



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

2026:RJ-JD:10101

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4830/2026

1. Sanjay Kumar Prajapati S/o Shri Ram Chander Prajapati, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Village Sunwasa, Tehsil And District Bundi.
2. Chandra Prakash S/o Shri Ram Narain Karad, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Ward No. 26, Rawla Chowk, Devpura, Bundi.
3. Tulsiram Choudhary S/o Shri Tajmal Choudhary, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Hattipura, Chatarpura, District Bundi.
4. Vishal Sharma S/o Shri Mukesh Sharma, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Namana, Bundi.
5. Diggi Raj Singh S/o Shri Ram Singh, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Sarsod, Gothra, Bundi.
6. Udai Raj Singh S/o Shri Devi Singh, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Sarsod, Gothra, District Bundi.
7. Sukhraj Saini S/o Shri Satyanarayan, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Maliyon Ka Mohalla, Mandawara, Amli, District Bundi.
8. Kalu Lal Gurjar S/o Shri Bhoja Ram, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Kachhola, Bundi.
9. Bantilal Jangid S/o Shri Mahaveer Prasad, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Jarkhoda, Tehsil Talera, District Bundi.
10. Ramvilash Gurjar S/o Shri Kajoda Lal Gurjar, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Ward No. 3, Jato Ka Mohalla, Ralri, Rajalawata, Bundi.
11. Hemraj Gurjar S/o Shri Heera Lal Gurjar, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Kumharla, Ronija, Bundi.
12. Amba Lal S/o Shri Prakash, Aged About 47 Years, Aarampura, Dhowara, Bundi.
13. Krishna Murari S/o Shri Chhotu Lal Meena, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Gurjniya, Phuleta, District Bundi.
14. Ghanshyam Kahar S/o Shri Jamana Lal Kahar, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Deloonda, Ajeta, District Bundi.
15. Jagdish Prasad Yadav S/o Shri Bhanwer Lal Yadav, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Dhabhaiyon Ka Nayagaon, Tehsil Hindoli, District Bundi.
16. Mahavir Singh Rathor S/o Shri Gopal Singh Rathor, Aged



About 50 Years, R/o Ward No. 11, Mahaveerpura, Lakheri, Bundi.

17. Mukesh Kumar Gurjar S/o Shri Ladu Lal Gurjar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Kariri, Bamangaon, Tehsil Nainwan, District Bundi.
18. Mukesh Kumar Gurjar S/o Shri Ram Prasad Gurjar, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Kariri, Bamangaon, Bundi.
19. Kailash Chand Chouhan S/o Shri Satyanarayan Chouhan, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Rajlavata, Nenwa, Bundi.
20. Hemant Kumar S/o Shri Madan Lal, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Dablana, Tehsil Hindoli, District Bundi.
21. Amit Goswami S/o Shri Pradeep Goswami, Aged About 37 Years, Ward No. 37, 114, Sikar Burj Area, Baanganga, Bundi.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Medical And Health Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Mission Director (Nhm), Directorate Of Medical Health And Family Welfare Services, Swasthya Bhawan, C-Scheme, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
3. The Director (Public Health), Medical And Health Services, Rajasthan, Swasthya Bhawan, C-Scheme, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
4. The Director (Non-Gazetted), Medical And Health Services, Rajasthan, Tilak Marg, Swasthya Bhawan, Jaipur.
5. The Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
6. The Secretary, Department Of Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
7. The Secretary, General Administration Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Bharat Singh Rathore



HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE NUPUR BHATI

Order

25/02/2026

1. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the facts in the present case are similar to the facts in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11737/2024 (**Rodu Lal & Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.**), decided on 26.08.2025.
2. The relevant paragraphs of the order dated 26.08.2025 passed in the case of *Rodu Lal (Supra)* reads as follows:-

"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.

43. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of."



3. In light of the order cited above, the present writ petition is disposed of in the same terms as in the case of **Rodu Lal & Ors. (supra)**. The petitioners shall be at liberty to make a representation before the concerned authorities within a period of 15 days. On such representation, the concerned authorities are directed to dispose of the same in light of the decision passed in case of *Rodu Lal* within a period of two months from the date of receipt of this order.

4. All the pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(DR.NUPUR BHATI),J

294-/Devesh/-