

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6434/2026

1. Deepa Ram S/o Shri Maluka Ram, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Gaon Kanor, Tehsil Fatehgarh, District Jaisalmer.
2. Gaji Ram S/o Shri Dadu Ram, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Mukam Post Sihedar, Tehsil Fatehgarh, District Jaisalmer.
3. Smt. Dhai, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Mandha, Kheya, District Jaisalmer.
4. Banwari Lal S/o Shri Ratan Lal, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Gaon Deewali, Post Bhesara, Tehsil Atru, District Baran.
5. Smt. Mamta Kumari @ Mamta Bai W/o Shri Banwari Lal, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Gaon Deewali, Post Bhesara, Tehsil Atru, District Baran.
6. Smt. Sushila Bai W/o Late Shri Jaswant, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Gaon Nariya Mohallah, Post Shahbad, District Baran.
7. Vishnu Jatav S/o Shri Dablu Ram Jatav, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Purshotampura, Tehsil Shahbad, District Baran.
8. Smt. Sawita W/o Shri Vishnu Jatav, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Purshotampura, Sahol Aleti, Post Shahbad, Tehsil Shahbad, District Baran.
9. Ms. Sarita Verma D/o Shri Vinod Kumar, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Indra Colony, Rao Bapawar Kallan, Tehsil Sangod, District Kota.
10. Smt. Kamlesh Verma W/o Shri Santosh Kumar, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Rataikhurd, Chamarna Basti, Dhigwani, Tehsil Shahbad, District Baran.
11. Kalyan Singh S/o Shri Puna Ram, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Budanonera, Post Kaswanonera, Tehsil Shahbad, District Baran.
12. Smt. Sato Bai W/o Shri Kalyan Singh, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Budanonera, Post Kaswanonera, Tehsil Shahbad, District Baran.
13. Smt. Rukmani W/o Shri Prakash Chandra, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Gaon Data, Post Kelwara, Tehsil Shahbad,

District Baran.

14. Ram Singh S/o Shri Nathiya Ram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Gaon Baint, Post Shahbad, Tehsil Shahbad, District Baran.
15. Ravi Kumar Jatav S/o Shri Banwari Lal Jatav, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Mukam Rataikhurd, Post Dhikwani, Tehsil Shahbad, District Baran.
16. Smt. Rashmi W/o Shri Ravi Kumar Jatav, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Mukam Rataikhurd, Post Dhikwani, Tehsil Shahbad, District Baran.
17. Deepak Meena S/o Shri Ram Kailash Meena, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Gaon Morpa, Post Godalyaheri, Tehsil Ladpura, District Kota.
18. Anil Meena S/o Shri Ram Kailash Meena, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Gaon Morpa, Post Godalyaheri, Tehsil Ladpura, District Kota.
19. Sachin S/o Shri Satyanarayan, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Gaon Post Kethun, Tehsil Ladpura, District Kota.
20. Devendra Kumar S/o Shri Babu Lal, Aged About 32 Years, R/o 290, Kachri Mohallah, Deegodpar, Tehsil Kishanganj, District Baran.
21. Smt. Pushplata W/o Shri Devendra Kumar, Aged About 31 Years, R/o 290, Kachri Mohallah, Deegodpar, Tehsil Kishanganj, District Baran.
22. Bhanwar Lal S/o Shir Sardul Ram, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Batara Jhak, Tehsil Shiv, District Barmer.
23. Ramesh Kumar S/o Shri Shankar Lal, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Gaon Baitu Panji, Post Baitu, Tehsil Baitu, District Balotra.
24. Dharma Ram S/o Shri Ala Ram, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Gaon Trimoli, Post Gadra Road, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer.
25. Luna Ram S/o Shri Pata Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Mafuri Buthiya, Post Buthiya, Tehsil Ramsar, District Barmer.
26. Mukesh Kumar Bheel S/o Shri Punam Chand Bheel, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Gaon Jamun, Post Mandla, Tehsil Jhadol, District Udaipur.

27. Krishan Kumar Gamar S/o Shri Ramdas Gamar, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Gaon Amaliya, Post Amaliya, Tehsil Jhadol, District Udaipur.
28. Smt. Ramu Bai Gameti W/o Shri Onkar Lal Gameti, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Fanda Titardi, Tehsil Girwa, District Udaipur.
29. Smt. Kamla Gameti W/o Shri Jagannath Gameti, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Fanda Titardi, Tehsil Girwa, District Udaipur.
30. Achla Ram S/o Shri Ganga Ram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Lopli Chidiya, Post Chidiya, Tehsil Gida, District Balotra.
31. Smt. Nirmala Devi W/o Devi Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o 3140 Ward No. 1, Arat Ka Jaav, Sivana, District Balotra.
32. Smt. Champa Devi W/o Bhanwar Lal, Aged About 21 Years, R/o 2195 Ward No. 1, Sivana, District Balotra.
33. Smt. Suji Devi W/o Ghevar Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Arat Ka Jaav, Sivana, District Balotra.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Commissioner-Cum-Director And Secretary To Government, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Joint Director, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Udaipur.
3. The Joint Director, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Kota.
4. The Deputy Director, The Joint Director, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Barmer.
5. The District Probation And Social Welfare Officer, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Jaisalmer.
6. The District Probation And Social Welfare Officer, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Baran.
7. The District Probation And Social Welfare Officer, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Balotra.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Ayushi Solanki
For Respondent(s) : ----

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEET PUROHIT

Order

25/03/2026

1. At the request of the learned counsel for the petitioners, the matter has been heard for final disposal at the admission stage itself.
2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the facts in the present case is 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.
3. The relevant paragraphs of the order dated 26.08.2025 passed in the case of Rodu Lal (Supra) reads as follows:- operative portion of the order dated 26.08.2025 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.”

4. 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.

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

(SANJEET PUROHIT),J