



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



S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4715/2026

Ram Kumar Meghwal S/o Shri Adu Ram Meghwal, Aged About 47
Years, Resident Of Near Chotina Kua, Bhinasar, Bikaner.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary,
Department Of Social Justice And Empowerment,
Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Department Of Social Justice And
Empowerment, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Dy. Director, Department Of Social Justice And
Empowerment, Chopra, Katla Rani Bazaar, Bikaner.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Sushil Solanki

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE NUPUR BHATI

Order

24/02/2026

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of
the Constitution of India with the following prayers:

“xxxxx

i) by an appropriate writ, order or directions, the
respondents be directed to regularize the services of the
petitioner w.e.f.1.7.1997 in light of the judgment of the
Hon'ble Supreme Court in light of the judgment of the
Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Mod Singh.

ii) By an appropriate writ, order or directions, the
respondents be directed to give remuneration to the
petitioner directly through the Department instead of
placement agency.

iii) By an appropriate writ, order or directions, in the
alternative and without prejudice to the above, the
respondents be directed to give minimum of the pay-scale
to the petitioner.

xxxxxx”

3. The facts of the case, briefly stated, are that the petitioner
was initially appointed on 01.10.1991 on the post of Cook-cum-



Class IV against a vacant post. He continued in service up to 01.05.1993 and thereafter, by order dated 06.05.1993, his engagement was extended up to 31.03.1994. However, with effect from 01.04.1994, his services came to be terminated.

3.1. Aggrieved by the said termination, the petitioner raised an industrial dispute before the Labour Court, Bikaner. The learned Labour Court, Bikaner, vide its judgment and award dated 29.10.2004, allowed the claim petition and directed reinstatement of the petitioner with continuity of service. In pursuance of the said award, the petitioner was reinstated vide order dated 19.06.2006 and he joined duties on 01.07.2006.

3.2. It is the specific case of the petitioner that once continuity of service has been granted and his services are liable to be counted from the initial date of appointment, i.e. 01.10.1991, he is entitled to the consequential benefits. It has also been pleaded in the writ petition that though the petitioner was appointed by the respondent-Department and has been discharging duties with it since 01.10.1991, his remuneration is being disbursed through a placement agency and being aggrieved thereof, petitioner prefers this writ petition.

4. Counsel representing the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed on the post of Cook-cum-Class IV Employee against a vacant post and continued his services thereafter and in the meantime, service of the petitioner was terminated and by way of the award passed by the Labour Court at Bikaner, petitioner was reinstated in service vide order dated 19.06.2006. He submits that since 2006, petitioner is working regularly with the respondents, however, has not been regularized



till date. He submits that the controversy involved in the present writ petition stands squarely covered by the order dated 23.03.2022 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court at Jaipur Bench, Jaipur, in **SBCWP No.1030/2013 : "Parmeshwar Lal v. The Director Social Justice and Empowerment Department & Anr."**; wherein, the Coordinate Bench allowed the writ petition, quashed the impugned order and directed respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for regularization of the service. He, thus, submits that the petitioner would be satisfied if the respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner in light of the order dated 23.03.2022 passed by the Coordinate Bench in the case of **Parmeshwar Lal (supra)**.

5. Thus, in view of the prayer so made by counsel for the petitioner, this Court deems it appropriate to grant liberty to the petitioner to file a detailed representation before the respondents for ventilating his grievances within a period of '10 days' from today. In case such representation is filed by the petitioner, the respondents are directed to consider and decide the same within a period of 'four weeks' thereafter, by passing a speaking order, strictly in accordance with law, while also keeping in mind the order dated 23.03.2022 passed by the Coordinate Bench in the case of **Parmeshwar Lal (supra)**.

6. It is made clear that aforesaid direction to decide the representation of the petitioner has been issued only with a view to ensure expeditious redressal of petitioner's grievance. The same may not be construed to be an order to decide the representation in a particular manner.



7. The order instant has been passed based on the submissions made by counsel in the petition, the respondents would be at liberty to examine the veracity of the submissions made in the petition and only in case the averments made therein are found to be correct/true, the petitioner would be entitled to the relief prayed for.

8. With the aforesaid observation and direction, the instant writ petition stands disposed of. Stay application as well as all other pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(DR.NUPUR BHATI),J

322-/Devesh Thanvi/-