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16242/2025**

Damodar Singh Meena S/o Brij Mohan Meena, Aged About 30 Years, R.o Village Tusari, Post Teekari, Tehsil Kathumar, District Alwar, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary,





School Education Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan,  
Government Secretariat, Jaipur

3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16243/2025**

1. Ankit Singh S/o Jaypal Singh, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Vpo Ibrahimpur, Tehsil Roopwas, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan.
2. Roopa Ram S/o Nortta Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Vpo Rabdiyad, Didwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
3. Kapil Sharma S/o Hari Narayan Sharma, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Vpo Dhamotar, District Pratapgarh, Rajasthan.
4. Pawan Rajawat S/o Suresh Chand, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Vpo Ibrahimpur, Tehsil Roopwas, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The Joint Director, School Education, School Education, Jodhpur Division, Jodhpur.
6. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Pratapgarh.
7. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Dholpur.
8. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Dholpur.
9. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Barmer.
10. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.





----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16247/2025**

1. Mohit Kumar S/o Pramod Kumar, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Ludhpura, Post Tasimo, Tehsil Saipau, District Dholpur, Rajasthan.
2. Kusama D/o Hori Lal, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Shahpur, Basai Nawab, Dholpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Dholpur.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Dholpur.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16380/2025**


Dr. Vishnu Gopal Gupta S/o Chiraniji Lal Gupta, Aged About 73 Years, R/o 11-12, Natraj Nagar, Imliwala Phatak, Jaipur-302015 (Rajasthan)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Department Of Medical Education, Through The Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302001 (Rajasthan)
2. Union Of India, Ministry Of Social Justice And Empowerment Through The Secretary, 604, A-Wing, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110001.
3. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302001 (Rajasthan)
4. Department Of Home, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302001 (Rajasthan)





5. Directorate Of College Education, Through The Commissioner, Shiksha Sankul, Jln Marg, Jaipur-302015 (Rajasthan)
6. The Additional Director General Of Police, (Special Operations Group), Janta Colony, Opposite To Central Jail, Jaipur-302004 (Rajasthan)
7. Directorate Of Specially Abled Persons, Through The Commissioner, Government Of Rajasthan, G3-1A, Raj Mahal Residency Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Lines Phatak, Jaipur-302005 (Rajasthan).
8. Department Of Medical Education, Through Commissioner, Janta Colony, Govind Marg, Opposite To Pagal Khana, Jaipur-302004.
9. Chanchal Verma, Additional Director, Department Of Medical Education, Janta Colony, Govind Marg, Opposite To Pagal Khana, Jaipur-302004.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16531/2025**

Nathu Lal Saini S/o Gordhan Lal Saini, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Vpo Farrashpura, Tehsil Baharwanda, District Dausa, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan Jaipur.
4. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan Bikaner
5. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16545/2025**

Sarjeet Singh S/o Harnek Singh, Aged About 35 Years, Village Chak Sohne Wala (9505), Post Budharwali, Tehsil Sadulshahar, District Sriganganagar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner





Versus

1. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Principal, Govt. Sr. Secondary School, 48 Gg, Karanpur, Sriganganagar.
3. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16546/2025**

Kishor Singh S/o Bhanwar Lal, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Bajroliya Ki Dhani, Sabalpur, Vpo Sablpur, Tehsil Makrana, District Didwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan .

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Joint Secretary And Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16659/2025**

Prathavee Raj Singh Gurjar S/o Hari Singh Gurjar, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village Kaleda, Post Sikandara, Tehsil Sikrai, District Dausa, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Dausa.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.





3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Dausa.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16688/2025**

Hari Singh S/o Kheem Singh, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Vpo Manasar, Post Phalsund, Tehsil Phalsund, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Nagaur.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Nagaur.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16689/2025**

Malkeet Singh Thind S/o Pritam Singh, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Ward No. 11, Vpo Kaliyan, Tehsil And District Sriganganagar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Sriganganagar.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary





Education, Sriganganagar

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16696/2025**

Praveen Sharma S/o Radha Krishan Sharma, Aged About 31 Years, R/o 197/11, Kundan Nagar, Ajmer, Rajasthan- 305001.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Information Technology And Communication Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Its Secretary, Agriculture Management Institute Building, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16706/2025**

Bhairoo Singh S/o Roop Singh, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Vpo Nahroli, Tehsil Bayana, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jalore.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Jalore.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17019/2025**

1. Ramkunwar S/o Bishan Singh, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Ghogor, Post Pasopa, Tehsil Kaman, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan.
2. Rajendra Singh S/o Vishram Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Vpo Kherla Bujurg, Tehsil Mahwa, District Dausa, Rajasthan.





3. Anjul Khan S/o Sabuddeen Khan, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Nagla Dhara Singh, Post Tasai, District Alwar, Rajasthan.
4. Jeetendra Sharma S/o Mukesh Sharma, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Budhwari Kalan, Tehsil Nadbai, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan.
5. Mahendra Kumar S/o Sumer Singh, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Vpo Khundroth, Tehsil Neemrana, District Alwar, Rajasthan.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The Joint Director, School Education, School Education, Bikaner Division, Bikaner.
6. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Alwar.
7. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Alwar.
8. District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Bharatpur.
8. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Bharatpur.
9. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Karauli.
10. District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Karauli.

----Respondents

***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17216/2025***

Pawan S/o Hakim Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Bhaisena, Kapura, Dholpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Bikaner.





2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The District Education Officer, (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Bikaner.

----Respondents

***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17293/2025***

Likhmaram Balotiya S/o Basti Ram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Near Bus Stand, Post Bagri Nagar, Tehsil Sojat, District Pali, Rajasthan

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education Pali.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Pali.

----Respondents

***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17294/2025***

Deendayal Sharma S/o Naval Kishor Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Deraki Dhani, Torda, Tehsil Bahrwanda, Dausa, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of





Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Dausa.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17303/2025**

Priyanka D/o Lal Chand W/o Sunil Kumar, Aged About 31 Years,  
R/o Village - Ambedkar Nagar, Tehsil - Malsisar, District  
Jhunjhunu (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary,  
Department Of Department Of Ayurved And Indian  
Medicine, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Director, Directorate, Department Of Ayurved And Indian  
Medicine, Government Of Rajasthan, Ajmer (Raj.)

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17611/2025**

Inderjeet Menaria S/o Panna Lal Menaria, Aged About 34 Years,  
R/o Vpo Mahuda, 105, Tehsil Badi Sadri, District Chittorgarh,  
Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary,  
School Education Department, Government Secretariat,  
Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of  
Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary  
Education, Chittorgarh.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Chittorgarh.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17700/2025**

Sohan Lal S/o Jagmal, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Vpo Jasana,  
Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner



Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Hanumangarh.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Hanumangarh.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17749/2025**

Suman D/o Asu Ram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Lachari, Post Hadetar, District Sanchore, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, (Raj.)
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Barmer.

-----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17750/2025**

Phool Chand Yadav S/o Shri Radhey Shyam Yadav, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Nathi Ka Bas, Baseri Khurd, Kishangarh Rainwal, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Pollution Control Board, Through Its Member Secretary, Hq.-4, Industrial Area, Jhalana Doongri, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.





3. Principal Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Chairman, Rajasthan State Pollution Control Board, T, Hq.-4, Industrial Area, Jhalana Doongri, Jaipur (Raj.)

-----Respondents

***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17876/2025***

Bhagwati Lal S/o Sohan Lal Menariya, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Vpo Mahuda, Tehsil Bari Sadri, District Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The Principal, Govt. Sr. Secondary School, Nadakheda, Block Dungla, District Chitorgarh.

-----Respondents

***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17918/2025***

Iswardei D/o Hakim Singh, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Nagariya, Bhura Ka Pura, Nidhaira Kalan, Post Nidhara, District Dholpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Dholpur.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Dholpur.

-----Respondents





**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 18779/2025**

Kaptan Singh S/o Dhani Ram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Tehra, Post Kherla, Tehsil Mahwa, District Dausa, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Elementary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Ajmer.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Ajmer.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19013/2025**

Ravindra Kumar Sharma S/o Pancham Singh Sharma, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Nidhaira Kalan, Saipau, District Dholpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Dholpur.
4. The Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Saipau, District Dholpur.

----Respondents

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19015/2025**

Sundar Singh Son Of Satyaveer Singh, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Kirat Singhprua, Tehsil Behror, District Alwar (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus





1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Sanskrit Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Commissioner, Sanskrit Education, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Divisional Sanskrit Education Officer, Bharatpur Division, Bharatpur (Raj.)
4. Principal, Government Varishth Upadhyay Sanskrit School, Neemla, Panchayat Samiti Rajgarh, District Alwar.
5. Additional Director General Of Police, A.t.s. And S.o.g. Rajasthan, Jaipur.

----Respondents

***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19024/2025***

Sanjeev Kumar Son Of Shri Roop Singh, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Nagla Algarji Ka Nagla, Village Gurdhandi, Tehsil Bayana, District Bharatpur (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Sanskrit Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Commissioner, Sanskrit Education, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Divisional Sanskrit Education Officer, Bharatpur Division, Bharatpur (Raj.)
4. Principal, Government Senior Upadhyay Sanskrit School, Sewar, Bharatpur.
5. Additional Director General Of Police, A.t.s. And S.o.g. Rajasthan, Jaipur.

----Respondents

***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19364/2025***

Mehandra Pal Singh S/o Girdhari Singh, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Dhoti, Post Bhim, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Higher Education, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of





Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

3. The Commissioner, College Education, Shiksha Shankul,  
JIn Marg, Jaipur.

-----Respondents



- For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Ram Pratap Saini with  
Mr. Aamir Khan  
Mr. Akshit Gupta with  
Ms. Pragya Seth  
Mr. Harendra Neel  
Mr. Tanuj Gupta  
Dr. Anil Sharma  
Mr. Tanveer Ahamad  
Mr. Bhupendra Jain  
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma  
Mr. Anand Sharma  
Mr. Ajatshatru Mina with Mr.  
Himanshu Kala  
Mr. Sudhir Yadav  
Mr. Ashwinee Kumar Jaiman with Mr.  
Keshav Parashar, Moin Khan and Mr.  
Ashish Kabra  
Mr. Balveer Singh Beniwal
- For Respondent(s) : Ms. Mahi Yadav, AAG with Mr. Kuldeep  
Singh Rathore & Ms. Saba Naaz  
Mr. Gopal Krishna Sharma, AGC with  
Mr. Saumil Sharma  
Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Ms. Anjali  
Ranga, Mr. Mahendra Pratap Singh,  
Mr. Anirudh Sharma, Ms. Anshul  
Sharma, Ms. Arya Garima for Mr.  
Kapil Prakash Mathur, AAG  
Mr. Sandeep Maheshwari  
Ms. Pooja Sharma, AAAG, Mr. Vishal  
Kumar, Mr. Dhruv for Mr. Manoj  
Sharma, AAG  
Mr. Archit Bohra, AGC with Mr.  
Prakhar Jain  
Mr. Narendra Singh Choudhary  
Mr. Nikhil Pal Singh  
Mr. S.K. Panwar  
Mr. Abhijeet Panchariya  
Ms. Bhavya Kala for Mr. Devansh  
Sharma, Dy.G.C.  
Mr. Neeraj Batra, GC with Ms. Gunjan  
Chawla and Ms. Sneha Kaushal



Mr. Ajay Poonia  
Mr. Prem Chand Dewanda  
Ms. Karishma Soni for Mr. Vinod  
Kumar Gupta, AGC  
Mr. Surendra Singh Naruka, AAG with  
Mr. Jitendra Kumar Takar  
Mr. Basant Singh Chhaba, AAG with  
Mr. Rahul Gupta & Mr. Satyam  
Bhardwaj  
Mr. Parth Sharma for Mr. Bhunesh  
Sharma, AAG  
Mr. Avanish Kumar Sharma, Dy.G.C



---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR JAIN**

**Order**

**27/01/2026**

**REPORTABLE**

1. As all these matters raises a common question of law, they are being decided by a common order. The controversy involved in these petitions pertains to the assessment and reassessment of benchmark disabilities of persons with disabilities, and their subsequent re-evaluation in light of the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as the "RPwD Act, 2016").

**2. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15370/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level I in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Order dated



10.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability of petitioner, may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned order dated 10.09.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6868/2023 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

In these circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept this writ petition and

i) the impugned order dated 31.03.2023 cancelling the selection of humble petitioner in Low Vision category on the post of Livestock Assistant in pursuance to advertisement dated 11.03.2022 may kindly be declared illegal and arbitrary and therefore, same may kindly be quashed and set aside.

ii) by issuing the writ of mandamus, order or direction in the nature thereof respondents may kindly be directed to:  
a) consider the candidature of humble petitioner in the Low Vision category for selection on the post of Livestock Assistant in pursuance to advertisement dated 11.03.2022;  
b) give appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Livestock Assistant in Low Vision category with all consequential benefits.

**Or in the alternative**

(a) Send the case of humble petitioner to AIIMS, Jodhpur for re-medical examination by Disability Board constituting of Ophthalmic experts to find if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under LV category in pursuance to advertisement dated 11.03.2022; and

(b) accord appointment to humble petitioner with all consequential benefits on the post of Livestock Assistant in Animal Husbandry Department pursuant to advertisement dated 11.03.2022, if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under LV category in pursuance to advertisement dated 11.03.2022.

iii) Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case may kindly also be passed in favour of the Petitioner.



**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13602/2023 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore humbly prayed that Your Lordship may graciously be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition and by an appropriate writ, order or direction:-

1. The impugned order dated 31.03.2023 (Annexure-10) qua the humble petitioner may kindly be quashed and set aside and respondents may be directed to appoint the humble petitioner on the post of Livestock Assistant in pursuant to the advertisement dated 11.03.2022 as also amended advertisement dated 27.05.2022 with all consequential benefits w.e.f. the date other person are given appointment in pursuant to the advertisement keeping in consideration his placement in the select list vide Office Order dated 28.09.2022, in the interest of justice.

2. Any other appropriate order, which may be found just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, be passed in favor of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 462/2024 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

In these circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept this writ petition and

i) the impugned actions of respondent authorities of not treating the candidature under Physical Disabled category and not granting appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Hindi) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022 and impugned medical opinion that 05.10.2023 by the Medical Board, Government Hospital, District Kota may kindly be declared illegal and arbitrary and therefore, same may kindly be quashed and set aside.

ii) by issuing the writ of mandamus, order or direction in the nature thereof respondents may kindly be directed to:

a) consider the candidature of humble petitioner in the Low Vision category for selection on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Hindi) in pursuance advertisement dated 16.12.2022; to

b) give appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Hindi) in Low Vision category with all consequential benefits.

Or in the alternative

(a) Send the case of humble petitioner to AIIMS, Jodhpur for re-medical examination by Disability





Board constituting of Ophthalmic experts to find if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under LV category for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Hindi) in advertisement dated pursuance to 16.12.2022; and (b) accord appointment to humble petitioner with all consequential benefits on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Hindi) pursuant to advertisement dated 16.12.2022, if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under LV category in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022.

iii) Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case may kindly also be passed in favour of the Petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 681/2024 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

In these circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept this writ petition and

i) the impugned actions of respondent authorities of not treating the candidature under Physical Disabled category and not granting appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-I in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022 may kindly be declared illegal and arbitrary and therefore, same may kindly be quashed and set aside.

ii) by issuing the writ of mandamus, order or direction in the nature thereof respondents may kindly be directed to:  
a) consider the candidature of humble petitioner in Multiple Disability category for selection on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-1 in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022;  
b) give appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-1 in Locomotor Disability category with all consequential benefits.

Or in the alternative

(a) Send the case of humble petitioner to AIIMS, Jodhpur for re-medical examination by Disability Board constituting of experts to find if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under Multiple category for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-1 in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022; and

(b) accord appointment to humble petitioner with all consequential benefits on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-I pursuant to advertisement dated 16.12.2022, if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered



under Multiple category in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022.

iii) Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case may kindly also be passed in favour of the Petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 683/2024 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

In these circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept this writ petition

1) the impugned actions of respondent authorities of not treating the candidature under Physical Disabled category and not granting appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022 may kindly be quashed and set aside.

ii) by issuing the writ of mandamus, order or direction in the nature thereof respondents may kindly be directed to:

- a) consider the candidature of humble petitioner in Locomotor Disability category for selection on the post of Teacher Grade III Level-II (Science Maths) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022;
- b) give appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in Locomotor Disability category with all consequential benefits.

**Or in the alternative**

(a) Send the case of humble petitioner to AIIMS, Jodhpur for re-medical examination by Disability Board constituting of experts to find if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under Locomotor Disability category for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022; and

(b) accord appointment to humble petitioner with all consequential benefits on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) pursuant to advertisement dated 16.12.2022, if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under Locomotor Disability category in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022.

iii) Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case may kindly also be passed in favour of the Petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 685/2024 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**





In these circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept this writ petition and

i) the impugned actions of respondent authorities of not treating the candidature under Physical Disabled category and not granting appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-I in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022 may kindly be declared illegal and arbitrary and therefore, same may kindly be quashed and set aside.

ii) by issuing the writ of mandamus, order or direction in the nature thereof respondents may kindly be directed to:  
a) consider the candidature of humble petitioner in the Locomotor Disability category for selection on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-I in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022;

b) give appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-I in Locomotor Disability category with all consequential benefits.

Or in the alternative

(a) Send the case of humble petitioner to AIIMS, Jodhpur for re-medical examination by Disability Board constituting of experts to find if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under LD category for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-i in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022; and

(b) accord appointment to humble petitioner with all consequential benefits on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-I pursuant to advertisement dated 16.12.2022, if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under LD category in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022.

iii) Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case may kindly also be passed in favour of the Petitioner.

### **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 690/2024 has been preferred**

#### **with the following prayer:-**

In these circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept this writ petition and  
i) the impugned actions of respondent authorities of not treating the candidature under Physical Disabled category and not granting appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022 may kindly be quashed and set aside.





ii) by issuing the writ of mandamus, order or direction in the nature thereof respondents may kindly be directed to:  
 a) consider the candidature of humble petitioner in Hearing Impairment category for selection on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022;  
 b) give appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in Hearing Impairment category with all consequential benefits.

**Or in the alternative**

(a) Send the case of humble petitioner to AIIMS, Jodhpur for re-medical examination by Disability Board constituting of experts to find if the candidature of humble petitioner be considered under Hearing Impairments category for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022; and can  
 (b) accord appointment to humble petitioner with all consequential benefits on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) pursuant to advertisement dated 16.12.2022, if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under Hearing Impairment category in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022.

iii) Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case may kindly also be passed in favour of the Petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 737/2024 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

In these circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept this writ petition and

i) the impugned actions of respondent authorities of not treating the candidature under Physical Disabled category and not granting appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022 may kindly be quashed and set aside.

ii) by issuing the writ of mandamus, order or direction in the nature thereof respondents may kindly be directed to:  
 a) consider the candidature of humble petitioner in Visual Impairment category for selection on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022;





b) give appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in Visual Impairment category with all consequential benefits.

**Or in the alternative**

(a) Send the case of humble petitioner to AIIMS, Jodhpur for re-medical examination by Disability Board constituting of experts to find if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under Visual Impairment category for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022;

(b) accord appointment to humble petitioner with all consequential benefits on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Science Maths) pursuant to advertisement dated 16.12.2022, if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under Visual Impairment category in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022.

iii) Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case may kindly also be passed in favour of the Petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1544/2024 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

In these circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept this writ petition and

i) the impugned actions of respondent authorities of not treating the candidature under Physical Disabled category and not granting appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Urdu) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022 and impugned medical opinion that 23.10.2023 by the Medical Board, J.L.N. Hospital, District Ajmer may kindly be declared illegal and arbitrary and therefore, same may kindly be quashed and set aside.

ii) by issuing the writ of mandamus, order or direction in the nature thereof respondents may kindly be directed to:  
a) consider the candidature of humble petitioner in the Low Vision category for selection on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Urdu) in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022;

b) give appointment to humble petitioner on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Urdu) in Low Vision category with all consequential benefits.





**Or in the alternative**

(a) Send the case of humble petitioner to AIIMS, Jodhpur for re-medical examination by Disability Board constituting of Ophtholess experts to find if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under LV category for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Urdu) in pursuance advertisement dated 16.12.2022; and

(b) accord appointment to humble petitioner with all consequential benefits on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-II (Urdu) pursuant to advertisement dated 16.12.2022, if the candidature of humble petitioner can be considered under LV category in pursuance to advertisement dated 16.12.2022.

(c) Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case may kindly also be passed in favour of the Petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.4896/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

- 1 By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue service duties on the post of Lecturer (Geography) in compliance of appointment order dated 18.03.2021 as well as joining Order dated 19.03.2021.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the impugned order dated 24.03.2025 may kindly be quashed and set aside and further respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in pursuance of impugned order dated 24.03.2025.
3. Issue an appropriate writ order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents may kindly be directed not to take any coercive action against the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.14850/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may very graciously be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition with the following relief :-





- (i) Direct the respondents to amend the contents of the alleged circular dated 28.08.2025 (Annexure-5). The proposed enquiry by the respondents may be conducted only with respect to the candidates selected after the issuance of this circular and not the enquiry of those selected prior to the issuance of this circular.
- (ii) The alleged circular dated 28.08.2025 may at the best have prospective effect as per law.
- (iii) Only the definition mentioned in the notification dated 01.01.1996 which was in force at the time of appointment of the petitioner be considered to be the standard of dated enquiry. While the subsequent notification 28.12.2016 be considered to be effective only to the appointments may after this 28th December 2016 notification came into force.
- (iv) Any other order or direction, which this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper, may also kindly be passed in the facts and circumstance of the case with costs.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15043/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore humbly prayed that Your Lordship may graciously be pleased to accept and allow this Writ Petition and by an appropriate writ, order or direction:-

1. The Respondents may be directed not to take any adverse action against the humble Petitioner.
2. If the Respondents take any adverse action against the humble Petitioner without giving him an opportunity of being heard, then such an adverse action of the Respondents shall be declared arbitrary and illegal.
3. Any other appropriate order, which may be found just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15151/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the



petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Junior Engineer in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the impugned Show cause Notice dated 15.09.2025 and 16.09.2025 may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to constitute the Medical Board for the purpose of examination of disability of the petitioner through Medical Board of AIIMS, Jodhpur.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

### **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15385/2025 has been preferred**

#### **with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, prayed that your Lordships may very graciously be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition and following direction may please be issued: -

- i. That the candidature of the petitioners be considered as per the certificate of disability issued by Competent Authority under rule 18 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules, 2017.
- ii. The re-medical examination of the petitioners with declared illegal and void.
- iii. The petitioners be appointed on the post of Clerk Grade - II and Junior Assistant in physically handicapped category (LV) as per there merits in this category.
- iv. If at all the re medical is required, then it should be as per the guidelines of WHO and Central Government and during the time of the re-medical proper procedure needs to be followed. If at all the petitioners are being reject under PH category, then proper reasons for rejection should be communicated to them so that they can avail their right to appeal against the rejection order, as per the Rules.
- v. Issue any other writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem just, fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case, in the interest of justice.



**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15387/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, prayed that your Lordships may very graciously be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition and following direction may please be issued: -

i. That the candidature of the petitioners be considered as per the certificate of disability issued by Competent Authority under rule 18 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules, 2017.

ii. The re-medical examination of the petitioners with declared illegal and void.

iii. The petitioners be appointed on the post of Clerk Grade - II and Junior Assistant in physically handicapped category as per there merits in this category.

iv. If at all the re medical is required, then it should be as per the guidelines of WHO and Central Government and during the time of the re-medical proper procedure needs to be followed. If at all the petitioners are being reject under PII category, then proper reasons for rejection should be communicated to them so that they can avail their right to appeal against the rejection order, as per the Rules.

v. Issue any other writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem just, fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case, in the interest of justice.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15392/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, prayed that your Lordships may very graciously be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition and following direction may please be issued: -

i. That the candidature of the petitioners be considered as per the certificate of disability issued by Competent Authority under rule 18 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules, 2017.

ii. The re-medical examination of the petitioners with declared illegal and void.

iii. The petitioners be appointed on the post of Clerk Grade - 1 and Junior Assistant in physically handicapped category as per there merits in this category.

iv. If at all the re medical is required, then it should be as per the guidelines of WHO and Central Government and during the time of the re-medical proper procedure needs



to be followed. If at all the petitioners are being reject under PH category, then proper reasons for rejection should be communicated to them so that they can avail their right to appeal against the rejection order, as per the Rules.

v. Issue any other writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem just, fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case, in the interest of justice.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15804/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 10.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 10.09.2025.
4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15832/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to join duties on the post of Junior Engineer in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Order dated





25.09.2025 may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability again and again.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15947/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 2 Social Science in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 10.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 10.09.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15950/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post



of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 10.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 10.09.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15952/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level I in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 10.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 10.09.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15954/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the



petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Gram Vikas Adhikari in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 04.09.2025, 24.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 04.09.2025, 24.09.2025

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15956/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to join duties on the post of Junior Engineer in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Order dated 25.09.2025 may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability again and again.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15958/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the





petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Assistant Statistical Officer in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 06.10.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 06.10.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15959/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1 By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the impugned order dated 24.09.2025 may kindly be quashed and set aside.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Sr. Teacher (Sanskrit) in compliance of appointment order after reinstating her in service.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned action of the respondents by which they are going again to verification of disability of petitioner, may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside.

4. By an appropriate writ order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Petitioner may be allowed to appear before the AIMS Jodhpur so her disability may be estimated and further consider the Disability Certificates by which the petitioner is having 45% disability.

5. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and





circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15967/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 2 English in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 10.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 10.09.2025.
4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15971/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

In the facts and circumstances stated hereinabove, it is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to:-

- 31.1. Issue an appropriate writ, order, or direction, more particularly in the nature of Certiorarified Mandamus, quashing and setting aside the impugned order dated 08.09.2025, whereby the Respondent has illegally, arbitrarily, and without authority of law, deleted the name of the Petitioner from the final merit list on the basis of an erroneous and mala fide medical report (Annexure no. P/9); and/or
- 31.2. Direct the Respondent Department to conduct a fresh and independent re-medical examination of the Petitioner, through a duly constituted Medical Board at AIIMS, Jodhpur, or any other equivalent institution of repute, in accordance with law and with due notice to the Petitioner, and/or
- 31.3. Direct the Respondents to consider and accept the Petitioner's valid Disability Certificate dated 12.12.2018,



issued by the Chief Medical and Health Officer, Chittorgarh, certifying 40% permanent locomotor disability due to Post-Polio Residual Paralysis, as conclusive and binding unless duly cancelled or superseded by competent authority, and/or

31.4. Direct the Respondents to restore the Petitioner's name in the final merit list of the recruitment process in accordance with his position as per merit and reservation category under Section 34 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016; and/or

31.5. Consequently, direct the Respondent Department to issue the Petitioner's appointment order to the post in question, in accordance with his merit and eligibility, with all consequential benefits including seniority, pay fixation, and arrears; and/or

31.6. Issue such further or other writ, order, or direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice, equity, and fair play; and/or

31.7. Award costs of this Petition in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondents, as may be deemed just and proper by this Hon'ble Court.

### **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16024/2025 has been preferred**

#### **with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 10.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 10.09.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.





**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16061/2025 has been preferred  
with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Gram Vikas Adhikari in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 12.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 12.09.2025.
4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16142/2025 has been preferred  
with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Gram Vikas Adhikari in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025





4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16145/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 2 in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 19.09.2025 and order dated 08.10.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 19.09.2025 and order dated 08.10.2025.
4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16148/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction, the respondents may kindly be directed to afford appointment to the petitioner on the post of Clerk Gr.II/Junior Assistant against the category of OBC Disabled PH with all consequential benefits as the petitioner secured more marks than the last cut off in his category; Issue an appropriate writ order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Petitioner may be allowed to appear before a Medical Board i.e. SMS Hospital Jaipur or AIMS Jodhpur so his disability may be estimated and further





consider the Disability Certificates by which the petitioner is having 53% disability and thereby he be given appointment on the post of Clerk Gr. II/Junior Assistant. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Email dated 10.09.2025 may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.



**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16202/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Sr. Teacher Gr. II-Sanskrit in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025, Order dated 10.09.2025 and order dated 07.10.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025, Order dated 10.09.2025 and order dated 07.10.2025.
4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16242/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is therefore, most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble court may very graciously



be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition and further be pleased to:  
i) Issue an appropriate writ order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Petitioner may be allowed to appear before a Medical Board i.e. SMS Hospital Jaipur or AIMS Jodhpur so his disability may be estimated and further consider the Disability Certificates by which the petitioner is having 45% disability and thereby he be given appointment on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level I with all consequential benefits.

(ii) By an appropriate writ, order or direction, the respondents may kindly be directed to afford appointment to the petitioner on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 against the category of ST Disabled PH with all consequential benefits as the petitioner secured more marks than the last cut off in his category;

(iii) Issue an appropriate writ order or direction in the nature thereof thereby directs the respondents to consider the Disability Certificates dated 09.02.2022 by which the petitioner is having 45% disability.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16243/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioners and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioners to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. II Level 1, Sr. Teacher, Librarian Gr. III in compliance of appointment order / Joining report.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioners.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioners to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.





4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioners.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16247/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the Petitioners and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioners to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order/Joining report.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioners.

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioners to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioners.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16380/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

In these circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept this writ petition and

- (I) Quash and set aside the letter vide dated 15.07.2025 issued by the Respondent No. 7;
- ii) Direct the Respondents to conduct the proper medical disability verification as the SMS Hospital having all facilities and equipment for assessment and investigation of disability of the candidates selected in RSB and RPSC examinations as per gazette notification guidelines at SMS Hospital under supervision of SOG Police;





(iii) To conduct the proper inquiry against the Officer Ms. Chanchal Verma, in Medical Education Department and to lodge an FIR against her;

(iv) Any other appropriate order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case may kindly also be passed in favour of the Petitioner.



**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16531/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the Petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16545/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Lecturer (Political Science) in compliance of appointment order.

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 06.10.2025 by which



the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16546/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the Petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of LDC in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 13.10.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16659/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and





after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Junior Assistant in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 10.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 10.09.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16688/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 10.09.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 10.09.2025.





4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16689/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 2 in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.
4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16696/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:**

It is therefore, most respectfully prayed that this Hon ble court may very graciously be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition and further be pleased to:

The respondent direct to give appointment to petitioner on the post of Informatics Assistant with all the consequent benefits. Because petitioner secured more marks and secured a position in merit.

ii) The action of the respondent declare illegal as they are not giving the appointment to the petitioner and further direct to consider the disability certificate dated 14.08.2018 i.e. Annexure-2.

iii) Direct the Respondent Authorities for conducting a reexamination of the Petitioner's



hearing test at AIMS, Jodhpur or any other institution.

iv) Pass any other appropriate order which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case in favour of the Petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.16706/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17019/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioners and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioners to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1, Level II, Sr. Teacher in compliance of appointment order/Joining report.





2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioners.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioners to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioners.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17216/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17293/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-





1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17294/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Librarian Gr. III in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17303/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**



It is, therefore humbly prayed that Your Lordship may graciously be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition of the petitioner and by appropriate writ, order or direction: -  
i) from Order dated 08.09.2025 passed by respondents, by which respondents rejected the candidature of the petitioner and her provisional merit list, may kindly be quashed and set aside, in the interest of justice.

ii) Order dated 30.07.2025, by which disability of petitioner was declared not eligible for Compounder / Nurse Junior grade post, on ground that petitioner was disable on upper limb (left side and left lower limb), may kindly be quashed and set aside, in the interest of justice

iii) Order dated 08.10.2020, by which respondents illegally consider only one leg disability for the appointment on the post of compounder / nurse junior grade, may kindly be quashed and set aside, in the interest of justice.

iv) Respondent may kindly be directed conduct medical examination of petitioner at All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), Jodhpur, by a competent Medical Board, in the interest of natural justice

v) The respondents may kindly be directed to consider the candidature of the petitioner on the post of Compounder / Nurse Junior Grade in pursuance of advertisement No. 01/2024 in SC PH OL Category and accordingly give her appointment with all consequential benefits.

vi) Any other appropriate order, which may be found just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17611/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 2 Science Math in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025





by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17700/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III in compliance of appointment order.

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17749/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-





1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Librarian Gr. III in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 11.10.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17750/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction, the circular dated 28.08.2025 and consequential orders dated 26.09.2025 may be quashed and set aside.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction, the Respondents may be directed to not to force/compel the Petitioner for re assessment/re-evaluation of their disabilities, pursuant to the circular dated 28.08.2025 and in furtherance of the order/letter dated 26.09.2025.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction Respondents may be directed to follow the mandate of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights And Full Participation) Act, 1995 and Rajasthan Persons With Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights And Full Participation) Rules of 2011 and Rights of Persons With Disabilities Act of 2016 and Rajasthan Rights of Persons With Disabilities Rules of 2018.



4. By an appropriate writ, order or direction if any prejudicial order is passed during the pendency of the writ petition, same may be taken on record and be quashed and set aside.

Any other appropriate order or direction which the Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17876/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Lecturer (Hindi Literature) in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.17918/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the



nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.18779/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Teacher Gr. III Level 1 in compliance of appointment order.

2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 20.11.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.

3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.

4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.19013/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same



may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition:-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of LDC in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 27.11.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and Order dated 27.11.2025.
4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.19015/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that your lordship may graciously be pleased to accept and allow this Writ petition and-

- i. Quash and set aside the impugned order dated 19.11.2025 passed by Respondent No. 2 (Commissioner, Sanskrit Education, Rajasthan, Jaipur) whereby the services of the petitioner have been illegally dismissed;
- ii. Direct the respondents to forthwith reinstate the petitioner in service the post of Senior Teacher (Sanskrit Education), Social Science under M.B.C.-L.V. category with all consequential benefits, including continuity of service, arrears of salary and other admissible emoluments;
- (iii.) Issue any other writ order or direction, which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper, may kindly be passed in favour petitioner. of the
- (iv). Cost of the writ petition be also awarded in favour of the petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.19024/2025 has been preferred**

**with the following prayer:-**



It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that your lordship may graciously be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition and-

- i. Quash and set aside the impugned order dated 19.11.2025 passed by Respondent No. 2 (Commissioner, Sanskrit Education, Rajasthan, Jaipur) whereby the services of the petitioner have been illegally dismissed;
- ii. Quash and set aside the consequential office order dated 21.11.2025 issued by Respondent No. 4 relieving the petitioner from service;
- iii. Direct the respondents forthwith reinstate the petitioner in service on the post of Senior Teacher (Sanskrit Education), Social Science under O.B.C.-H.I. category with all consequential benefits, including continuity of service, arrears of salary and other admissible emoluments;
- iv. The petitioner may be allowed to appear before A.I.M.S. Jodhpur so his disability may further consider disability certificate of petitioner be estimated
- (v) Issue any other writ order or direction, which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper, the may kindly be passed in favour of petitioner.

**S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.19364/2025 has been preferred with the following prayer:-**

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for the entire record relating to the case of the petitioner and after perusing the same may be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition :-

1. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondent be directed to allow the petitioner to continue serve duties on the post of Assistant Professor (Geography) in compliance of appointment order.
2. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025 and order dated 21.11.2025 by which the respondents again and again going to verification of disability may kindly be declared illegal and be quashed and set aside to the extent of petitioner.
3. By an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby, the respondents be directed to not to insist the petitioner to re-examine disability in the garb of Impugned Circular dated 28.08.2025.
4. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and





circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

3. The details of each of the case is summarized in following tabulation.


Case No.	Title	Disability details	Tenure
CW No.15370/2025	Ramprakash Kharlwa v. State of Rajasthan	Multiple disability to the extent of 43% (blindness in his left eye-30% and hearing impairment-20% in both ears	The petitioner appointed on post of Teacher Gr. III, Level-I on basis of reservation
CW No. 6868/2023	Chandar Mohan Gurjar v. State of Rajasthan	40% disability- permanent blindness in left eye	The petitioner was appointed as Livestock Assistant in LV category but selection was canceled
CW No.13602/2023	Mahendra Ram Jat v. State of Rajasthan	Low Vision Category	The petitioner was selected as Live Stock Assistant but later selection was canceled
CW No. 462/2024	Yogesh Malav v. State of Rajasthan	Low Vision in both eyes	The petitioner was selected on post of Teacher Gr. III, Level-II (Hindi) but selection was cancelled
CW No. 681/2024	Rajesh Kumar v. State of Rajasthan	Total disability 51%- hearing 20% and locomotor disability 40%	The petitioner was selected on post of Teacher Gr.-III, Level-I but appointment was not granted.
CW No. 683/2024	Sohan Singh Chouhan v. State of Rajasthan	Left eye- 42%	The petitioner was selected on post of Teacher Gr. II, (Science) but appointment was not granted.
CW No. 685/2024	Aruna Verma v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor disability- 60%	The petitioner was selected but appointment was not granted.
CW No. 690/2024	Komal v. State of Rajasthan	Visual impairment- 50%	The petitioner was selected but appointment was not granted.
CW No. 737/2024	Antima Yadav v. State of Rajasthan	60% Locomotor (Longitudinal deficiency)	The petitioner was selected but appointment was not granted.





	Rajasthan		
CW No. 1544/2024	Amiruddin v. State of Rajasthan	Physically Disabled category (Low vision/Visual impairment)- 40%	The petitioner was selected but not given appointment on the post of Teacher Gr. III (Level-II) Urdu.
CW No. 4896/2025	Harish Chander v. State of Rajasthan	Low vision in both eyes- 40%	The petitioner was selected but not given appointment on the post of Lecturer (Geography) but directed to appear before Medical Board
CWNo. 14850/2025	Subhash v. State of Rajasthan	Hearing Impairment (deaf) 40%	The petitioner was appointed on the post of second level teacher on 10.09.2012
CWNo. 15043/2025	Mohd. Naffes v. State of Rajasthan	Hearing Impairment 40%	The petitioner was appointed on the post of Junior Clerk on 28.06.2013
CWNo. 15151/2025	Nikita Mangal v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor Disability 41%	The petitioner was appointed as Junior Engineer on 08.12.2022 and as per re- assessment disability was found as 16%
CWNo. 15804/2025	Ajay Pratap v. State of Rajasthan	Disability-40%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 selected on 10.03.2023
CWNo. 15832/2025	Akhilesh Kumar Bind v. State of Rajasthan	Disability-40%	Junior Engineer appointed on 24.09.2025
CWNo. 15947/2025	Dharma Meghwal v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor disability-45%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.2 (Social Science) appointed on 09.10.2024
CWNo. 15950/2025	Tulsi Kumari v. State of Rajasthan	Disability-40%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 selected on 11.10.2022
CWNo. 15952/2025	Ramresh Meena v. State of Rajasthan	Blindness in both eyes- 40%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 selected on 05.10.2023
CWNo. 15954/2025	Ramesh v.	Blindness in both	Gram Vikas Adhikari






	State of Rajasthan	eyes- 40%	selected on 06.04.2023
CWNo. 15956/2025	Manish Kumar Meena v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor disability-40%	Junior Engineer
CWNo. 15958/2025	Dalip v. State of Rajasthan	Blindness in both eyes- 40%	Selected on 07.07.2020 service of 5 years
CWNo. 15959/2025	Hantu Gurjar v. State of Rajasthan	Disability-45%	Senior Teacher joined on 30.12.2023
CWNo. 15967/2025	Prem Prakash Sharma v. State of Rajasthan	Blindness in both eyes- 40%	Teacher Grade III Lvl. 2 (English) selected on 01.04.2019
CWNo. 15971/2025	Aslam Khan Pathan v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor Disability	Compounder/Nurse Junior Grade- name erroneously omitted from final merit list despite being top ranker in provisional merit list dated 03.06.2025 (medical check done on wrong leg)
CWNo. 16024/2025	Mohan Lal Gurjar v. State of Rajasthan	Blindness in both eyes- 40%	Selected on 13.03.2023 but respondents are insisting the petitioner to re-examine his disability
CWNo. 16061/2025	Saurabh Sharma v. State of Rajasthan	Blindness in both eyes- 40%	Appointed as Gram Vikas Adhikari on 12.04.2023
CWNo. 16142/2025	Ankur Tyagi v. State of Rajasthan	Blindness in both eyes- 40%	Selected on 17.04.2023
CWNo. 16145/2025	Dalip Singh	Locomotor	Teacher Grade III Lvl.2






	v. State of Rajasthan	disability- 40%	appointed on 28.03.2005 20 years of service
CWNo. 16148/2025	Pankaj Verma v. State of Rajasthan	Hearing Impairment in both ears- 53%	Lower Division Clerk II and Junior Assistant appeared in selection process (verification of documents) on 01.05.2025 but denied unfairly on 10.09.2025 stating that he did not cooperate with medical test
CWNo. 16202/2025	Hajari Lal v. State of Rajasthan	Blindness in both eyes- 40%	Teacher Grade II (Sanskrit) selected and appointed on 16.03.2024
CWNo. 16242/2025	Damodar Singh Meena v. State of Rajasthan	Hearing Impairment in both ears- 45%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 allotted on 21.04.2025 via district allotment list- not issued joining order due to re-medical results
CWNo. 16380/2025	Dr. Vishnu Gopal Gupta v. State of Rajasthan	Daughter is wheelchair bound and suffering from SMA rare disease	No chance given- case filed against malpractice of doctors for issuing fake disability certificates
CWNo. 16531/2025	Nathu Lal Saini v. State of Rajasthan	Deafness- 50%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 appointed on 31.03.2023 and joining order dated 05.04.2023 Tenure of 2 years
CWNo. 16545/2025	Sarjeet Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor disability- more than 50%	Lecturer (Political Science) appointed on 18.03.2021 Tenure of 4 years
CWNo. 16546/2025	Kishor Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Blindness and Locomotor disability-60%	LDC appointed on 25.06.2013 Tenure of 12 years






CWNo. 16659/2025	Prathvee Raj Singh Gurjar v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor disability- 40%	Junior Assistant appointed on 08.03.2018 Tenure of 7 years
CWNo. 16688/2025	Hari Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Blindness in both eyes- 70%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 appointed on 02.11.2022 and joining report of 03.11.2022 Tenure of 3 years
CWNo. 16689/2025	Malkeet Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor disability- 40%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.2 appointed on 13.02.2017 Tenure of 8 years
CWNo. 16696/2025	Praveen Sharma v. State of Rajasthan	Hearing impairment in both year- 64%	Appointed on 20.09.2024
CWNo. 16706/2025	Bhairoo Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Disability- 40%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 appointed on 12.06.2024
CWNo. 17216/2025	Pawan v. State of Rajasthan	Hearing impairment in both ears- 42%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1appointed on 12.06.2024
CWNo. 17293/2025	Likhmaram Balotiya v. State of Rajasthan	Visual impairment- 40%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1appointed on 24.09.2007
CWNo. 17294/2025	Deendayal Sharma v. State of Rajasthan	Visual impairment both eyes- 40%	Librarian Grade III appointed on 12.11.2021
CWNo. 17303/2025	Priyanka v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor Disability-42%	Compounder/Nurse Junior Grade
CWNo. 17611/2025	Inderjeet Menaria v. State of Rajasthan	Permanent disability in left hand- 50%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.2 appointed on 31.03.2023
CWNo. 17700/2025	Sohan Lal v.	Disability- 40%	Teacher Grade III





	State of Rajasthan		appointed on 07.03.1995
CWNo. 17749/2025	Suman v. State of Rajasthan	Visual impairment both eyes- 40%	Librarian Grade III Tenure of 4 years
CWNo. 17750/2025	Phool Chand Yadav v. State of Rajasthan	Disability- 40%	Appointed as Junior Environmental Engineer
CWNo. 17876/2025	Bhagwati Lal v.State of Rajasthan	Disabled-40%*	Hindi lecturer selected on 18.03.2021 Tenure of 4 years Re-examination on 28.08.2025
CWNo. 17918/2025	Iswardei v. State of Rajasthan	Hearing impairment/Deaf ears- 42%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 appointed on 07.02.2025 Tenure of 7 months
CWNo. 18779/2025	Kaptan Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Locomotor disability- 40%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 appointed on 20.07.2019 Tenure of 6 years
CWNo. 19013/2025	Ravindra Kumar Sharma v. State of Rajasthan	Hearing impairment- 50%	LDC appointed on 27.06.2013 Tenure of 12 years
CWNo. 19015/2025	Sundar Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Visual Impairment both eyes- 60%	Senior Teacher
CWNo. 19024/2025	Sanjeev Kumar v. State of Rajasthan	Disability- 42%	Senior Teacher
CWNo. 19364/2025	Mahendra Pal Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Hearing impairment in both ears- 60%	Assistant professor appointed on 24.02.2023






4. Following writ petitions were filed jointly by more than one petitioner and details are as under:-

Case No.	Name of petitioner	Disability details	Remarks
Suraj Panchal v. State of Rajasthan CW No. 15392/2025	1) Suraj Panchal 2) Manoj Kumar Meena 3) Manoj Kumar	Hearing Impairment both ears- 40%  Hearing Impairment (right ear) 43%  Hearing impairment both ears-	The petitioners selected in recruitment for the post of LDC Grade-II and Junior Assistant in PH Category but not found fit for consideration
Satish Kumar Saini v. State of Rajasthan CWNo. 15385/2025	1. Satish Kumar  2. Pitambar	Disability- 40%  Visual Impairment 60%	LDC Grade II and Junior assistant result on 26.08.2025
Pankaj Kumar Jonwal v. State of Rajasthan CWNo. 15387/2025	1. Pankaj Kumar Jonwal  2. Mahender Yogi	Locomotor Disability/Cerebral Palsy  Locomotor Disability	LDC Grade II and Junior assistant result on 25.11.2024 and merit based list on 12.03.2025
CWNo. 16243/2025 Pawan Rajawat v. State of Rajasthan	1. Pawan Rajawat  2. Ankit Singh  3. Roopa Ram	Locomotor and hearing impairment- 42%  Locomotor - 42% Blindness in right eye 10%  Permanent	





	4. Kapil Sharma	disability in right hand 40% Permanent disability in right upper and right lower limb- 45%	The petitioners were appointed as Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 appointed on 06.02.2025
CWNo. 16247/2025 Mohit Kumar v. State of Rajasthan	1. Mohit Kumar	Blindness- 46%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 appointed on 04.09.2024
	2. Kusama	Blindness- 50%	Teacher Grade III Lvl.1 appointed on 13.02.2019
CWNo. 17019/2025 Ramkunwar v. State of Rajasthan	1. Ramkunwar	Hearing impairment in both ears- 42%	appointed as Teacher Grade III Lvl.2
	2. Rajendra	Hearing impairment in both ears- 42%	appointed as Teacher Grade III Lvl.1
	3. Anjul Khan	Hearing impairment in both ears- 42%	appointed as Teacher Grade III Lvl.2
	4. Jeetendra Sharma	Hearing impairment in both ears- 42%	appointed as Teacher Grade III Lvl.1
	5. Mahender Kumar	Hearing impairment in both ears- 42%	appointed as Senior Teacher





5. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) have submitted that the petitioners are having benchmark disabilities, which means they are persons having not less than 40% of the specified disability, and the same is certified by a competent authority under the law. They further submitted that Section 2(r) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (In short " the RPWD Act, 2016 or Act of 2016") defines that any person having not less than 40% of a disability and a specified disability has been included as a person having physical disablement. They also referred to the process as prescribed under the 'Act of 2016' and submitted that the petitioners have undergone a test by a competent medical authority and, after examination, a certificate was issued in favor of the petitioner(s). They further submitted that after considering their physical disability as per the criteria and the guidelines prescribed by the Government, a certificate is issued in favor of the petitioner(s), and on the basis of the said certificate, filed an application to claim reservation in the recruitment process initiated by the State. They also submitted that once a disability certificate issued by a competent authority under the 'Act of 2016' is submitted, then the State has no authority to raise doubt on the certificate issued in favor of any of the petitioner. They also referred to the provisions and submitted that by an administrative order the State Government has mandated that, during last five years or more, all those candidates who are recruited under the PH category have to compulsorily undergo re-examination of their benchmark disability. They further submitted





that the action of state to the force and pressurize petitioners to undergo fresh medical test is discriminatory and malafide.

6. Learned Counsels has further referred provisions of the 'Act of 2016' and submitted that the direction of the State for re-examination is challenged primarily on three counts, Firstly, the disability certificate issued by the competent authorities is binding and conclusive for determination of benchmark disability; Secondly, the action of the State is arbitrary and aimed to deny equal opportunity to the petitioners, thus violating their fundamental rights; Thirdly, the petitioners were forced to face high-handedness by the State authorities and there is a clear violation of the doctrine of reasonable accommodation.

7. Learned Counsel has further referred to the obligation of the State to promote persons with disabilities and ensure their right of inclusion in the mainstream, and submitted that it is the duty of the Government to ensure implementation of reservation policies in the right spirit. They further submitted that persons with blindness, low vision, hard hearing, loco-motor, etc., suffer from different types of physical disabilities, and same is required to be assessed only by scientific methods, and the petitioners were issued certificates after compliance of the standards as prescribed under the law.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submitted that after submission of disability certificates by the petitioner(s), the respondent(s) are under an obligation to consider the same for





the purpose of employment and grant of benefits under the RPwD Act, 2016, and also the Rules of 2018. They further submitted that the State Government and the recruiting agencies appointed by the State Government have adopted a methodology to harass the persons with disabilities and, with an oblique motive, have blanketly issued orders for reassessment of the disabilities of the petitioner(s), which is violation of Articles 14, 16, and 21 of the Constitution of India. They further referred to the circular and the decision as cryptic, non-speaking, and contrary to all established canons of law and medical ethics.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submitted that unless there is a specific complaint against any person, he cannot be subjected to the same process to satisfy respondent(s). They further referred to Sections 3(5) of the RPwD Act, 2016, and submitted that the State Government, is under an obligation to take necessary steps to ensure reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, but they have not take any steps. They also submitted that this provision is introduced to ensure equality and non-discrimination of persons with disabilities. Thus, the respondent(s) have no authority to enforce a mandate to undergo medical re-examination or reassessment of their benchmark disabilities.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) also submitted that they are not adverse to mandate, but the respondents are forcing them to undergo a medical test in the presence of the officer of Special Operation Group (SOG), Rajasthan Police, and under the





pressure of the SOG, the medical boards are not assessing the disabilities as per the standards prescribed by the Government.

11. Some of the counsels have also referred to the interim orders passed in some of the cases wherein, after assessment, disability was found to be 40% or more. Some of the counsels also submitted that the petitioner(s) may again appear before a Medical Board, but not under the pressure of the respondents, as the respondents have no authority to re-evaluate physical disability or benchmark disability at their whims.

12. Aforesaid contentions were opposed by the learned AAG and the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the respondents. They have also referred to the judgment in the case of **State of U.P. & Ors. vs. Ravindra Kumar Sharma and others, reported as (2016) 4 SCC 791**, and submitted that the petitioners have claimed benchmark disability on the basis of certificates obtained by them; however, a series of complaints were made to the State Government alleging that, by producing fake and false disability certificates, some candidates have either secured job or are in the process of securing government jobs. He further submitted that the State Government, on the basis of certain complaints, had issued a circular for re-examination of benchmark disability of such candidates, and that to eliminate persons who secured benefits with fraudulent, fake, and false certificates, thus an exercise is undertaken by the Government. He also referred to the judgment of a Coordinate Bench of the Madhya Pradesh High Court in the case of **Sapna Lodhi vs.**





**State of Madhya Pradesh and others, Writ Petition No. 25145/2024**, passed at Jabalpur, and submitted that an identical issue was considered therein and no relief was granted to persons possessing false certificates. They also referred to the provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016, and submitted that the respondents are making all endeavors to ensure that the Act is implemented in its true spirit, with the object of uplifting the status of individuals with benchmark disabilities. At last, they submitted that the petitioners have no right to claim any equity from this Hon'ble Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

13. Heard the learned counsels for the petitioners, learned Additional Advocate General for the State and learned counsels for the respondent(s) and perused the material placed on record. We have also considered and perused the judgments referred by the learned counsels for the parties.

14. After conclusion of arguments, but before pronouncement, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted and relied upon judgment in the case of **Sujata Bora vs. Coal India Limited and others, reported as 2026 INSC 53**, which has also been considered in support of the petitioners.

15. Recently, identical issue was considered by a Coordinate Bench at the Principal Seat, Jodhpur, in the case of **Bharat Kumar vs. State of Rajasthan, S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10056/2024, decided on 16.12.2025**, and the said judgment has also been considered by us.





16. The 2011 Census data indicate that 2.6 crore persons are persons with disabilities in India. Out of these, 1.46 crore are literate, and merely 8.53% of the said 1.46 crore possess a graduation degree or higher qualification. India is a signatory to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2008 (UNCRPD), which mandates the State to provide an inclusive system at all levels to ensure that persons with disabilities participate effectively in a free society. The Constitution of India also mandates the State to promote the educational and economic interests of weaker sections and to secure the right to work and education for persons with disabilities (Articles 46 and 41 of the Constitution of India), as well as Article 14.

17. Article 14 guarantees equal treatment by the State and prohibits arbitrary action by State authorities, whereas Article 16 mandates non-discrimination in government employment, except on basis of legitimate and reasonable classification. Article 21 encompasses dignity, autonomy, and livelihood as fundamental rights. The Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016, was enacted with the object of inclusion and governs the rights of persons with disabilities after replacing the earlier Act of 1995. The Act of 2016 was enacted to include and comply with the UNCRPD. The Act further ensures equality, non-discrimination, and full participation in society, and also provides protection against abuse and violation.

18. In order to ensure the implementation of the Act of 2016, the





Government of India has established the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan) under the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, and we are considering several provisions available on the website of the said Department. The Government of India is well aware of the increased incidence of issuance of false and fraudulent disability certificates by some medical authorities and the securing of employment or other claims on the basis of such fake and false certificates. The Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan) issued a letter dated 24.11.2025 enclosing revised advisory guidelines dated 15.10.2025 to handle cases of RPwD candidates applying for jobs or admission in government employment, Government Educational Services (GEs), Government Institutions of Higher Education (GIHE), and other higher education institutions aided by the Government (OHEI). The revised rules and guidelines are reproduced as under:-

**Reference:**

1. This department's gazette notifications dated 26.04.2016 and 04.01.2018 prescribing the disability assessment guidelines (SOP) for disability certification
2. Launch of UDID project through online swavalamban portal in January, 2017 vide Section 18(5) of RPwD Act, 2016
3. This department's Gazette Notification dated 21.05.2021 on mandatory issuance of certificate of disability through swavlambancard.gov.in portal.
4. Department's notification no: 38/16-2020/DDIII (Note 8) dated 4th January 2021 mandating the government employers to verify the authenticity of





certificate of disability and examine suitability of the candidate in terms of functional requirement before appointment.

5. SOP on appeal for re-assessment of disability, issued by this DEPwD dated 19.06.2024.

6. CCPD's order dated 05.03.2024 in Case No. 14380/1031/2023 directing MoH&FW, GoI to create a structure for handling the appeals of PwBD students, against the assessments of the designated medical boards of NMC.

7. Disability assessment guidelines (SOP) for disability certification, issued by department vide Gazette Notification dated 12.03.2024, and as amended from time to time.

8. Appeal mechanism prescribed by DEPwD for Government Employers (GEs) or Government and Other Institutions of Higher Education (GIHE& OHEI) dated 17.07.2024.

9. This department's communication to UPSC, vide letter no. 18-25/2024/policy dated 25.04.2025, authorizing any organization to verify disability status/suitability for job by conducting a medical test.

Section 32 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 provides for reservation of not less than five percent seats for persons with benchmark disabilities in all Government Institutions of Higher Education (GIHE) and other Higher Education Institutions (OHEI) aided by the Government. Further, Section 34 of this Act also mandates the appropriate Government (GE) to appoint in every Government establishment not less than four percent of the total number of vacancies in the cadre strength in each group of posts, duly identified by the appropriate Government as mandated under Section 33 of the Act to be filled with persons with benchmark disabilities. It is essential that only genuine PwBD applicants meeting functional requirements of job/course get selected. This comprehensive SOP is being issued towards this goal only. The stakes in the selection to above mentioned jobs and higher education courses are quite high and consequently the competition is equally fierce. Of late, there have been some complaints about getting a fake disability certificate or with a different or higher percentage than actual disability. The DEPwD therefore, in compliance of reference- 4 & 6 and in supersession of reference- 8, is issuing the present comprehensive guidelines





(SOP).

**1. Ensuring that disability certificate is genuine:** The "Unique Disability ID (UDID)" project was launched in January, 2017 (reference-2) to create a National Database for all Persons with Disabilities (PwDs). Accordingly, certificates of disability and Unique Disability Identity cards are issued to Persons with Disabilities through medical assessment of PwDs (reference-1 & 7) by competent medical authorities notified by governments of respective States /Union Territories. It is pertinent to mention here that in RPwD Act, the number of disabilities were increased to 21 from the 7 disabilities mentioned in PwD Act, 1995.

Vide Rule-20 of RPwD Rules, 2017, the certificates of disability issued under the repealed PwD Act, 1995, shall continue to be valid after commencement of the RPwD Act, 2016 for the period specified therein. Vide Rule 18(5) of the same rules, the DEPwD mandated that, 01.06.2021 onwards, the disability certificate shall be generated only through the swavalamban portal. However, a provision was kept in the said portal for digitizing the manual disability certificates generated earlier under RPwD Act, 2016 or under PwD Act, 1995. Now, majority of this work is also complete.

Accordingly, all GEs/GIHEs/OHEIs are hereby requested to authenticate validity of disability certificate/UDID card from UDID portal. For this purpose, they are also encouraged to integrate their respective portals with UDID's national database through an API for real-time, authentic update on disability of individual applicants. UDID's API can be shared with GE/GIHE/OHEI by department under a standard process of MoU. Further. The GEs/GIHEs/OHEIs are advised to instruct, through their job notification/admission guidelines, the applicants to get their manual certificate (if any) digitized on UDID portal well within time, for such API-based authentication. However, if a manual old disability certificate is presented by the candidate, it may be got validated by the corresponding issuing authority of the State Government.

**2. Ensuring that Disability type and percentage of disability is correctly assessed and meets functional requirements of job/course**

Presently, UDID card is issued to PwDs through a decentralized mechanism of medical examination in various district/sub-district hospitals as notified by





respective state/UT governments. The disability assessment guidelines, issued vide reference-6 above, have been framed based on infrastructure, expertise and training available in various parts of country to carry out the disability assessment. However, it is possible that medical institutions/Hospitals/Medical Boards empanelled by GE/GIHE/OHEI may be better equipped in terms of tools, equipments, machines, technologies to have more accurate assessment of the disability using disability assessment guidelines issued by Department (DEPwD). Medical institutions/Hospitals/Medical Boards can therefore additionally use those tools, equipments, assessment while evaluating a candidate for disability for jobs or admission with GE/GIHE/OHEI.

It is also pertinent to mention that disability assessment guidelines have been framed to establish extent of disability in an individual and does not necessarily provide assurance of fitness of individual for a particular job or educational curriculum requirements. Therefore, many GE/GIHEs/OHEIs may additionally examine the PwBD applicants medically to establish suitability of applicant for the course/post for which he/she is being considered by GE/GIHE/OHEI. If necessary set of information required to establish suitability of job/admission is not available in any of the 3 documents available in UDID database, viz., UDID card, Disability certificate and diagnostics sheet, the earlier referred appropriate tests/procedures/protocols may also be included in the process of medical examination by GE/GIHE/OHEI. It needs to be ensured that sufficient number of hospitals are empanelled across the country by the GE/GIHE/OHEI so that PwBD candidates do not have to travel too far.

### **3. Ensuring that an Appellate mechanism exists if PwBD is aggrieved by decision of empanelled hospital of GE/GIHE/OHEI**

CCPD, vide reference-6 above, has also mandated for providing for Appellate hospitals by GE/GIHE/OHEI if the candidate has any grievance against the decision of the empanelled hospital. Therefore, an appeal arrangement is also expected to be provided by GE/GIHE/OHEI to PwBD applicants for re-evaluation of his suitability and extent of disability for the offered job/admission.

19. Section 34 of the RPwD Act, 2016, provides that persons with





benchmark disabilities of 40% and above are eligible for the benefit of reservation in respect of specified categories of disabilities. A further clarification regarding benchmark disabilities for reservation in recruitment was issued by the Department on 17.12.2025, which is being reproduced hereunder.



**Subject: Clarification regarding eligibility of Persons with Benchmark Disabilities for reservation in recruitment.**

The undersigned is directed to refer to a representation from Sh. Himshikhar Deka dated 19.11.25 and this Department's OM No. P-13013/57/2023-Policy dated 20.01.2025 (copy enclosed), to DoPT, clarifying that candidates with disabilities which are progressive, non-progressive or not likely to improve, as defined under the RPwD Act, 2016, shall be considered equivalent to "Permanent Disability" for the purpose of disability certification in terms of RPwD Amendment Rules, 2024 and may be considered for the benefit of reservation under Section 34 of the RPwD Act 2016. Further, the certificates having the condition prescribed as "likely to improve" to be issued temporary disability certificate and may not be considered eligible for reservation.

2. It is to be noted that, PwBD candidates with disabilities that are progressive, non-progressive or not likely to improve may not be denied reservation merely on the ground that their disability certificate indicates the disability as "temporary". Therefore, if the recruiting body receives such disability certificates being "temporary" in nature but having conditions other than "likely to improve", the certificates not to be outrightly rejected, and candidates be advised to get them re-assessed under RPwD Amendment Rules 2024.

3. Further, to effectively address the issues raised in the petition, while publishing the advertisements, all Ministries/ Departments and Establishments under its control are requested to ensure specifying the following so that candidates do not face undue hardship while applying for the examination:

i. That the disability conditions falling under the category "likely to improve" under temporary disability category, are not eligible for reservation.



ii. That the conditions i.e. "progressive, non-progressive or not likely to improve" are to be treated eligible for reservation.

**Encl: As above**

20. The aforementioned clarification clearly indicate that if the disability certificate contains a remark such as "likely to improve," then such candidates are required to be reassessed under the RPwD Amendment Rules, 2024. It is sufficient to indicate that all due care has been taken by the Government of India to ensure that candidates or individuals do not face any undue hardship while competing with other persons. Chapter X of the RPwD Act provides for certification of specified disabilities, and under Section 56, the obligation is upon the Central Government to notify guidelines for the purpose of assessing the extent of specified disability in a person.

21. The certifying authority also had a jurisdiction under Section 57(2) of the Act, and it is the duty of the appropriate Government to ensure that specific jurisdiction is assigned to the authority; otherwise, persons from any area may approach a particular certifying authority to obtain certificate(s) favorable to them under the Act. Section 58 further provides the procedure for certification, and any person aggrieved by the decision of the certifying authority may prefer an appeal under Section 59 before the Appellate Authority as may be designated by the State Government.

22. The Government of India has issued a notification dated 12.03.2024, published in the Extraordinary Gazette on





14.03.2024, regarding guidelines for the assessment of disabilities and the recommendations of the Sub-Committee of Experts. The notification has been worded as under:-

**S.O. 1338(E).**-In exercise of the power conferred by Section 56 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (49 of 2016) and in supersession of notification issued vide No. 16-21/2013-DD-III dated 25" April, 2016 and No. 16-9/2014-DD-III [S.O. 76(E) Dated 4"January, 2018] of the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan), the Central Government hereby notifies the guidelines for the purpose of assessing the extent of following specified disabilities in a person after having considered the recommendations of the sub-committees of experts to assess the extent of specified disabilities in a person, detailed in the ANNEXURE, namely:-

- i. Locomotor disability;
- ii. Visual Impairment;
- iii. Hearing Impairment and Speech & Language Disability;
- iv. Specific Learning Disability, Intellectual Disability and Autis Spectrum Disorder;
- v. Mental illness;
- vi. Blood Disorder
- vii. Multiple Disorder; and
- viii. Chronic Neurological Disorder.

**Note 1:-**In In terms of Section of of the Rights of the Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016(49 of 2016), the State Government or Union Territory Administrators or as the case may be shall designate persons, having requisite qualifications and experience, as certifying authorities, who shall be competent to issue the certificate of disability and also notify the jurisdiction within which and the terms and conditions subject to which, the certifying authority shall perform its certification functions.

**Note 2:-**The Director General of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India shall be the authority to decide upon cases where any controversy or doubt arises in matters relating to interpretation of the definitions or classifications or evaluation procedure regarding the said guidelines.





23. In view of the guidelines dated 12.03.2024 and published on 14.03.2024 under Section 56 of the RPwD Act, 2016, all certifying authorities of India are under an obligation to issue disability certificate(s) strictly in accordance with the said guidelines. Any certificate issued contrary to the provisions of Chapter-X of the Act of 2016 is void and non-est in the eye of law, and no person can claim any benefit or right on the basis of a certificate(s) issued by any medical authority, except as provided under Chapter X of the Act of 2016.

24. In the case of **MP State Cooperative Bank Ltd., Bhopal vs. Nanu Ram Yadav and Others, (2007) 8 SCC 261**, Hon'ble Supreme Court enumerated large-scale illegalities in different appointments and held that widespread irregularities can warrant scrapping the entire selection process. Similarly, in the case of **Union of India & Ors. vs. Raghuwar Pal Singh, (2018) 15 SCC 463**, Hon'ble Supreme Court has clarified that when an appointment is ab-initio illegal, the employer need not comply with the principles of natural justice while canceling the invalid appointment since no lawful right accrues from an illegality.

25. Aforementioned judgments were considered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Amrit Yadav Vs. State of Jharkhand reported as 2025 INSC 176**, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court has directed the State Government to issue a new advertisement that aligns with constitutional requirements and clarifies reservation policies and the number of posts. The State is under





an obligation to ensure equality of opportunity and rule-out discrimination in public appointment. The reservation policies adopted by the Government and recognized under the Constitution of India have to be implemented in legal manner, thus every public appointment must satisfy the tenets of transparency, equality and fairness.

26. In the case of **Sujata Bora vs. Coal India Limited and Others (supra)**, Hon'ble Supreme Court referred quote of Stevie Wonder, who was born prematurely and suffered from a condition known as retinopathy, which caused him to become blind. He is, of course, one of the best-selling music artists of all time, with 25 Grammy Awards. His quote is referred as under:-

**"just because a man lacks the use of his eyes does not mean he lacks vision"**

27. The ratio in **Sujata Bora (supra)** emphasized that disability assessment must be contextual, humane, and aligned with the mandate of inclusion rather than exclusion. The judgment further highlights the concept of reasonable accommodation, a principle enshrined in the RPwD Act, which emanates from Articles 41 and 21 of the Constitution of India. Further reference was made to the judgment in the case of **Omkar Ramchandra Gond vs. The Union of India, 2024 INSC 775**, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that:-

"40. ...Section 2(y) of the RPwD Act, defines "reasonable accommodation" to mean necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments, without imposing a disproportionate or undue burden in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities





the enjoyment or exercise of rights equally with others. The concept of reasonable accommodation would encompass within itself the deployment of a purposive and meaningful construction of the NMC Regulations of 13.05.2019 read with the Appendix H-1 guidelines in a manner as to further the objectives of the RPwD Act. The reasonable accommodation as defined in Section 2(y) of the RPwD Act should not be understood narrowly to mean only the provision of assisting devices and other tangible substances which will aid persons with disabilities. If the mandate of the law is to ensure a full and effective participation of persons with disabilities in the society and if the whole idea was to exclude conditions that prevent their full and effective participation as equal members of society, a broad interpretation of the concept of reasonable accommodation which will further the objective of the RPwD Act and Article 41 of the Directive Principles of State Policy is mandated."

**(Emphasis supplied)**

28. Again, referring from **Om Rathod Vs. Direction General of Heath Services**, 2024 SCC Online SC 3130 observed as under:-

"29. The principle of reasonable accommodation is not only statutorily prescribed but also rooted in the fundamental rights guaranteed to persons with disabilities under Part III of the Constitution. Reasonable accommodation is a fundamental right. It is a gateway right for persons with disabilities to enjoy all the other rights enshrined in the Constitution and the law. Without the gateway right of reasonable accommodation, a person with disability is forced to navigate in a world which excludes them by design. It strikes a fatal blow to their ability to make life choices and pursue opportunities. From mundane tasks of daily life to actions undertaken to realise personal and professional aspirations -all are throttled when reasonable accommodations are denied. Reasonable accommodation is a facet of substantive equality and its failure constitutes discrimination.

29. Again, relying upon the judgment in the case of **Rajive Raturi vs. Union of India, (2020) 16 SCC 654**, while explaining the concept of reasonable accommodation to achieve individual justice by encompassing dignity, autonomy, individual choice, and non-discrimination, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under:-

"23. The duty to provide reasonable accommodation is an ex nunc duty, which means that it is enforceable from the moment an





individual with an impairment needs it in a given situation (workplace, school, etc.) in order to enjoy her or his rights on an equal basis in a particular context. Here, accessibility standards can be an indicator, but may not be taken as prescriptive. Reasonable accommodation can be used as a means of ensuring accessibility for an individual with a disability in a particular situation. Reasonable accommodation seeks to achieve individual justice in the sense that nondiscrimination or equality is assured, taking the dignity, autonomy and choices of the individual into account. Thus, a person with a rare impairment might ask for accommodation that falls outside the scope of any accessibility standard. The decision to provide it or not depends on whether it is reasonable and whether it imposes a disproportionate or undue burden.””

**(emphasis supplied)**

30. Earlier, Hon’ble Supreme Court has also considered the doctrine of reasonable accommodation in the case of **Ravinder Kumar Dhariwal vs. Union of India, reported as 2021 SCC Online SC 12193**, wherein it was observed that disability is a social construct, as disability is not universal but is an interaction between the impairment a person has and the barriers they face. It was held that denial of reasonable accommodation amounts to indirect discrimination. Again, in the case of **Bambahaniya Sagar Vashrambhai vs. Union of India and Others, Civil Writ Petition No. 856 of 2023**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court flagged the distinction between persons with disabilities and persons with benchmark disabilities.

31. Section 2(r) defines “persons with benchmark disabilities,” meaning a person having not less than 40% of a specified disability, and includes a person with disability where the specified disability has not been defined in measurable terms and





includes a person with disability where specified disability has been defined in measurable terms, as certified by the certifying authority; Section 2(s) defines "persons with disabilities," whereas Section 2(g) defines "reasonable accommodation." Section 20 of the Act of 2016 specifically provides for non-discrimination in employment and the same is reproduced hereunder:

**20. Non-discrimination in employment.—(1)** No Government establishment shall discriminate against any person with disability in any matter relating to employment:

Provided that the appropriate Government may, having regard to the type of work carried on in any establishment, by notification and subject to such conditions, if any, exempt any establishment from the provisions of this section.

(2) Every Government establishment shall provide reasonable accommodation and appropriate barrier free and conducive environment to employees with disability.

(3) No promotion shall be denied to a person merely on the ground of disability.

(4) No Government establishment shall dispense with or reduce in rank, an employee who acquires a disability during his or her service: Provided that, if an employee after acquiring disability is not suitable for the post he was holding, shall be shifted to some other post with the same pay scale and service benefits: Provided further that if it is not possible to adjust the employee against any post, he may be kept on a supernumerary post until a suitable post is available or he attains the age of superannuation, whichever is earlier.

(5) The appropriate Government may frame policies for posting and transfer of employees with disabilities.

32. Section 33 mandates for identification of posts for reservation, whereas Section 34 provides for reservation. Chapter-XIII specifically provides for the establishment of Special Courts, whereas Chapter XVI provides for offences and penalties.





Section 91 provides for punishment for fraudulent availing of any benefit or attempt to avail any benefit meant for persons with benchmark disabilities.

**The State action for re-verification of disability certificates, particularly of those who secured jobs on the basis of disability certificates.**

33. An order dated 28.08.2025 is issued by the Department of Personnel, Government of Rajasthan, after noticing that certain irregularities were found during the assessment of employees appointed against posts reserved for persons with benchmark disabilities. Consequently, such persons with benchmark disabilities were directed to undergo medical re-examination by a Medical Board of a Medical College/Hospital. A provision is also mentioned to show that if the certificate is found as false or fake then proper action be initiated against such person.

34. The petitioner(s) have claimed that they procured valid certificates from competent authorities, Medical Boards, or Medical Officers, and on the basis of such certificates, they applied for recruitment and were selected against reserved posts meant for persons with benchmark disabilities. Their primary argument is whether a certificate issued by a Medical Officer is binding in nature? and whether a person can be compelled to undergo fresh examination of his disability. The provisions of the Act of 2016 clearly indicate that if any person, by using a fake or false certificate, seeks to avail or attempts to avail any facility or benefit under the Act, such person is liable for punishment. In





other words, the use of a false or fake certificate is a punishable offence under law.

35. It is evident that while enacting a law and providing reservation, the legislature was conscious of the fact that fake and false certificates could be procured to avail benefits meant for persons with disabilities. Chapter-X of the Act deals with certification of disabilities and further provides for appeal to an Appellate Authority.

36. The Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Govt. of India has also introduced the Unique Disability ID (UDID) system, wherein, upon filing an application, assessment of disability is conducted by a notified authority. This clearly reflects that the Government is aware that claims can be made, but since public posts and public funds are involved, it is the duty of the Government to give effect to constitutional provisions by preventing misuse and fraudulent claims. The Government of India has also issued advisories to all Departments and State Governments to ensure proper implementation of the Act of 2016 while preventing undue harassment of persons with disabilities.

37. In the case of **State of Uttar Pradesh and Others vs. Ravinder Kumar (supra)**, Hon'ble Supreme Court considered a case wherein a complaint was lodged by a Viklang Sangh alleging illegal usurpation of the quota reserved for specially-abled persons by a large number of individuals who were, in fact, not specially-abled and had fraudulently procured disability





certificates from the District authorities under the Rules of 1996. On the basis of the said complaint, the Government issued an order for verification of the certificates issued by the Medical Boards, and certificates of about 21% of the selected candidates were found to be fake and obtained fraudulently. It was held that fraud vitiates everything, and in such a case, a large number of candidates had illegally usurped the reserved seats meant for persons suffering from disabilities. The action of the State Government did not call for interference. The following paragraph from the judgment in **Ravinder Kumar and others (supra)** is reproduced for ready reference:-

5. It is apparent from Rules of 1996 that disability certificate is required to be issued by Medical Board. It can issue permanent disability certificate or the Medical Board shall indicate the period of validity in the certificate in case where there is any chance of variation in the degree of disability. In case of refusal of disability certificate an opportunity is required to be given to the applicant of being heard, and there can be a review by the Medical Board on representation by the applicant and Rules contains a provision to the effect that the certificate issued by the Medical Board shall make a person eligible to apply.

6. In the facts of the instant case there was a serious complaint lodged by Viklang Sangh of illegal usurpation of the quota reserved for specially abled by large number of persons who were not in fact specially abled and have procured certificates fraudulently from their districts under the Rules of 1996. On the basis of the said complaint Government has issued an order for the purpose of verification of such certificates issued by the Medical Board and certificates of 21% of selected candidates of handicapped category were found to be fraudulent. It is settled proposition of law that fraud vitiates and in such a case when large number of candidates have illegally usurped the reserved seats of the persons suffering from disability the action of State Government did not call for interference.





7. In *Bhaurao Dagdu Paralkar v. State of Maharashtra & Ors.* (2005) 7 SCC 605, it was observed :

“16. In *Lazarus Estates Ltd. v. Beasley* (1956) 1 All ER 341, Lord Denning observed at QB pp. 712 and 713: (All ER p. 345 C)

“No judgment of a court, no order of a minister, can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by fraud. Fraud unravels everything.”

In the same judgment Lord Parker, L.J. observed that fraud vitiates all transactions known to the law of however high a degree of solemnity. (p. 722) These aspects were recently highlighted in *State of A.P. v. T. Suryachandra Rao* (2005) 6 SCC 149.”

8. In *Ram Chandra Singh v. Savitri Devi* (2003) 8 SCC 319 it was held thus:

“15. x x x Fraud as is well known vitiates every solemn act. Fraud and justice never dwell together.

16. Fraud is a conduct either by letter or words, which induces the other person or authority to take a definite determinative stand as a response to the conduct of the former either by word or letter.

17. It is also well settled that misrepresentation itself amounts to fraud. Indeed, innocent misrepresentation may also give reason to claim relief against fraud.

18. A fraudulent misrepresentation is called deceit and consists in leading a man into damage by wilfully or recklessly causing him to believe and act on falsehood. It is a fraud in law if a party makes representations which he knows to be false, and injury ensues therefrom although the motive from which the representations proceeded may not have been bad.

X X X X X

23. An act of fraud on court is always viewed seriously. A collusion or conspiracy with a view to deprive the rights of others in relation to a property would render the transaction void ab initio. Fraud and deception are synonymous.

25. Although in a given case a deception may not amount to fraud, fraud is anathema to all equitable principles and any affair tainted with fraud cannot be perpetuated or saved by the application of any





equitable doctrine including res judicata.

26. In *Shrisht Dhawan v. Shaw Bros.* (1992) 1 SCC 534, it has been held that: (SCC p. 553, para 20)

“20. Fraud and collusion vitiate even the most solemn proceedings in any civilized system of jurisprudence. It is a concept descriptive of human conduct.”

x x x x x

29. In *Chittaranjan Das v. Durgapore Project Ltd.* (1995) 99 CWN 897, it has been held: (Cal LJ p. 402, paras 57-58)

“57. Suppression of a material document which affects the condition of service of the petitioner, would amount to fraud in such matters. Even the principles of natural justice are not required to be complied with in such a situation.

58. It is now well known that a fraud vitiates all solemn acts. Thus, even if the date of birth of the petitioner had been recorded in the service returns on the basis of the certificate produced by the petitioner, the same is not sacrosanct nor the respondent company would be bound thereby.”

9. This Court in *Express Newspapers (P) Ltd.& Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.* (1986) 1 SCC 133 at para 119 has held thus:

“119. Fraud on power voids the order if it is not exercised bona fide for the end design. There is a distinction between exercise of power in good faith and misuse in bad faith. The former arises when an authority misuses its power in breach of law, say, by taking into account bona fide, and with best of intentions, some extraneous matters or by ignoring relevant matters. That would render the impugned act or order ultra vires. It would be a case of fraud on powers. The misuse in bad faith arises when the power is exercised for an improper motive, say, to satisfy a private or personal grudge or for wreaking vengeance of a Minister as in *S. Partap Singh v. State of Punjab* AIR 1964 SC 72. A power is exercised maliciously if its repository is motivated by personal animosity towards those who are directly affected by its exercise. Use of a power for an ‘alien’ purpose other than the one for which the power is conferred is mala fide use of that power. Same is the position when an order is made for a purpose other than that which finds place in the order. The ulterior or alien purpose clearly speaks of the misuse of the power and it was observed as early as in 1904 by Lord





Lindley in General Assembly of Free Church of Scotland v. Overtoun (1904) AC 515, 'that there is a condition implied in this as well as in other instruments which create powers, namely, that the powers shall be used bona fide for the purpose for which they are conferred'. It was said by Warrington, C.J. in Short v. Poole Corpn. (1926) Ch 66, that:

'No public body can be regarded as having statutory authority to act in bad faith or from corrupt motives, and any action purporting to be of that body, but proved to be committed in bad faith or from corrupt motives, would certainly be held to be inoperative.'"

38. Considering aforesaid, the State Government is competent and within its authority to re-verify or re-assess the certificates submitted by candidates to claim appointments against posts reserved for persons with benchmark disabilities. There is no provision either under the Act of 1995 or under the Act of 2016 which is sufficient to draw a conclusion, that once a certificate is issued in favour of anyone then same becomes binding for all purposes. A humane and inclusive approach, as indicated hereinabove, has to be adopted, but at the same time fraudulent acts must be prevented at all costs so as to implement the law in true spirit. The system is inclusive, and inclusivity can be ensured only when policies are implemented in letter and spirit, with the aim of extending benefits to the last person in the queue.

39. The second ground pertains to the alleged violation of Fundamental Rights under Articles 14, 16, and 21 of the Constitution of India. The Constitution guarantees equal treatment and equality of opportunity in public employment. To give effect to these constitutional mandates, the RPwD Act was enacted by the Union of India, and its provisions ensure three





basic principles: first, equality and non-discrimination; second, reservation in appointments; and third, reasonable accommodation. The Government is the authority to implement the provisions of the Act of 2016, and only when the Government discriminate any of the petitioner, then only they can claim violation of fundamental rights. Herein, there is no case for violation of Section 20 of the Act of 2016.



40. Having taken note of the ratio laid down in **Ravinder Kumar and others (supra)** and further considered and followed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in **Bharat Kumar vs. State of Rajasthan (supra)**, no case of violation of Articles 14, 16, or 21 is made out in favor of the petitioners, as the Government is duty-bound to follow fundamental tenets such as transparency, equality, and fairness while making appointments to public posts. If there is any violation or flouting of norms, the remedy of judicial review is always available; however, in the present case, no such ground is made out in favour of the petitioner(s). The Government, on the basis of a large number of complaints, decided to verify the certificates of all individuals who claimed employment on the basis of disability certificates. When there is large number of appointments then it is not possible to segregate few, who played fraud. Thus, by a general order all individuals who claimed and availed benefit of reservation, were directed to undergo a reassessment exercise.

41. The third principle forcefully argued is the doctrine of reasonable accommodation as provided under Section 3(5) of the




Act of 2016. The process of reasonable accommodation has been specifically considered in the context of ordering re-examination or reassessment of individuals. The petitioners have to establish that the directions issued by the respondents lack good faith or violate the principle of a unified approach, and further to demonstrate undue hardship faced during reassessment.

42. In some of the writ petitions, interim orders were passed, whereby directed assessment of benchmark disabilities, and in some of them certificates to show benchmark disabilities were received from AIIMS, Jodhpur, but in some of them not received any certificate. The details are as under:-


Case No. (CW)	Title		Remarks
15370/2025	Ramprakash Kharlwa v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
14850/2025	Subhash v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Did not appear before the AIIMS board on date fixed.
15043/2025	Mohd. Naffes v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15151/2025	Nikita Mangal v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15385/2025	(i) Satish Kumar Saini v. State of Rajasthan (ii) Pitambar	Yes. Yes.	AIIMS Board said that he has 40% blindness in both eyes. AIIMS Board said that he has 60% visual impairment in both eyes
15387/2025	(i) Pankaj Kumar Jonwal v. State of Rajasthan (ii) Mahendra Yogi	Yes. Yes.	AIIMS Board said that he has 10% locomotor disability. AIIMS Board said that he has 17% locomotor disability.
15804/2025	Ajay Pratap v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Did not appear before the board on date fixed.
15832/2025	Akhilesh Kumar Bind v.	Yes.	Did not appear before the





	State of Rajasthan		board on date fixed.
15947/2025	Dharma Meghwal v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15950/2025	Tulsi Kumari v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15952/2025	Ramresh Meena v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15954/2025	Ramesh v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15956/2025	Manish Kumar Meena v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15958/2025	Dalip v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15959/2025	Hantu Gurjar v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15967/2025	Prem Prakash Sharma v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
15971/2025	Aslam Khan Pathan v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
16024/2025	Mohan Lal Gurjar v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
16061/2025	Saurabh Sharma v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
16142/2025	Ankur Tyagi v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
16145/2025	Dalip Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
16148/2025	Pankaj Verma v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
16202/2025	Hajarimal v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
16242/2025	Damodar Singh Meena v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.
16243/2025	(i) Pawan Rajawat v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.
	(ii) Ankit Singh	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.
	(iii) Roopa Ram	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.
	(iv) Kapil Sharma	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.
16247/2025	(i) Mohit Kumar v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
	(ii) Kusama	Yes.	Report not received.
16696/2025	Praveen Sharma v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.
17019/2025	Ramkunwar v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
17216/2025	Pawan v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.





17293/2025	Likhmaram Balotiya v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
17294/2025	Deendayal Sharma v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
17303/2025	Priyanka v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
17611/2025	Inderjeet Menaria v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.
17700/2025	Sohan Lal v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.
17749/2025	Suman v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
19015/2025	Sundar Singh v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
19024/2025	Sanjeev Kumar v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Report not received.
17876/2025	Bhagwati Lal v. State of Rajasthan	Yes.	Did not appear before AIIMS Board on date fixed.

43. The State has an authority to verify disability certificate(s) through general or specific orders if suspicion arises, and the petitioner/candidate, or employee has no right to challenge such action. If the State Government after every change of Government pursue any employee to undergo reassessment multiple times then only the employee has a right to challenge the decision of the Government on the ground that the action of the Government is violative of basic principles such as discussed herein-above. After challenge, the action would be examined in light of the obligation of the State to promote inclusiveness in the society but the decision of the Government to examine or reassess the disability of the petitioner(s) neither violate any statutory provision nor fundamental right. Therefore, the petitioner(s) have no right to challenge the reassessment of their benchmark disabilities.





### Solution or Resolution

44. The material on record clearly indicates that some of the petitioners are already in Government service on the basis of certificates to demonstrate benchmark disabilities in their favor, meaning thereby that they have more than 40% physical disability, to claim reservation for appointment to a particular post. Some of the petitioners have already been confirmed in service after completion of their probation period, and still they were directed to undergo for medical. The issue is whether a departmental proceeding under the Rajasthan Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules or any other applicable disciplinary rules is required to be initiated if certificate is found as false?

45. In **Ravinder Kumar (supra)**, Hon'ble Supreme Court considered identical issue and held that fraud vitiates everything, and if a person has secured employment on the basis of a fraudulent certificate, he is not entitled to any protection. Recently, in the case of **Amrit Yadav vs. State of Jharkhand (supra)**, while referring to and relying upon judgment in case of **Union of India vs. Raghuwar Pal Singh, (2018) 15 SCC 463**, it was held that when an appointment is ab-initio illegal, the employer need not comply with the principles of natural justice. The relevant para is extracted herein-below.

20. Further, the position of law is settled that though there is no fundamental right to claim reservation as Articles 16(4) and (4-A) of the Constitution of India are in the nature of enabling provisions only and do not





mandate the State or its instrumentalities to provide reservation in every selection process but in spite thereof, the State's decision to not provide reservation has to be based on some quantifiable data and valid reasoning 23. In the present case, the advertisement dated 29th July, 2010, issued by respondent No. 4 is completely silent on the aspect of total number of posts and the number of reserved quota and general quota posts. We are of the view that if the State chooses not to provide reservation, that decision must also be conveyed through the advertisement along with the afore-mentioned lists of inclusions. This Court in the case of State of Karnataka v. Uma Devi observed that any appointment made in violation of the statutory rules as well as the mandate of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution would be a nullity in law.

46. Again referring ratio from the case of **MP State Cop. Bank Ltd. Vs. Nanuram Yadav (2007) 8 SCC 264**, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the Court should not exercise its jurisdiction on misplaced sympathy. Therefore, if any of the certificate found as false and fabricated the option is not only to terminate services of individual but also to take action as per law.

47. Whether an employer is bound by a certificate issued by any Medical Officer or a Medical Board, and any person claiming to be a benchmark disability, and that too without verification by an employer. The RPwD Act, 2016 provides that the certificate be issued in accordance with Chapter-X by the certifying authority. The responsibility to issue guidelines is upon the Central Government, and the material on record clearly indicate that the Central Government has notified the guidelines. A certificate can be issued only in accordance with the guidelines as issued by the Central Government under Section 56 of the RPwD Act, 2016.

48. The procedure has been prescribed under Section 58 of the Act, and if anyone, aggrieved by the decision of the certifying






authority, then he can file an appeal under Section 59 of the Act. Nowhere it has been provided under the RPwD Act, 2016 that once a certificate is issued, then it would be binding against all. There is no conclusive presumption in favor of the certificate, once issued by the Medical Officer/Board. Herein, the medical record clearly indicate that the certificates produced by each of the petitioner(s) are not in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Central Government. Section 57 empowers the State Government to designate persons having the requisite qualification and experience as the competent persons to issue a certificate of disability. Not only are the persons required to be designated, but the jurisdiction of such persons is also required to be determined and notified. The duty lies upon the Government to implement the provisions under Chapter-X of the RPwD Act, 2016.

49. **In the case of Jane Kaushik vs. Union of India, 2025, INSC 1248**, Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered a situation wherein there was a persistent gap between the rights of transgender persons as guaranteed on paper and their lived reality. The Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the "doctrine of reasonable accommodation" and also "omissive discrimination". There is positive obligation upon the Government, both upon the Central Government and the State, under the RPwD Act, to adopt and implement positive measures such as reasonable accommodation and to operationalize the mandated mechanisms under the law.






50. While referring to the judgment in the case of **Vikas vs. UPSC (supra)** and **Kabir Paharia Vs. National Medical Commission & Ors., 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1025**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has elaborated the doctrine of reasonable accommodation as a positive duty, and not charity, in disability law.

51. In the case of **Bharat Kumar vs. State of Rajasthan (supra)**, a coordinate Bench, while considering an identical issue, has referred to Section 44 of the Indian Evidence Act, which deals with fraud or collusion in obtaining a judgment and the incompetency of the Court, and how the same is proved. It also considered Section 79 of the Evidence Act regarding the presumption of genuineness of certified copies but after considering the judgment in case of **State of U.P. & Ors. vs. Ravindra Kumar Sharma & Ors. (supra)**, observed that the State has a right to verify a disability certificate issued by Medical Board/Medical Officer.

52. Again, referring to the judgment reported in **Ram Chandra Singh Vs. Savitri Devi 2003 (8) SCC 319**, held that fraud is a well-known vitiating solemn act, and that fraud and justice never dwell together. After considering several judgments, it was held that an employer or the State has a right to verify a disability certificate, if there is any suspicion regarding its genuineness. The petitioner cannot object to re-examination as ordered by the State Government.






53. Even in the case of **Sujata Bora (supra)**, the Supreme Court has considered the principle of reasonable accommodation and also inter-sectional discrimination. However, when a large number of candidates apply for a job in a particular category and there are complaints against some of them or reasonable suspicion exists, then the duty lies upon the State to ensure that only eligible persons are appointed against the reserved posts for persons with disabilities. The State is duty-bound to implement the constitutional mandate as provided under the law, and in such circumstances, the State or the State actors cannot violate or breach the mandate provided under the law.

54. The material on record clearly indicate that some of the certificates were not issued in accordance with Chapter-X of the RPwD Act, 2016. Therefore, the question, which was also considered by a coordinate Bench in the case of **Bharat Kumar vs. State of Rajasthan (supra)** and also discussed in detail herein-above, clearly reflects that the State or the employer has an authority to re-verify the facts as claimed by a person seeking public employment. Thus, the State or the Government has to re-examine the veracity of the claim made by any individual by submitting a certificate in support of such claim. The intention of the State, is to ensure that the right and eligible person is appointed to the post reserved for persons with disabilities.

55. The circular, though general in nature, has been issued within the authority by the Government, and the petitioner has not make out a case to challenge the circular on any of the





ground, as mentioned in these writ petitions.

56. The issue remains some of the petitioners, already in Government service or who have completed their probation and confirmed, whether in such circumstances, a full-fledged inquiry under the Rajasthan Civil Services (CCA) Rules, 1958, is required before taking any action. The judgments referred herein-above, including the judgment in the case of **Amrit Yadav vs. State of Jharkhand (supra)**, clearly held that when somebody secures a job without possessing the proper qualification, it is not necessary to hold a full-fledged inquiry. Rule 19 of the CCA Rules specifically provides for dispensing with an inquiry where it is not possible.

57. In the present case, when somebody obtains a job on the basis of a fake or false certificate claiming to be a person with disabilities, then there is no protection for such individual(s) under the law. The State Government or the appointing authority may terminate services of such person after recording reasons in detail, and nobody has a right to continue on a post which is not meant for him/her. Thus, there is no protection of law for a person who has secured a job on the basis of a fake or false certificate, and the duty to take action lies upon the State Government, or the department concerned.

58. Again, there is a question whether criminal action is required to be taken or not, is within the domain of the department concerned or the State Government. However, if





somebody commits a crime, he is liable for criminal prosecution, and thus there is no protection for individual(s) who do not have a benchmark disability, but still procured a certificate to show a benchmark disability. The disability has to be assessed on the basis of the guidelines as issued by the Government of India under Sections 56 of the RPWD Act, and it is sufficient to draw a conclusion that certificate issued only in accordance with Chapter-X of RPWD Act are valid and legal for all purpose.

59. In view of discussions made herein-above, the State Government is under a constitutional obligation in providing equal protection, as provided under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India, and bound to follow the doctrine of reasonable accommodation while considering the case of any individual who is declared as a person with disabilities under the RPWD Act, 2016. At the same time, the State Government is also duty-bound to prevent misuse of the provisions of the RPWD Act, 2016 by any individual, with aim to usurp the employment opportunities meant for persons with benchmark disabilities. If the State Government fails in its constitutional obligation or omits to do any act in furtherance of the directions and duties as mandated under the RPWD Act, 2016, then they are liable for omissive discrimination.

60. The State Government or the recruiting agency has every right to assess or reassess the case of benchmark disability and direct the candidate(s) to undergo assessment or reassessment of disability in accordance with the guidelines issued by the





Government of India under Section 56 of the RPwD Act, 2016. The assessment has to be made by the designated certifying authorities as declared under Chapter X of the RPwD Act. A designated certifying authority cannot issue any certificate, which is not in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Government of India under Section 56 of the RPwD Act, 2016. A designated certifying authority is not competent to issue a disability certificate beyond its jurisdiction, as determined by the State Government.

61. The State Government or the recruiting agency may direct anyone, whether an employee who secured a job on the basis of a disability certificate or a candidate who appeared to claim a reservation quota under the RPwD Act, 2016, to appear before any designated authority to assess or reassess the disability of such person.

62. Thus, the writ petitions are disposed of in following manner:-  
(i) The petitioner(s) have no right to challenge the assessment or reassessment order issued by the State Government or the respondent(s) for reassessment of benchmark disability. No person is entitled to be considered for appointment on seat reserved for persons with benchmark disabilities, unless his/her benchmark disability is assessed as per Chapter-X of the RPwD Act, 2016.

(ii) The respondent(s) are free to assess or reassess the benchmark disability of the petitioner(s) in accordance with the





provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016, and such assessment shall be made in accordance with the guidelines framed by the Government of India in exercise of powers under Section 56 of the RPWD Act, 2016.

(iii) Any certificate issued by any Medical Board or Medical Officer, not designated as a certifying authority under Section 57 of the RPwD Act, is invalid and illegal, and the same cannot be relied upon for availing any benefit under the RPwD Act, 2016 or the rules made thereunder.

(iv) The respondent(s) including recruiting agencies are directed to ensure that the certification process conforms to the standards as prescribed by the Government of India under the RPwD Act, 2016 and the rules made thereunder.

(v) The State Government is also under an obligation to notify the designated certifying authorities along with their jurisdiction for issuance of certificates under Section 2 (r), 2(s) or 2(t) to declare a person as having a disability or a benchmark disability, or person with high support needs.

(vi) After assessment or reassessment of in service candidate(s), if the respondent(s) find that the candidate does not have a benchmark disability as required under the Act of 2016, then they are free to take any action as discussed herein-above.

(vii) If a candidate appears in a recruitment process on the basis of benchmark disability, then the recruiting agency is duty-bound to assess or reassess his benchmark disability through a





designated certifying authority as notified under Section 57 of the RPwD Act, 2016, and such assessment has to be made strictly on the basis of guidelines issued by the Government of India under Section 56 of the RPwD Act, 2016.

(viii) The petitioner(s) are not entitled to any protection under the law but any action against them shall be taken or initiated only after re-assessment of their benchmark disability under the directions of the respondent(s) by following the procedure as prescribed under Chapter X of the RPwD Act, 2016.

63. No order as to costs.

64. With aforesaid, the writ petition(s) along with pending application(s) if any shall stand disposed of.

65. Any interim order or any protection granted to the petitioner(s) is hereby withdrawn.

66. The Registry is directed to place a copy of order in each of the file.

(ASHOK KUMAR JAIN),J

MONU KAMRA/173-237-S

