

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 21976/2025

Amara Ram S/o Shri Gordhan Ram, Aged About 63 Years, R/o
Pichiyak, Tehsil Bilara, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary,
Water Resources Department, Government Of Rajasthan,
Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Joint Secretary, Finance Rules, Department Of
Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Chief Engineer (H Q And I.t.), Water Resources
Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department,
Rajasthan, Jodhpur
5. Assistant Engineer, Water Resources Department, Sub
Division, Bilara, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
6. The Dy. Director, Pension And Pensioners Welfare
Department, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Manoj Kumar

For Respondent(s) : Jaya Dadhich

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEET PUROHIT

Order

09/03/2026

1. Learned counsel for both parties agreed that the controversy involved in the present writ petition is covered by the decision of a Coordinate Bench of this Court dated **05.12.2022** passed in the case of ***Harphool Singh & Anr. Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.*** (***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.6054/2025***) and connected writ petition.

2. Operative portion of the order dated 05.12.2022 passed in the case of Harphool Singh (supra) reads as follows:

"Keeping into consideration the above observation of the Hon'ble Apex Court, this Court is of the clear opinion that the present matters do fall within the parameters as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court. This is a specific case wherein keeping into consideration the said parameters, the Court definitely ought to interfere as here is a clear discrimination between the employees appointed by the same authorities, in the same manner, wherein the eligibility criteria was also the same and duties are also identical in all the aspects.

So far as the clarification dated 20.05.2016 is concerned, the contents or the facts of the same were never pleaded in reply to the writ petition nor was the said document placed on record. Therefore, the same could not have been refuted or controverted by the petitioners. Even otherwise, this Court is of the specific view that the clarification dated 20.05.2016 cannot be held to be valid as the same specifically discriminates between two set of employees of the same parent department.

In view of the above observations, the present writ petitions are allowed. The respondent authorities are directed to grant the benefit of the three selection grades to the petitioners on the promotional post of Work Supervisor Gr. I on the same terms, as granted to the Mate of the IGNP Department. The essential orders be passed within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the present order.

All the pending applications also stand disposed of."

3. Considering the above submissions, the writ petition is **allowed** in the same terms as passed in the case of Harphool Singh (supra). The respondents are directed to grant the benefit of three selection grades to the petitioner on the promotional post of Work Supervisor Grade-I on the same terms, as granted to the Mate of the IGNP Department. The essential orders be passed within a period of three months from the date of receipt of this order.

4. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SANJEET PUROHIT),J

35-yagya/-