

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4303/2026

Naman Choudhary S/o Shri Ramesh Choudhary, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of Near Transport Company, Khariya Khangar, Tehsil- Bhopalgarh, District- Jodhpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Mines And Geology, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Mines And Geology Department, Udaipur.
3. The Superintending Mining Engineer, Mines And Geology Department, Ajmer.
4. The Mining Engineer, Mines And Geology Department, Nagaur.
5. The Assistant Mining Engineer, Mines And Geology, Gotan District Nagaur.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Sunil Purohit
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Mahaveer Bishnoi, AAG Mr. Gaurav Bishnoi

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEET PUROHIT

Order

23/03/2026

1. Present writ petition has been filed challenging order dated 30.01.2026 issued by Respondent No. 3, whereby, on the allegation that during inspection petitioner's vehicle was found not carrying a valid e-Ravanna/ETP, the Stockist ID of petitioner was deactivated on the same day while issuing notices.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a reply to the said notice has already been submitted before Assistant Mining Engineer, Gotan, District Nagaur.

3. Opposing present writ petition, learned AAG, Mr. Mahaveer Bishnoi submits that impugned action has been taken strictly in accordance with the guidelines dated 22.04.2022 issued by the Department of Mines and Geology, Government of Rajasthan, which expressly provide for deactivation of the Stockist ID in cases of irregularities as contemplated under Clause 9(XII) of the said guidelines.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent further submits that the petitioner has an efficacious alternative remedy under the said guidelines by way of submitting representation before the Superintending Mining Engineer. It is further submitted that, in the event such a representation is filed, the same shall be duly considered and decided in accordance with law.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the penalty amount has already been deposited by petitioner. It is also submitted that, pursuant to the allegations in question, an FIR was lodged; however, in the proceedings, no specific role has been attributed to petitioner.

5. This Court is of the opinion that, since an efficacious alternative remedy is available to the petitioner under the applicable guidelines, the same ought to be availed. The grounds raised in the present writ petition may also be urged by the petitioner in such representation, and the Superintending Mining Engineer shall consider and decide the same strictly in accordance with law.

6. Consequently, present writ petition is **disposed of** with liberty to petitioner to file a detailed representation before the Superintending Mining Engineer, Ajmer, within a period of seven

days from today. In the event such a representation is filed, the same shall be considered and decided by the said authority within a period of ten days from the date of its receipt, strictly in accordance with law.

7. Accordingly, stay petition and all other pending applications, if any, also stand **disposed of**.

(SANJEET PUROHIT),J

47-yagya/-