

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4294/2026

1. Rohtash S/o Shri Madu Ram, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Dhani Mauji, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu (Raj.).
2. Satyaveer Singh S/o Shri Sultan Meghwal, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Ward No. 4, Hameerwas, Bara, District Churu (Raj.).
3. Shishpal Singh S/o Shri Lochhman Puri, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Dhani Jeewangeer, Churu (Raj.).
4. Late Shri Ramswaroop Gurjar S/o Shri Hanuman Ram Gurjar, (Since Deceased)
5. Chhoti Devi W/o Late Shri Ramswaroop Gurjar, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Dandoo Mohansingh, District Churu (Raj.).
6. Dharampal S/o Shri Mohar Singh, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Bairasar Manjhla, District Churu (Raj.).
7. Shish Ram S/o Shri Tejaram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Thiimau Chhoti, Norangpura, District Churu (Raj.).
8. Ishwar Singh S/o Shri Kana Ram, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Dhani Mauji, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu (Raj.)

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariate, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Chief Engineer (Rural), Public Health Engineering Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariate, Jaipur (Raj.).
3. The Superintendent Engineer, Public Health Engineering Department, Churu (Raj.).
4. The Assistant Engineer, Public Health Engineering Department, Sadulpur, District Churu (Raj.).

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Hardik Gautam.

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE NUPUR BHATI

23/02/2026

Learned counsel. for the petitioners submits that the controversy, raised in the instant writ application, stands resolved in view of the opinion of a Co-ordinate Bench, at Principal Seat, Jodhpur, as SBCWP No. 3631/2008, (***Sohan Lal Mathur Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.***) decided on 17th November, 2008, and in the case of ***Ladulal Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.***; SBCWP No. 3583/2013, decided on 12th November, 2013.

It is further contended that the opinions aforesaid have been affirmed by the Division Bench in intra-court appeals so also Special Leave Petition instituted by the State-respondents was declined by the Supreme Court.

In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, for the present, the petitioners would be satisfied if the State-respondents are directed to consider the case of the petitioners for grant of same benefits, as accorded to ***Ladulal and Sohan Lal*** (supra).

In view of the limited prayer addressed; the instant writ proceedings are closed with a direction to the petitioners to address a comprehensive representation to the State-respondents enclosing copies of the orders in the case of ***Sohan Lal and Ladulal*** (Supra) along with relevant materials to substantiate the fact that the matter has attained finality; within two weeks hereinafter.

aforesaid

In case representation is so addressed within the aforesaid period, the State-respondents are directed to consider and decide

the same by a reasoned and speaking order as expeditiously as possible; preferably within two months from the date of receipt of the representation along with the relevant materials as well as a certified copy of this order.

Needless to observe that in case the claim of the petitioners is found admissible as in the case of ***Sohan Lal and Ladulal*** (Supra), the petitioners be also extended the same benefits.

With the observations and directions, as indicated above, the writ application stands disposed of.

(DR.NUPUR BHATI),J

175-pradeep/-