

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6769/2026

Anopa Ram S/o Shri Samarth Ram Meghwal, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 04, Barmer Road, N.h. 15 Meghwalo Ka Bas, Dabla, Village And Post Dabla, District Jaisalmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Commissioner-Cum-Director And Secretary To The Government, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Probation And Social Welfare Officer, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Jaisalmer.
3. The Assistant Director, Child Empowerment Department, Jalore.
4. The District Probation And Social Welfare Officer, Social Justice And Empowerment Department, Balotra.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Sushil Solanki
For Respondent(s)	:	

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FARJAND ALI

Order

27/03/2026

1. At the request of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the matter has been heard for final disposal at the admission stage itself.
2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner 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 ontractual 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 ssued 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 petitioner 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.

(FARJAND ALI),J