

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

D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 969/2023

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Department Education Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Director, Directorate Of Primary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
4. Zila Parishad, Through The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Pratapgarh.
5. Chief District Education Officer (Headquarter), Pratapgarh.

----Appellants

Versus

Leha Gaur W/o Vilaxan Singh D/o Gopal Singh, Aged About 32 Years, Dak Bangla Road, Civil Line Colony, Pratapgarh, Rajasthan.

----Respondent

Connected With

D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 949/2023

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Department Education Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Director, Directorate Of Primary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
4. The Coordinator, Directorate Elementary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
5. Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Secretariat, Jaipur.
6. Zila Parishad, Through The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Udaipur.

----Appellants

Versus

Sheetal Ameta W/o Hitesh Ameta, Aged About 26 Years, 655 Kurabad, Tehsil Girwa, District Udaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondent

---

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Mahaveer Bishnoi, AAG.  
For Respondent(s) : Mr. VLS Rajpurohit.

---

**HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MUNNURI LAXMAN**

**Order**

**15/03/2024**

Heard.

These appeals are admitted for hearing.

Heard on prayer for stay.

The main submission of learned counsel for the State is that learned Single Judge could not have granted relief to those candidates, who have filed petitions at the fag end of the selection process claiming appointment against posts in the TSP area for which they have not even applied for.

Learned counsel for the respondents-writ petitioners would submit that the State had decided to consider applications of all women candidates of non-TSP area for TSP area as well, and therefore, the State could not oppose the relief on the said ground.

We find that the submission regarding State having taken a policy decision to allow all women candidates, who had earlier applied in non-TSP area to be considered and appointed against the posts advertised under a separate advertisement for appointment in TSP area has not been taken into consideration.

Therefore, in view of the above, a case for stay is made out. Accordingly, the effect and operation of the impugned order shall remain in abeyance.



[SAW-969/2023]

List these matters along after two weeks with all other similar appeals, details of which shall be submitted by the learned counsel for the State within one week before the Registry.

**(MUNNURI LAXMAN),J**

**(MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA),CJ**

9-a.asopa/-