



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

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 357/2026

CNR: RJHC010190672026 | URN: SAW / 612U / 2026

Topa Ram S/o Shri Jetha Ram, Aged About 72 Years, Ro Ward No 7 Opp Panchyat Samiti Bheelon Ka Bass Pokran District Jaisalmer Rajasthan.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Miss. Shruti Sharma, Managing Director Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jaipur.
2. Mr Om Prakash Paliwal, Chief Manager Depot Manager Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation Phalodi Depot (Raj.).

----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 233/2025

CNR: RJHC010166502025 | URN: SAW / 329U / 2025

Loon Dan S/o Shri Shri Bhagwan, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Maderna Colony, Mandore Road, Behind Krashi Mandi, Mahadev Gali, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Shri Rajeshwar Singh, The Managing Director, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jaipur.
2. Sh. Swati Mehta, The Chief Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Pali, Depot, Pali.
3. Sh. Kuldeep Sharma, The Chief Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jodhpur Depot, Jodhpur.
4. Smt. Ruchi Panwar, The Chief Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jodhpur Depot, Jodhpur.
5. Sh. Pravesh Borana, The Chief Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jalore Depot, Jalore.
6. Sh. Parmeshwar Lal Saini, The Chief Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Sardar Shahar Depot, Churu.

----Respondents

**D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 446/2025**

CNR: RJHC010254022025 | URN: SAW / 670U / 2025

Vijay Kumar S/o Ram Karan Jangid, Aged About 72 Years, R/o Jangid Bhawan, Sevasadan School, Gali No. 2 Kaga Colony Via - Mahamandir Jodhpur Rajasthan.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mr. Kuldeep Ranka, Managing Director, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Parivahan Marg, Chomu House, Jaipur.
2. Mr Lal Chand Chandak, Chief Manager/depot Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jodhpur Depot, (Raj.).

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 797/2025

CNR: RJHC010295442025 | URN: SAW / 1446U / 2025

Bhanwar Lal Bishnoi S/o Puna Ram, Aged About 65 Years, Village And Post Birani Tehsil Bhopalgarh, Dist. Jodhpur.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Smt. Suchi Sharma, The Managing Director Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jaipur.
2. Birma Ram Beda, The Chief Manager Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jodhpur Depot, Jodhpur.
3. Miss. Ruchi Panwar, The Chief Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Falna Depot, Pali.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1438/2025

CNR: RJHC010521962025 | URN: SAW / 2686U / 2025

Ramniwas Choudhary S/o Shri Ugma Ram Ji, Aged About 69 Years, Resident Of Village Rajapura, Tehsil Degana, District Nagaur (Raj.).

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mr. Sanwar Mal Verma, Managing Director, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jaipur.
2. Mr. Sukhpal Binoliya, Chief Manager/depot Manager,



Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Ajmer Depot,

-----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1757/2025

CNR: RJHC010521132025 | URN: SAW / 3137U / 2025

Ghanshyam Singh Rawal S/o Shri Shaitan Singh, Aged About 67 Years, R/o Sant Dham Road, Guron Ka Talab, Kamla Nehru Nagar, Jodhpur (Raj.).

-----Appellant

Versus

1. Mr. Sanwar Mal Verma, Managing Director, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jaipur.
2. Mr. Birma Ram Bera, Chief Manager / Depot Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jodhpur Depot, (Raj.).

-----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 191/2026

CNR: RJHC010050992026 | URN: SAW / 325U / 2026

Rajendra Singh Chhaba S/o Shri Ram Karan Singh, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Village Post Sarmaliya, Tehsil Beawar, District Ajmer (Raj.).

-----Appellant

Versus

1. Mr. Rajeshwar Singh, Managing Director, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Jaipur.
2. Mr. Raghuveer Singh Rajawat, Chief Manager / Depot Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Beawar Depot.

-----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 241/2026

CNR: RJHC010163312026 | URN: SAW / 394U / 2026

Mahender Singh Tanwar S/o Ranjeet Singh Tanwar, Aged About 62 Years, R/o 327 Main Road Hanuman Chowk, Shakti Nagar, Ward No. 9 Purani Aabadi Sri Ganganagar, District- Sri Ganganagar (Rajasthan).

-----Appellant

Versus



1. Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Through Its Chairman, Chomu House, Parivahan Marg, Near Civil Lines, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Managing Director, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Chomu House, Parivahan Marg, Near Civil Lines, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Financial Advisor, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Head Office Chomu House, Parivahan Marg, Jaipur.
4. Depot Manager, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Depot Manager, Sri Ganganagar.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 356/2026

CNR: RJHC010186522026 | URN: SAW / 611U / 2026

Kalu Lal Paliwal S/o Shri Gotu Lal Paliwal, Aged About 75 Years, R/o Santosh Tent Ke Pichhe Digamber Jain Mandir Ke Pass Station Road Kankroli District Rajsamand. (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mr. Naveen Jain, The Managing Director Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation Head Office Chomu House Parivahan Marg Jaipur.
2. Mr Mahesh Upadhyay, Chief Manager Depot Manager Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation Udaipur Depot District Udaipur. Rajasthan.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 610/2026

CNR: RJHC010295812025 | URN: SAW / 1131U / 2026

Salim Khan Pathan S/o Meharban Khan, Aged About 68 Years, Near Bari Darwaja Masjid Benganpura Gangapur District Bhilwara (Raj.).

----Appellant

Versus

1. Smt. Suchi Sharma, Managing Director, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Head Office, Chonu House, Parivahan Marg, Jaipur.
2. Mr Om Prakash Chechani, Chief Manager/depot Manager,



Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Bhilwara
Depot District Bhilwara.(Raj.).

3. Rajasthan Stateroad Transport Corporation, Manging
Director Head Office Chonu House Parivahan Marg Jaipur

----Respondents

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Sukesh Bhati.
For Respondent(s) : Dr. Harish Purohit.
Mr. Suniel Purohit.

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEER BHATNAGAR

Order

23/07/2026

1. The impugned order dated 10.12.2024 was passed in ***S.B. Writ Contempt Petition No.1027/2018 (Dungav Ram v. Shri Raj Hans Upadhyay & Ors.)***, which reads as follows:

"1. The present application has been filed by the applicant Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation Retired Employees Association seeking their impleadment in the present contempt petition.

2. Having heard learned Senior Counsel and considering that the Association is representing all the retired employees of the Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation (hereinafter referred to as 'Corporation'), the application is allowed so that a common order, which can be made applicable to all the retired employees with common consensus can be passed. The applicant is allowed to intervene in the present contempt proceedings.

3. The amended cause title is taken on record.

4. Present contempt petition so also other petitions enlisted in the Schedule appended herewith which involve identical allegation and facts are being disposed of conjointly by this Common order. The Schedule shall be treated as part and parcel of the order instant.



5. The petitioners herein have raised a grievance that though the respondent – Corporation was under the order of this Court to clear their retiral dues in accordance with law in time bound manner, but the amount which the respondent – Corporation has calculated is not in accordance with law and contrary to record.

6. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the entire record and details which are necessary for calculation of the due payment is with the respondent – Corporation and despite claiming the copies under Right to Information Act, the same have not been provided. It was argued that the petitioners have unverified input/information about their claim and therefore, they cannot even properly challenge legality of such adjudication made by the Corporation even if they wish so to do.

7. While informing that pursuant to the order dated 07.05.2024 passed by this Court, the Corporation has determined and sent copy of such determination to each of the employees, who had lodged their claim, learned counsel argued that the petitioners and other retired employee are dissatisfied with such unilateral determination.

8. An attempt was made to point out the discrepancies, but the Court expressed its inability to enter into such arena having regard to its limitations in contempt jurisdiction. The petitioners were asked to take their remedies before Civil Court or Labour Court etc.

9. Mr. Punia, learned Senior Counsel submitted that the Labour Court/competent Court are neither having expertise to calculate the overtime amount and other dues of the employees nor will they be able to judiciously undertake such exercise, on account of the workload they are already burdened with.

10. Mr. G.R. Punia, learned Senior Counsel for the Association therefore, suggested that the calculation of the amount payable to each of the employees under various heads such as overtime allowances; night allowances; double duty allowances; weekly raised allowances; etc. be got done through a retired accountant at the depot level so as to ensure fair assessment of the amount. He contended that the same would ward-off unnecessary burden on the Courts and statutory or departmental authorities given that the number of claims will be in hundreds.



11. The Financial Advisor of the respondent - Corporation however submitted that the respondent - Corporation is ready to earmark one of its accountant at each depot to consider the claim of the retired employees.

12. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that there are large number of claims and the Labour Court are already swamped in pending dockets, this Court feels that it would be expedient to get the claims of the employees settled by way of arbitration so as to eliminate the element of bias or prolonged decision. Everyone present in the Court agreed and gave their suggestions in this regard.

13. It was suggested that arbitration be done through retired accountant of the Corporation who shall be nominated (by the Managing Director of the respondent – Corporation) for each of the depot. Neither Mr. Punia nor Mr. Purohit, learned counsel for the respondent – Corporation showed any objection(s).

14. Hence, all these petitions are disposed of with following directions:

(i) All the retired employees [who had filed their claims pursuant to order dated 07.05.2024 passed in the case of Dungav Ram (S.B. Writ Contempt No. 1027/2018) or the order passed in the case of Tara Chand Panchal (S.B. Writ Contempt No. 1099/2019)] shall file their objection(s)/claim(s) for determination of their retiral dues and other benefits within a period of two months.

(ii) The claims be filed in the office of the Chief Manager of their respective depot (from which depot the concerned employee has retired) in two sets. It will be required of the Chief Manager to give receipt of the claims so filed with seal and date.

(iii) The Managing Director of the respondent – Corporation shall within two months from today nominate one retired accountant or higher official (Retd.) at each depot, to adjudicate the claims so filed.

(iv) Such nominated retired employee shall work as an 'Arbitrator'.

(v) It will be required of the Chief Manager of each Depot to provide a befitting place where the Arbitrator can have his sitting/ hearing.



(vi) All the claims filed by the employees shall be sent to the Arbitrator, who shall fix the date of hearing as per his convenience under intimation to both the parties.

(vii) It will be required of the respondent – Corporation to make entire service record of each of the employees, whichever is necessary for the purpose of determination of claim, available to the Arbitrator.

(viii) An honorarium of Rs.500/- shall be paid by each of the employees/claimants to the Arbitrator, while the Corporation shall also pay equal amount to him.

(ix) Out of the amount mentioned in clause (viii) above, half of the amount (Rs.250/-) shall be paid by both the parties to the Arbitrator at the time of first hearing. The remaining amount of (Rs.250/- each) shall be paid by the parties immediately before the final award is passed by the Arbitrator.

(x) The respondent – Corporation shall also be free to file its objections regarding the claim so lodged by the employees.

(xi) The Arbitrator shall take summary proceedings and pass award indicating therein the claim wise details of the amount payable.

(xii) With the consent of all the parties, it is hereby ordered that the determination so made by the said Arbitrator shall be final and binding on all the parties. No legal remedy against such order shall be permissible to any party.

(xiii) Once the amount is determined by the Arbitrator, it will be required of the respondent – Corporation to pay the same on the basis of the priority as given in the circular dated 03.11.2021 issued by the Corporation.

(xiv) Needless to mention that in case of a deceased employee his wife or legal representative shall be free to pursue the claim.

15. Notices of contempt are hereby discharged.

16. All the captioned contempt petitions stand disposed of in terms of the above directions.”

2. It has been jointly submitted by learned counsel for the parties that, on account of the paucity of retired accountants or



higher officials available at each depot to be nominated as Arbitrator under clause (iii) of paragraph 14 of the impugned order, the exercise of adjudication of claims has become slow and the respondent-Corporation has been unable to complete the said exercise.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants further submits that it may be made clear that the Arbitrator shall have to act neutrally and strictly in accordance with law and not in accordance with any directions given by the respondents. The Arbitrator shall be free to call for any record from the respondents, who shall be under an obligation to make the same available, including the attendance register, promptly.

4. In view of the above, the present appeals are disposed of with liberty to the respondents to substitute the authority mentioned in clause (iii) of paragraph 14 of the impugned order, whereby the direction was to nominate one retired accountant or higher official of the respondent-Corporation, in the following terms:

(a) The respondents are granted liberty to nominate, in place of a retired accountant or higher official of the Corporation, one retired accountant or higher officer from any department of the State of Rajasthan. Such appointment shall be made within a period of 30 days from today.

(b) The Arbitrator so nominated shall act neutrally and strictly in accordance with law and shall be free to call for



any record from the respondents, as may be required for adjudication of the claim.

(c) Whenever any record is sought by the Arbitrator, including the attendance register, the same shall be made available by the respondents within a period of 30 days.

(d) The Arbitrator shall thereafter be required to decide the claim within a period of one year from the date of institution of the claim.

(e) The respondents shall also be at liberty to pay an honorarium higher than Rs.500/- (as stipulated in clause (viii) of paragraph 14 of the impugned order), in case circumstances so warrant.

(f) Save and except the modifications and clarifications made hereinabove, all other directions contained in paragraph 14 of the impugned order shall remain unchanged and shall continue to operate.

5. All pending applications also stand disposed of.

(PRAVEER BHATNAGAR),J

(DR. PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J