

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4677/2026

Mukesh Kumar Salvi, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Bhandra Udaipur

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary
Department Of Revenue Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur
2. The Board Of Revenue Ajmer, Through Its Registrar
3. The District Collector, Pratapgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Jay Choudhary.

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE NUPUR BHATI

Order

24/02/2026

1. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner aggrieved against the order dated 23.0.2024 (Annex.2), whereby the petitioner has been placed under suspension.
2. The petitioner made representation, inter alia, indicating that already challan against the petitioner has been filed and despite passage of sufficiently long time, the petitioner has not been reinstated and, therefore, the order of suspension requires review and the petitioner deserves to be reinstated.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner with reference to judgment in ***Manvendra Singh v. State of Raj. & Ors.: SBCW No. 4276/2018, decided on 21.12.2018*** at Jaipur Bench submitted that the Court in the said judgment has dealt with the powers of the disciplinary authority under Rule 13(5) of the Rules of 1958 and appellate authority under Rule 22 of the Rules of

1958 and has held that the various circulars issued by the State Government laying down limitation to examine the revocation of suspension order after a period of three years from the date of suspension/after a period of one year from the date, the charge-sheet has been filed, was not justified and it was open for the authorities to examine the case for revocation of suspension even prior to the said periods fixed in the circular.

4. In the over all facts and circumstances of the case as projected as well as the law laid down by this Court in the case of Manvendra Singh (supra), the writ petition filed by the petitioner is disposed of, the respondent - disciplinary authority, is directed to decide the representations made by the petitioner in light of the judgment in the case of **Manvendra Singh (supra)**.

5. The needful may be done by the respondents within a period of four weeks from the date a copy of this order is placed by the petitioner.

6. The petitioner would be free to file a further representation alongwith requisite documents before the disciplinary authority.

7. The stay petition also stands disposed of accordingly.

(DR.NUPUR BHATI),J