

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5238/2025

Vijay Prakash Sharma  
-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan  
-----Respondent

Connected With

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13194/2024

Vijay Prakash Sharma  
-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan  
-----Respondent

---

|                   |   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner(s) | : | Mr. Vikas Balia, Senior Counsel with<br>Mr. Karan Singh Rathore and<br>Mr. Manish Bhargava (in SBCWP<br>No. 5238)<br>Mr. L.S. Udawat (in SBCWP<br>No. 13194/2024)<br>Mr. Shreyash Ramdev<br>Mr. Priyanshu Gopa |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Mr. I.R. Choudhary, AAG<br>Mr. Kuldeep Singh Solanki<br>Mr. Manish Patel<br>Mr. Prakash Choudhary<br>Mr. Divik Mathur<br>Mr. Avdhesh Kumar Meena, BDO,<br>Raipur, present in person                            |

---

**JUSTICE DINESH MEHTA**

**Order**

**27/03/2025 (Amended vide order dated 01.04.2025)**

1. The then Block Development Officer, Mr. Avdhesh Kumar Meena has furnished his explanation.
2. Mr. Manish Patel, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the the Block Development Officer prays for and is granted four

weeks' time to complete his instructions and come out with a satisfactory explanation.

3. List these cases on 24.04.2025, as prayed.
4. On the next date of hearing, Mr. Avdhesh Kumar Meena, BDO need not remain present.
5. Mr. I.R. Choudhary, learned Additional Advocate General submitted that on 06.03.2025, the Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Raipur had written a letter to the petitioner to take the record, but he has not taken.
6. Mr. L.S. Udawat, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that since the matter was pending before the Court, the petitioner refused to accept the record under an apprehension that it will prejudice his pending litigation.
7. Considering that the work is stopped and the petitioner has to file his response to notice, subject to just objection of the petitioner, this Court directs the petitioner to accept the record and proceed in accordance with law.
8. Interim order dated 06.03.2025 shall continue till then.

**(DINESH MEHTA),J**