

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13644/2026

CNR: RJHC010615722026

URN: CW / 24831U / 2026

Ashok Kumar Sindhi S/o Shri Vasumal Sindhi, Aged About 51 Years, R/o 10/14 Housing Board Chanderiya Cement Factory Dist. Chittorgarh Dist. Chittorgarh Raj.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation, Chomu House Parivahan Marg Jaipur Through Its Managing Director
2. The Executive Director (Administration), Raj. State Road Transport Corporation Parivahan Marg Jaipur
3. The Chief Depot Manager, Raj. State Road Transport Corporation Chittorgarh Depot Dist. Chittorgarh Raj.
4. The Superintendent, Sawai Man Singh Hospital Jaipur Raj.
5. The Executive Director, All India Institute Of Medical Science (Aiims) Jodhpur Raj.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Inderjeet Yadav

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE NUPUR BHATI

Order

06/07/2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner suffered serious spinal injury for which a Medical Board was constituted vide order dated 21.02.2025 (Annexure-3), which examined the petitioner and the Medical Board opined that the petitioner was fit to perform light work but was not fit for driving or undertaking heavy work, including weight lifting. He submits that, despite the aforesaid medical opinion, the respondents again subjected the petitioner to a medical examination, during which an MRI of the spine was also conducted. He submits that, without

recording any opinion on the MRI findings and solely on the basis of the conclusion that the petitioner's eyesight was absolutely normal, the respondents directed the concerned authorities to assign the petitioner duties relating to vehicle operation. He also submits that once the Medical Board had specifically opined, on the basis of the petitioner's spinal injury, that he was unfit to perform driving duties, the respondents cannot assign him the duties of a driver without obtaining a fresh medical opinion on the said spinal condition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner, on his own, again appeared before the same Medical Board, which, vide its opinion dated 15.06.2026 (Annexure-13), advised that the petitioner should avoid heavy work and lifting heavy weights. He submits that the subsequent medical opinion is inconsistent with the respondents' decision to assign the petitioner driving duties, thereby placing the petitioner in a prejudicial position on account of the contradictory medical assessments. He further submits that the impugned order (Annexure-12) was passed on 25.05.2026, however, till date the petitioner has not been assigned the duties of a driver.

3. Matter requires consideration.

4. Issue notice to the respondents. Issue notice of stay application as well.

5. In the meanwhile and till further orders, the respondents are restrained from assigning duties of driver to the petitioner.

(DR. NUPUR BHATI),J