



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

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4375/2026

1. Vinod Kumar Suthar S/o Shri Gopi Ram Suthar, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Ward No. 11, Roranwali, 4 Rrw Hanumangarh, District Hanumangarh Raj.
2. Mahaveer Prasad S/o Shri Sant Ram, Aged About 38 Years, Near Ramdev Mandir, Khileri Bas, Ward No 01, Fatehgarh, District Hanumangarh Raj.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Commissioner (Egs), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. The District Collector- Cum- District Programme Coordinator, Egs, Hanumangarh.
6. The Chief Executive Officer-Cum- Additional District Programme Coordinator, Egs, Zila Parishad, Hanumangarh.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Jitender Singh Bhaleria Mr. Deepak Pareek
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Mahaveer Bishnoi, AAG Mr. Ayush Gehlot Mr. Pawan Bharti for Mr. I.R. Choudhary, AAG

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH
Order

29/04/2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners may be permitted to file representation in light of the



order dated 26.08.2025 passed by Co-Ordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.11737/2024 titled as "*Rodu Lal & Ors. Vs. The State of Rajasthan & Ors.*" and connected batch of petitions.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents are agreeable to the proposition and submit that the representation shall be decided in light of the decision rendered in Rodu Lal's case (supra).

3. The operative portion of the order dated 26.08.2025 (supra) reads as follows:

"40. This Court is further of the firm opinion that if the respondents continue with the services of the petitioners, without covering them under the Rules of 2022 would be against the principles as enumerated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in a catena of judgments wherein the Court has opined that the practice of appointment of contractual employees without any rules would lead to a situation of exploitation by the employer. With this intent only, the Rules of 2022 have been framed and therefore, the benefit of the said rules cannot be denied to the petitioners and similarly situated persons merely on the count of having been appointed through placement agency.

41. In light of the aforesaid facts & findings and the judgments, this Court is of the opinion that Rule 3 of the Rules of 2022 has to be read harmoniously, whereby, the petitioners and similarly situated persons, who have been appointed through placement agency after issuance of public advertisement are to be covered under the ambit of Rule 3 of the Rules of 2022. Since, the above rule has been read harmoniously in favour of the petitioners, therefore, there is no requirement to decide question No. (b), which was framed under para 13. The harmonious reading of the Rule itself clarifies that, there ought to be no discrimination between the contractual employees appointed through placement agency as well as the



contractual employees appointed directly. 42. For the aforesaid reasons, the writ petitions are allowed in the following terms:

(i) The respondents shall consider the individual case of each contractual employee, appointed prior to enforcement of the Rules of 2022 strictly in accordance with Rule 3 of the Rules of 2022, meaning thereby, that if an employee has been appointed on a post created by the Administrative Department with the concurrence of the Finance Department and the appointment has been through issuance of a public advertisement further without there being any differentiation whether the public advertisement has been issued by the State Government or by the placement agency.

(ii) If the case of the individual is in conformation with the Rule 3 of the Rules of 2022, as interpreted above, then the benefit of the Rules of 2022 shall be extended to such petitioners.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petition is also disposed of in the light of decision rendered vide order dated 26.08.2025 passed in Rodu Lal's case (supra) on the same terms.

5. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J

6-nirmala/-