

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

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7628/2019

Jagdish Solanki S/o Shri Lal Chand, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Babu Laxman Singh Colony, Outside Third Pole, Mahamandir, Jodhpur- 342001.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Union Of India, Through The Finance Secretary, Ministry Of Finance, North Block, New Delhi- 110001.
2. Pr. Chief Commissioner Of Income-Tax, C.r. Building, Statue Circle, Jaipur- 302005.
3. Chief Commissioner Of Income-Tax, Paota, C-Road, Jodhpur- 342010.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Kshama Purohit

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Sunil Bhandari

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH**

Order

23/03/2026

1. Learned counsel for the parties jointly submit that the controversy involved in the present petition is no more res-integra and it is covered by the decision rendered by a Coordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court in **Jeewan Singh Gehlot & Ors. vs. The Union of India & Anr. (D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1783/2026)** decided on 28.01.2026. The judgment reads as under:-

"1. The petitioner seeks quashing of an order/judgment dated 29.03.2019 passed by learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Jodhpur whereby his claim to seek regularization, after having worked as casual/daily wages worker for periods lasting more than 10 years was rejected. Hence, the instant writ petition.

2. *At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the writ petitions filed by similarly situated other workers were disposed of by a common judgment dated 09.01.2026 rendered by Division Bench of this Court in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.5318/2025. Vide the said Division Bench judgment, petitioners therein were given liberty to pursue their cause with the Department in terms of the parameters enunciated therein. For ready reference, the operative portion of the Division Bench judgment is reproduced herein below:*

“11. In view of the above discussion and keeping in mind the ratio laid down in the above referred judgments rendered by Hon’ble Supreme Court, we are of the view that ends of justice will be met, if the cases of the petitioners for regularization are reconsidered by the respondent department taking into consideration the notification dated 17.01.2011 as well as other subsequent notifications, if any, holding the field and in the light of the authoritative pronouncements of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the cases of Jaggo, Shripal and Dharam Singh (supra).

12. Since, the petitioners are working under the respondent department for last more than 10 years, therefore, it is expected that the respondent department may reconsider the case of the petitioners for regularization of their services as one time measure keeping in mind the rules and regulations in vogue as also stand taken by it in other similar cases of regularization in other States of the Country.

13. Consequently, the writ petitions are allowed in the above terms. The order dated 06.12.2024 passed by the Tribunal is quashed and set aside.

14. The entire exercise shall be carried out by the respondent department expeditiously preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order, strictly in accordance with law.”

3. *Apropos, it transpires that the case of the petitioner arising out of the same common judgment, ibid, is para materia with the petitioner herein. Both the counsels are ad idem qua the same.*

4. *Accordingly the instant writ petition is also disposed of on the same terms as the Division Bench judgment dated 09.01.2026, supra. It is expected of the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner alongside the other similarly situated employees whose case is already under consideration.*

5. *Stay petition and pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.”*

2. In light of the aforequoted judgement, the present civil writ petition is disposed of in the same terms.

3. All pending applications also stand disposed of.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J

6-Love/-