

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

S. B. Civil Writ Petition No. 18575/2025

PETITIONERS:-

1. Anil Kalwaniya S/o Shri Chandraram Kalwaniya, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Singhrawat Khurd, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.
2. Mamta D/o Shri Dariya Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Tehsil Taranagar, Kalwas, Po- Kalwas, District Churu, Rajasthan.
3. Savitri Jyani W/o Rakesh Choudhary, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Akkhasar, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
4. Rajeshwari Rathore D/o Shri Shivraj Singh Rathore, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Dabla, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
5. Narendra Kumar S/o Shri Negha Ram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Kundaki, Po Keriya, District Jalor, Rajasthan.
6. Bhavin Ameta S/o Shri Pravin Kumar Ameta, Aged About 25 Years, R/o H No. 145, Takiyon Ki Vadali Ke Asapas, Bhindar Vard Nan 10, Tehsil Bhinder, District Udaipur, Rajasthan.
7. Bajrang Lal Dara S/o Shri Gopal Ram Dara, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Daron Ka Bas, Maroth, Nagaur, Nawa, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.
8. Mahendra Kumar S/o Shri Chhagan Lal, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Jeerawal, Po Reodar, District Sirohi, Rajasthan.
9. Ritika Dotasra D/o Shri Mahipal Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Hamirwas, Nua, Jhunjhunun, District Churu, Rajasthan.
10. Virendra Bishnoi S/o Shri Narana Ram Vishnoi, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Bishnoiyo Ki Dhani Bhutel, Bhootel, District Jalor, Rajasthan.
11. Nikhil S/o Shri Rajkumar Bajaj, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Ward No.-19, Guru Nanak Colony, Sri Vijay Nagar, Vijainagar, Sribijaynagar, District Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
12. Priya Saini D/o Shri Ramniwash Saini, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Tehsil Village Dhandhela, Tehsil Neem Ka Thana, Dhandhela, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

13. Sagar Agrawal S/o Shri Hukum Chand Bansal, Aged About 26 Years, R/o 73/234, Near Tagore Hospital, Mansarover, Jaipur, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
14. Beena Sharma D/o Shri Chetan Kumar Sharma, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Bamanwas Chaugan, District Alwar, Rajasthan.
15. Neeru Joshi D/o Shri Sonu Kumar Tiwari, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Karni Kot, Po Karni Kot, District Alwar, Rajasthan.
16. Paylet Meena S/o Shri Kalu Ram Meena, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Nagar Ishear, Datawas, District Tonk, Rajasthan.
17. Nidhi Meghwal D/o Shri Satya Prakash Meghwal, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Plot No. 19, Santosh Nagar 2, Borkheda, Kota, Po Kota, District Kota, Rajasthan.
18. Nidhi Gupta D/o Shri Rajesh Kumar Sonkhiya, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Guest House, New Colony, Lalsot, Village Daus/street Dausa, District Dausa, Rajasthan.
19. Lakshy Kumar Kisan S/o Shri Jitendra Kumar Kisan, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Nand, Vatika, Gudha Bairsal, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
20. Raj Shukla S/o Shri Ball Krishan Sharma, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Masalpur, District Karauli, Rajasthan.
21. Monika D/o Shri Suresh Kumar Meena, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ward No. 1, Meeno Ka Mohalla, Nangal, District Jhunjhunun, Rajasthan.
22. Daya Ram Meena S/o Shri Kailash Chand Meena, Aged About 27 Years, R/o 49, Lamba Sirran Dhani, Gokulpura, District Dausa, Rajasthan.

Versus

RESPONDENTS:-

1. The State of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department of School Education, Government of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner, Rajasthan.

3. Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

For Petitioners : Mr. V.L.S. Rajpurohit Advocate.
For Respondents : Mr. Tarun Joshi Advocate and Mr. Vikram Singh Advocate.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Judgment

24/04/2026

1. Petitioners have filed this writ petition with following prayers:

"It is, therefore, most humbly and respectfully prayed that the writ petition may kindly be allowed and by issuing an appropriate writ, order or direction:-

i. By an appropriate writ order or direction, the respondent may be directed to grant opportunity to the candidates to submit their application form online/offline in pursuance to notification no. 06/2025 dated 17.07.2025 (Annex.2) on the post School Lecturer and Coach (School Education).

ii. By an appropriate writ order or direction, the respondent may be directed to allow the petitioners to participate in the recruitment process in pursuance to notification no. 06/2025 dated 17.07.2025 for the post of School Lecturer and Coach (School Education).

iii. By an appropriate writ order or direction, the respondent may be directed to grant appointment to the candidates on the post of School Lecturer and Coach (School Education) in pursuance to notification no. 06/2025 dated 17.07.2025 if otherwise candidates are eligible to be appointed.

*iv. Any other appropriate relief which this Hon'ble High Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may kindly be passed in favour of the petitioner.
v. Cost of this writ petition may also kindly be passed in favour of the petitioner."*

2. It is stated by learned counsel for the petitioners that an advertisement was issued by the respondent-Rajasthan Public Service Commission on 17.07.2025 for recruitment on the posts of School Lecturer and Coach (School Education). The petitioners made several attempts on 12.09.2025 to submit their online

application forms pursuant to aforesaid advertisement, yet on account of fault in server/portal of the respondents, they could not succeed in submitting their online application forms. For the aforesaid technical glitch solely attributable to the respondents, the petitioners cannot be made to suffer and under these circumstances, where the petitioners were deprived of their legitimate right to submit their online application forms pursuant to advertisement dated 17.07.2025, their offline application forms be accepted and the petitioners may further be allowed to participate in the recruitment process.

3. The respondents have opposed the writ petition by filing reply to writ petition. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that as per advertisement dated 17.07.2025, the permissible period for submitting online application forms was from 14.08.2025 to 12.09.2025 until midnight. It is submitted that there was no technical glitch in the server or portal of the respondents and the respondents have received as many as 5,68,754 application forms pursuant to aforesaid advertisement. In reply to writ petition, in order to show that online portal was properly functioning, details of number of forms received by the respondent-Commission in the last five days of submission of online application forms has been given in a table, which is quoted as under:

Date	Application Form Received
8/9/2025	20,477
9/9/2025	32,664
10/09/2025	56,045
11/09/2025	79,476
12/09/2025	49,851

4. The petitioners objected to the aforesaid details and submitted that allegation of the petitioners is that on the last date,

i.e., 12.09.2025, server of the respondent was down from 5.30 P.M. till midnight and the details given by the respondents in reply are incomplete in this regard.

5. Thereupon, an additional affidavit was filed on behalf of the respondent-RPSC in which it was specified that even on last date, i.e., 12.09.2025, after 5.30 P.M., the respondents have received total 8,504 application forms till midnight which demonstrates that the server or portal of the respondents were working in a proper manner without there being any disruption. No counter to such additional affidavit has been filed by the petitioners.

6. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record, this Court is of the considered opinion that the writ petition filed by the petitioners is totally misconceived. Allegations levelled by the petitioners are factual in nature and the respondents by way of filing categorical reply as also additional affidavit have given specific details with complete data showing that there was no technical glitch in the server or portal of the respondents. It is not a case where window for submitting online application forms was open only for a day or two. As stated in the reply, permissible period for submitting online application form was from 14.08.2025 to 12.09.2025 till midnight and thus, as many as 29 days were given to the aspirants to submit their online application forms. No reasons whatsoever have been assigned by the petitioners for making alleged attempts only on the last date, i.e., on 12.09.2025 after 5.30 P.M., which shows that the petitioners were themselves negligent and not diligent in complying with the time schedule

prescribed in the advertisement. The respondents have also specified that even on the last date, i.e., 12.09.2025, after 5.30 P.M., they have received as many as 8504 application forms, which makes it clear that there was no failure of server or any technical glitch on the portal of the respondents.

7. Thus, this Court does not find any merit and substances in the present writ petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

8. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANAND SHARMA),J

MANOJ NARWANI/24