



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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15494/2025

1. Manoj Swami S/o Shri Gopal Swami, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village And Post Gopalpura, Tehsil Sujangarh, District Churu, Rajasthan.
2. Deepak Kumar Meghwal S/o Shri Poonam Chandra, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Achalpura, Tehsil Chhoti Sadari, District Pratapgarh, Rajasthan.
3. Harish Kumar S/o Shri Ghasiram Sharma, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Ward No. 27, Degawas, Taranagar, District Churu, Rajasthan.
4. Sanjay Kumar Regar S/o Shri Om Prakash, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Ward No. 06, Village Khinyera, Loonkaransar, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
5. Narpat Kumar S/o Shri Chaina Ram, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Sajan Ji Ki Dhani, Sindhari, Barmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director, Directorate Of Treasury And Accounts, Rajasthan, Office Address Vitt Bhawan, A Block, Jyoti Nagar, Janpath, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Jaipur (Raj) Office Addrss - Agriculture Management Institution Campus, Durgapura, Jaipur (Raj.) Through Its Chairman.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Sushil Bishnoi
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manish Patel

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Order (Oral)

19/05/2026

1. Petitioners, having remained unsuccessful in the selection process for the posts of Junior Accountants and Tehsil Revenue Accountant, inter alia, challenge the final answer key dated 27.06.2024 pertaining to the examination conducted pursuant to an advertisement dated 20.06.2023.

2. Brief Facts first, as stated in the petition. Respondent No. 3 issued an advertisement dated 20.06.2023 inviting applications for recruitment to the posts of Junior Accountant and Tehsil Revenue Accountant. For the Non-TSP area, this comprised 4,911 posts of Junior Accountant and 170 posts of Tehsil Revenue Accountant.

2.1 The petitioners, being eligible, applied pursuant to the advertisement and were issued admit cards. A written examination was held on 11.02.2024 in two papers, each consisting of objective-type questions with responses to be marked on OMR sheets. The petitioners appeared in the examination.

2.2 On 07.03.2024, a model question paper and a provisional answer key were uploaded on the official website of respondent No. 3, and objections were invited from candidates. The petitioners did not submit any objection at that stage. A final answer key was thereafter issued on 27.06.2024, by which certain questions were deleted and certain answers modified. A provisional result was declared the same day, followed by document verification, in which the petitioners were included.

2.3 On 17.12.2024, the final result was declared on the basis of the final answer key, together with the cut-off marks and individual score cards. The petitioners' grievance concerns Question No. 54 of Paper-I and Question Nos. 35, 72 and 92 of Paper-II. They contend that the answers and deletions reflected in the final answer key are incorrect,

and that, if these questions were evaluated as they urge, the petitioners would score above the cut-off and be selected.

2.4 Hence, the present writ petition.

3. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard the rival contentions which are on the lines of respective pleadings and perused the case file.

4. In response to a query from the Court, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners did not file any objections qua the challenge to the answer key because no opportunity was afforded to them after the Examination Committee substituted the impugned question. He further submitted that the substitution was made on the advice of an Expert Committee, which had been constituted to address the objections received in the earlier round.

5. Be that as it may, the petitioners have filed no affidavit or rejoinder controverting the stand taken in the reply, nor did they respond to the respondents' undated additional affidavit received by the Registry on 11.05.2026 (per the receipt stamp). The respondents' position deposed therein therefore stands uncontroverted on record.

6. Moreover, the learned counsel for the respondents informed the Court during the hearing, the entire selection process has attained finality and appointment letters have already been issued to the successful candidates.

7. In my opinion, the petition appears to be an afterthought. Having been unsuccessful in the selection process, the petitioners have now challenged a handful of examination questions on the ground that incorrect answers were assigned to them.

8. On the merits thereof, this Court will not sit in appeal over the opinion of the Expert Committee, which was admittedly constituted by the respondents precisely to address the objections received.

9. As already noted, the petitioners filed no objection to the same at the appropriate stage.

10. They have also filed no affidavit, rejoinder, or other material to controvert either the reply or the additional affidavit, the contents of which therefore remain undisputed.

11. Furthermore, the result based on the substituted question was declared on 27.06.2024 (provisional result), in which the petitioners were unsuccessful. They took no step to approach the respondents thereafter. Instead, they filed the present writ petition directly in August 2025, more than a year later, and only then set the matter in motion, claiming to be whistleblowers exposing alleged wrongdoing. This timeline is itself a telling circumstance and plainly indicates that the petition is an afterthought by unsuccessful candidates.

12. For the reasons set out above, the writ petition is dismissed.

13. Pending application(s) stand disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA),J