

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6491/2026
CNR: RJHC010285742026
URN: CW / 11905U / 2026

Seeta Kumari Ninama W/o Late Shri Dhuliram Maida, D/o Shri Kanji Ninama, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Padoli Gordhan, Ghatol, Banswara (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Secretary, Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Rajya Kishi Prabandh Sansthan Parisar, Durgapura, Jaipur (Raj.)

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. C.R. Choudhary for Mr. Devendra Sanwalot
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manish Patel

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE NUPUR BHATI

Order

07/07/2026

1. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayers:-

“It is, therefore, respectfully prayed that Your Lordship may be pleased to allow this writ petition and by an appropriate writ, order or directions respondents may be directed to correct the category of the petitioner and treat her under the category of ST-WD instead of ST and accordingly he may be appointed on the post of Class Fourth Employee under Class Fourth Employee Recruitment 2024. Any other appropriate order which is deemed just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may kindly be also passed”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner, belonging to the Scheduled Tribe (ST) category as per the caste certificate

dated 30.01.2026 issued by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Ghatol (Banswara), is a widow following the demise of her husband, late Shri Dhuliram Maida, on 10.09.2022 (Death Certificate dated 07.10.2022). Being fully eligible, she applied online via an E-Mitra kiosk on 12.04.2025 for the Class-IV Employee Direct Recruitment-2024 advertised by the respondents. However, due to an inadvertent oversight by the E-Mitra operator, who failed to query her marital status, her category was erroneously recorded merely as "ST/TSP-ST" instead of "ST-Widow (ST-WD)". Consequently, her provisional E-Admission Card for the written examination held on 21.09.2025 reflected only the general ST category. Although the petitioner secured 26.2224 marks in the final results, which is substantially higher than the ST-Widow cut-off score of 0.0033, she has been deprived of selection and appointment solely due to this minor typographical error. Hence, this petition has been preferred.

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the respondents submits that this writ petition has been filed by the petitioner for seeking amendment in the application form as the petitioner inadvertently filled her category as "ST/TSP-ST" instead of "ST-Widow (ST-WD)".

4. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the issue involved in the writ petition is squarely covered by the order passed in **Munni Devi Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors. (SBCWP No. 4599/2026)**, decided on 01.04.2026, wherein, this Court has held as under:

"8. Upon perusal of the admit card on record, it is evident that the petitioner was issued an admit card (Annexure-5), wherein her category was clearly indicated as "OBC Widow." Therefore, the contention of the

petitioner that the incorrect mention of her category came to her notice only upon publication of the merit list cannot be accepted, as the admit card itself explicitly reflected her category as "OBC Widow." Consequently, it is apparent that the petitioner was well aware, at that stage itself, that her category had been wrongly recorded as "OBC" instead of "General".

9. Despite having knowledge of the aforesaid inadvertent error, the petitioner failed to avail the second opportunity granted by the respondents for making necessary corrections, as provided through the press note dated 07.10.2025 (as reflected in the additional affidavit filed today, i.e., 01.04.2026). Furthermore, the petitioner has not averred specific pleadings in the writ petition explaining as to why, despite being afforded two opportunities to rectify/amend the application form, she failed to avail the same. The absence of any plausible explanation clearly indicates negligence on her part, for reasons best known to her.

10. This Court also takes into consideration Clause 17 (i) of the advertisement dated 12.12.2024 (Annex-3), which unambiguously provides that in case any amendment/rectification in the application form is required, candidates may make such corrections upon deposit of Rs. 300/- within a period of seven days from the cut-off date for submission of the application form. The said clause is reproduced hereunder:

"17. ऑनलाईन आवेदन में संशोधन की प्रक्रिया: बोर्ड द्वारा ऑनलाईन आवेदन में संशोधन हेतु कोई ऑफलाईन प्रार्थना पत्र स्वीकार नहीं किया जायेगा। बोर्ड द्वारा जारी विज्ञप्ति दिनांक 14.07.2023 द्वारा यदि किसी अभ्यर्थी को अपने OTR में स्वयं के नाम, पिता के नाम जन्मतिथि एवं लिंग में परिवर्तन करना है तो उसे सर्वप्रथम अपने आधार / जनआधार में परिवर्तन करवाना होगा तत्पश्चात् OTR स्क्रीन पर फेच का बटन दबाना होगा जिससे आधार / जनआधार में दर्ज नवीन डाटा उसके OTR में स्वतः ही आ जायेगा। अभ्यर्थी को अपने OTR में आरक्षण श्रेणी, दिव्यांगजन श्रेणी एवं मूल निवास में टांछित संशोधन करने की अनुमति दी गयी है। अभ्यर्थी संशोधन करने के उपरान्त ही ऑनलाईन आवेदन भरें। यदि अभ्यर्थी भर्ती का ऑनलाईन आवेदन सबमिट कर चुका है तो ऐसी स्थिति में ऑनलाईन आवेदन में संशोधन करने को अवधि के दौरान भी उसे : स्वयं के नाम, पिता के नाम, जन्मतिथि एवं लिंग में परिवर्तन की अनुमति नहीं होगी। अभ्यर्थी को यदि आरक्षण श्रेणी / दिव्यांगजन श्रेणी / मूल निवास में संशोधन करने है तो पहले उसे OTR पेज पर आरक्षण श्रेणी/दिव्यांगजन श्रेणी / मूल निवास में संशोधन करना होगा इससे उसे स्वयं के ऑनलाईन आवेदन में पूर्व में भरें गये आरक्षण श्रेणी/ दिव्यांगजन श्रेणी / मूल निवास में संशोधन करने का विकल्प उपलब्ध हो जायेगा, जिसे उपयोग में लेकर वह वांछित संशोधन कर सकता है। ऑनलाईन आवेदन Submit किये जाने के पश्चात् यदि आवेदक को किसी प्रकार की त्रुटि का पता लगता है तो अभ्यर्थी ऑनलाईन आवेदन में फोटो, हस्ताक्षर एवं उन सूचनाओं को परिवर्तित नहीं कर पाएगा जो उसने OTR के समय दर्ज की है। शेष सूचनाओं में वह संशोधन निम्नानुसार कर सकता है:-

(i). यदि कोई अभ्यर्थी अपने ऑनलाईन आवेदन में संशोधन कराना चाहता है तो आवेदन प्राप्ति की अंतिम दिनांक के पश्चात् 07 दिवस के भीतर निर्धारित शुल्क 300/- रुपये देकर ऑनलाईन आवेदन में संशोधन कर सकता है। ऑनलाईन आवेदन में अभ्यर्थी फोटो, हस्ताक्षर एवं उन सूचनाओं को परिवर्तित नहीं कर पाएगा जो उसने OTR के समय दर्ज की है यथा नाम,

पिता का नाम, जन्मतिथि, लिंग इत्यादि। शेष प्रविशिष्टियों में संशोधन किया जा सकेगा। शैक्षणिक योग्यता में अभ्यर्थी अंतिम तिथि के पश्चात् 07 दिवस में ही संशोधन कर सकते हैं। इसके पश्चात् शैक्षणिक योग्यता के कॉलम में बोर्ड / विश्वविद्यालय का नाम, रोल नं.. उत्तीर्ण वर्ष इत्यादि में कोई संशोधन नहीं कर सकेगा। बोर्ड द्वारा जारी कार्यालय आदेश दिनांक 27.07. 2023 के अनुसार ऑनलाईन आवेदन के लिये One Time Registration (OTR) में शैक्षणिक योग्यता में केवल मात्र एकबारीय संशोधन की अनुमति दी गयी है। सर्वप्रथम अभ्यर्थी अपने OTR में शैक्षणिक योग्यता में वांछित संशोधन कर लें। अभ्यर्थी संशोधन करने के उपरान्त ही ऑनलाईन आवेदन भरें। यदि अभ्यर्थी भर्ती का ऑनलाइन आवेदन सबमिट कर चुका है तो ऐसी स्थिति में अभ्यर्थी को शैक्षणिक योग्यता में संशोधन करने हेतु पहले, CTR पेज पर स्वयं की शैक्षणिक योग्यता में संशोधन करना होगा इससे उस शैक्षणिक योग्यता में संशोधन करते का टिकल स्वयं के ऑनलाईन आवेदन में ऑनलाईन आवेदन को संशोधित करने की अवधि के दौरान उपलब्ध रहेगा, जिसे उपयोग में लेकर यह शैक्षणिक योग्यता में वांछित संशोधन कर सकता है। ऑनलाईन आवेदन में संशोधन हेतु निर्धारित फीस जमा कराने की प्रक्रिया ऑनलाईन आवेदन करने की प्रक्रिया के समान ही होगी।

ii. यदि किसी अभ्यर्थी के ऑनलाईन आवेदन में त्रुटि रह जाती है तथा यह किसी कारणवश आवेदन करने की अंतिम दिनांक के पश्चात् 7 दिवस के भीतर अपने ऑनलाईन आवेदन में संशोधन नहीं कर पाता है तो उसे अपने ऑनलाईन आवेदन में संशोधन करने का एक ओर अंतिम अवसर परीक्षा आयोजन के पश्चात् ऑनलाईन त्रुटि संशोधन हेतु एक निश्चित समय दिया जायेगा जिसमें अभ्यर्थी अपने ऑनलाईन आवेदन की त्रुटि को ऑनलाईन संशोधन कर सकेगा। ऑनलाईन आवेदन में संशोधन हेतु दिनांक एवं समय की सूचना पृथक से बोर्ड की वेबसाइट के माध्यम से दी जायेगी। उक्त निर्धारित समय में अभ्यर्थी अपने ऑनलाईन आवेदन में निर्धारित संशोधन शुल्क 300/- रुपये ऑनलाईन आवेदन करने की प्रक्रिया के समान भुगतान कर संशोधन कर सकेगा।

iii. इसके पश्चात् ऑनलाईन आवेदन में किसी प्रकार का संशोधन / परिवर्तन स्वीकार नहीं किया जायेगा तथा ऐसी किसी भी त्रुटि का सम्पूर्ण दायित्व अभ्यर्थी का होगा।”

11. It is not in dispute that the respondents had provided multiple opportunities to the candidates to rectify errors in their online application forms. Initially, a correction window was made available under Clause 17(i) of the advertisement. Thereafter, in terms of Clause 17(ii), a further and final opportunity was envisaged even after the conduct of the examination, subject to notification of a specific time period by the Board. In addition, the respondents also issued a press note dated 07.10.2025, permitting candidates to carry out necessary corrections during the period from 06.10.2025 to 16.10.2025, thereby ensuring that no candidate suffers on account of bona fide mistakes. However, despite being aware of the incorrect reflection of her category, the petitioner failed to avail any of the opportunities so provided. Such inaction cannot be overlooked, particularly when the scheme of the recruitment process places a clear obligation upon the candidate to remain vigilant and to correct any errors within the stipulated time.

12. This Court has considered the view taken by the order dated 10.03.2026 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court at Jaipur Bench by the order dated 10.03.2026 in the case of Nirmala vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr. (S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4373/2026), wherein it

has been categorically held that a candidate cannot be permitted to alter his/her category after the closure of the stipulated correction window in the online application process with the emphasis that in the present era of large-scale recruitment, involving thousands of applicants, the selection process is predominantly technology-driven, and any deviation or post facto correction would lead to serious administrative inconvenience and delay. The relevant paragraph of the order is reproduced hereunder:-

“5. It is settled proposition of law as held by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court at Principal Seat, Jodhpur in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15900/2021 (Mustak Khan vs. The Rajasthan High Court Jodhpur & Ors.), the relevant portion of the aforesaid order is reproduced as hereunder:-

“5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents while relying on the judgment of this Court in Sunil Bhanwariya v. Registrar, Examination Cell, RHC, Jodhpur & Anr. submits that the petitioner having participated in the preliminary examination in the General category cannot raise this issue at belated stage after declaration of the result for the post of District Judge. 8. In the considered opinion of this Court, having participated in the examination and knowing that he has applied in the General category, he cannot be allowed to change his category from General to OBC (NCL) category. No prima facie case is made out by the petitioner. He did not file any proof to the effect that he made any endeavour to change his category in the application form from General to OBC (NCL).”

13. This Court has considered the view of the Hon’ble Division Bench in Piyush Kaviya and others versus Rajasthan Public Service Commission and others (D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 198/2018), wherein it has been held that in large-scale public recruitment, the process is necessarily technology-driven and structured around strict timelines, with specific opportunities provided to candidates to rectify errors through a correction window. The relevant paragraph of the aforesaid judgment is reproduced hereunder:-

“29. It needs to be highlighted that seeking public employment the number of applicants swell into thousands for every appointment offered. The cumbersome process of processing the applications manually and at each stage of the selection process manual intervention being time consuming, aid of technology is being taken. On-line applications are being received. Opportunities to correct mistakes in the on-line application forms are provided by opening a window period. When the window period closes, the forms, applications etc. as amended are processed. The computer generates the admit

cards. The results of the examination are fed in the computer for various categories of posts and in the instant case, the number being 30, select list based on merits and categories are generated by the computer. The candidates need to be vigilant and specially when, as in the instant advertisement, they were cautioned time and again to check their particulars and a window period within which corrections could be made was made available to the candidates.

30. Whilst it may be true that every endeavour should be made to induct meritorious candidates but at the same time administrative inconvenience caused by permitting applicants to correct errors committed by them has to be kept in mind. It serves public interest that appointments to civil posts are made as early as possible."

14. In view of the aforesaid facts and the settled legal position, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner, despite having clear knowledge of the incorrect reflection of her category at the stage of issuance of the admit card, failed to avail the first opportunity that was provided before the issuance of admit card that is seven days from the date of the cut off date i. e. 19.04.2025 of the application form and second opportunity was given after the date of issuance of admit card by way of press note dated 07.10.2025 during the period from 06.10.2025 to 16.10.2025, both the opportunities expressly provided by the respondents for correction of the application form. The recruitment process, being strictly governed by notified conditions and timelines, casts a duty of due diligence and vigilance upon the candidates, which the petitioner has failed to discharge. The law laid down by the Co-ordinate Bench as well as the Hon'ble Division Bench in Piyush Kaviya (supra) clearly mandates that no post facto modification can be permitted after closure of the correction window, as the same would disrupt the sanctity and finality of a technology-driven selection process and cause administrative inconvenience.

15. In such circumstances, this Court finds no justification to exercise its writ jurisdiction in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merit, deserves to be and is hereby dismissed."

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to refute the fact that the issue involved is squarely in the case of Munni Devi (supra).

6. Thus, the writ petition is dismissed in the same terms as in the case of Munni Devi (supra).

(DR.NUPUR BHATI),J