



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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9944/2026

Nirma Kanwar D/o Shri Bhom Singh, Aged About 30 Years, R/o
Ward No. 1, Pardoli Badi, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Through Its Secretary,
Agriculture Management Institute Building, Durgapura, Jaipur,
Rajasthan.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. K.R. Saharan

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Manish Patel

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Order

22/05/2026

1. Petitioner has preferred the instant writ petition with the following
prayer:-

"A. By an appropriate writ, order or direction, the impugned rejection communication in mode of Email dated 12.02.2026 (Annex-7) may kindly be quashed and set aside.

B. By an appropriate writ, order or direction, respondent-Board may kindly be directed to correct/rectify the petitioner's category from "Married" to "Widow (General EWS)" in the online application form (Annex-2) submitted pursuant (Annex-1). to advertisement dated 12.12.2024.

C. By an appropriate writ, order or direction directing the respondent-board to consider the candidature of the petitioner under the correct category i.e. General EWS Widow category and include her in the further stages of selection process, including document verification and appointment, otherwise eligible and meritorious. if found D. By an appropriate writ, order or direction directing the respondents to revise the merit position of the petitioner in accordance with her correct category and grant all consequential benefits arising therefrom.

E. Any other appropriate writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may kindly be passed in favour of the petitioners.

F. Writ petition filed by the petitioners may kindly be allowed with costs."

2 . The respondent-Selection Board issued an advertisement dated 12.12.2024 inviting online applications for the post of Class IV Employees in TSP and Non-TSP areas, prescribing eligibility, reservation categories, and the application procedure. The petitioner, a bona fide resident of Non-TSP Area, District Sikar, belonging to the General (EWS) Widow Category and holding a valid EWS Certificate, applied being fully eligible.

2.1: The petitioner submitted her online application on 25.04.2025 within time through E-Mitra. Owing to an inadvertent, bona fide mistake by the E-Mitra operator, her marital status was wrongly entered as "Married" instead of "Widow." Relying in good faith on the correctness of the form, she remained unaware of the error.

Para 2.2: She was issued Admit Card (Roll No. 3503582) and appeared in the written examination held on 21.09.2025 at MGS Government School, Gokulpura, District Sikar.

2.3: Although the respondents allowed candidates an opportunity to correct errors in their forms within a stipulated period, the petitioner, unaware of the wrong entry and believing her form correctly submitted, could not avail of it.

2.4: The merit list showed the petitioner at Serial No. 1637556 with 25.2656 marks. However, she was wrongly considered under the "Married Category" instead of the "General EWS Widow Category" due to the clerical error. The cut-off for the General EWS Widow Category was only 0.017 marks; having scored far above it, she would have been within the zone of selection under the correct category. Thus, solely because of the inadvertent mistake, she was deprived of selection.

2.5: On learning of the discrepancy after the result, the petitioner emailed a representation to the respondents on 08.02.2026 seeking

correction of her category from "Married" to "Widow," enclosing supporting documents including her Marriage Certificate and her husband's Death Certificate dated 01.03.2023. No action was taken.

2.6: Her further representation seeking reconsideration was rejected by email dated 12.02.2026 on the ground that no change of category is permissible after declaration of the result under the Rajasthan Staff Selection Board rules. The respondents did not consider the bona fide nature of the error or the documentary evidence.

2.7: Document verification is still ongoing and opportunities are being given to other candidates, yet the petitioner has been denied any opportunity to rectify the error or to participate under the correct category. This denial of correction of a bona fide clerical mistake is said to be arbitrary, unjust, and violative of Articles 14 and 16, especially as the petitioner is fully eligible and meritorious and no third-party prejudice would result.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the refusal to correct the inadvertent error is arbitrary, illegal, and violative of Articles 14 and 16. The petitioner is fully eligible under the General EWS Widow Category and was denied consideration solely due to the E-Mitra operator's bona fide clerical mistake.

3.1: The error in stating marital status is merely technical and curable, especially as the petitioner held all valid documents proving her widow status before submitting the form. She submitted representations with supporting documents immediately on learning of the mistake, but the respondents rejected her claim on hyper-technical grounds.

3.2: The petitioner scored 25.2656 marks against a cut-off of only 0.017 marks for the General EWS Widow Category and would have been within the zone of selection under the correct category. Technical

mistakes should not defeat the substantive rights of an otherwise eligible and meritorious candidate, particularly where no third-party prejudice would arise and the recruitment process is ongoing.

4. Per contra, learned Counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner consciously applied under the "Married" category and participated in the selection accordingly. The Board granted candidates multiple opportunities to rectify errors on payment of the prescribed fee, but the petitioner never sought correction at the relevant stage. The petition was filed only after the result, upon her finding herself unsuccessful in her chosen category.

4.1: The petitioner was herself negligent in not verifying the entries in her application form, admit card, and other documents, all of which reflected her category as "Married," yet she participated in the examination without objection. Her plea of inadvertence cannot be accepted at this belated stage.

4.2: Reliance is placed on Arvind Singh v. State of Rajasthan (SBCWP No. 11520/2023, decided 09.02.2024), holding that once a candidate consciously participates under a particular category and fails to seek correction despite opportunities, no change of category is permissible after the result, and the rules of the game cannot be changed after the selection process commences. Dismissal of the petition is therefore sought.

5. Against this backdrop, having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, I find that the respondent-Board admittedly afforded candidates repeated opportunities to correct errors in their online application forms. Despite the availability of these opportunities, the petitioner did not seek correction of her category at any stage before the result was declared.

6. The petitioner participated in the entire recruitment process under the "Married" category without demur. The admit card issued to her reflected that very category, yet she raised no objection at the relevant time and proceeded to sit the examination. The grievance now raised, only after declaration of the result, appears to be an afterthought, prompted by her realisation that she could have secured selection under a different category.

7. The petitioner seeks to characterise the error as bona fide and clerical. Even accepting that the wrong entry originated in an operator's mistake, the difficulty is that the Board provided adequate opportunity to detect and correct precisely such mistakes, and the petitioner, on whom the responsibility to verify her own application, admit card, and category ultimately rested, failed to avail of it at every available stage. A clerical error, however innocent in origin, does not by itself confer a right to correction after the result is out; the law affords a window for rectification, and a candidate who lets that window pass cannot reopen it once the outcome is known. The principle that the rules of the game cannot be altered after the process has begun applies with equal force here.

8. A candidate who remains negligent throughout the selection process, and stirs only upon being declared unsuccessful, cannot thereafter invoke the equitable and discretionary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution. Equity assists the vigilant, not those who sleep over their rights. The petitioner having approached the Court only after the result, and that too on a ground she had every opportunity to raise earlier, the discretionary relief sought cannot be granted.

9. For the foregoing reasons, the writ petition is dismissed. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA),J

52-KP Singh Dewasi/
Dhananjay Sharma/-