



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

2026:RJ-JD:9794-DB

D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 1202/2025

Pooja Ratnu D/o Jai Singh Ratnu, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Plot No. 56, Radha Govind Colony, Sikar Road, Jaipur 302039.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Deepti Choudhary D/o Shri Govindram Choudhary, Aged About 43 Years, R/o House No. 8, Street No. 5, Vijay Nagar, Opposite Bhagat Ki Kothi, Police Chowki, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Town, Planner, Town Planning Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer.

----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 1203/2025

The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Deepti Choudhary D/o Shri Govind Ram Choudhary, R/o House No. 8, Street No. 5, Vijay Nagar, Opposite Bhagat Ki Kothi, Police Chowki, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Town Planner, Town Planning Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

----Respondents

D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 1302/2025

Barkha Singh Inaniya D/o Shri Bhupendra Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Near Jhalra Kuwa, Satsang Bhawan Road, Rajpura Ward, District Baran (Rajasthan).

----Appellant

Versus

1. Deepti Choudhary D/o Sri Govindram Choudhary, R/o House No. 8, Street No. 5, Vijay Nagar, Opposite Bhagat



Ki Kothi, Police Chowki, Jodhpur.

2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Town Planner, Town Planning Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 1793/2025

The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Town Planner Town Planning Department Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Deepti Choudhary D/o Shri Govind Ram Choudhary, Aged About 43 Years, R/o House No 8 Street No 5 Vijay Nagar Opposite Bhagat Ki Kothi Police Chowki Jodhpur Rajasthan.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary Ajmer.

----Respondents

For Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Rajesh Panwar, Sr. Adv. & AAG assisted by Mr. Ayush Gehlot. Dr. Vikas Balia, Sr. Adv. assisted by Mr. Sachin Saraswat. Mr. Khet Singh Rajpurohit. Mr. Hanuman Singh Choudhary.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Deepesh Singh Beniwal.

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH

J u d g m e n t

24/02/2026

1. The matters have come up for consideration on an application (IA No.01/25) in D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) No.1202/2025, whereby the applicant-appellant has sought leave



to prefer an appeal against the impugned judgment and order of the learned Single Bench.

2. Having considered the averments made in the application for leave to appeal and the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the applicant-appellant, sufficient grounds are made out for grant of leave to appeal. Accordingly, application (IA No.01/2025 in DBSAW No.1202/2025) is allowed. The applicant-Pooja Ratnu, who was not a party before the learned Single Judge in the writ petition, is treated as the appellant.

3. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matters have been heard finally and are being disposed of at this stage itself.

4. This batch of Special Appeals (Writ) arises out of a common factual matrix and seeks substantially identical reliefs against the common judgment and order dated 25.07.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7464/2025. Owing to the considerable overlap of facts, issues, and reliefs involved, all the appeals have been heard analogously and are being decided by this common judgment. For the sake of convenience, clarity and uniformity of reference, D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1202/2025 — *Pooja Ratnu v. Deepti Choudhary* — is being treated as the lead case, and the facts, background and reliefs are being noticed and extracted therefrom.

5. The relief clause as prayed for in the said appeal is reproduced hereinbelow for the sake of ready reference:



"It is, therefore, humbly prayed that Your Lordships may graciously be pleased to accept and allow this Civil Special Appeal (Writ) and further be pleased to quash and set aside the order dated 25.07.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.7464/2025 and the respondent may be directed to consider the candidature of the appellant in accordance with law for the post of Assistant Town Planner under the Backward Class (Women) category.

Any other appropriate order or direction this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper be also passed in favour of the appellant."

6. Mr. Rajesh Panwar, learned Senior Counsel & AAG assisted by Mr. Ayush Gehlot, appearing on behalf of the State submits that the Hon'ble Court has allowed the prayers while evaluating the work experience of two years as per the requirements of the advertisement, whereas the experts committee duly constituted by the State has examined the same and the requisite two years' experience was not found to be made out.

6.1 Learned AAG further submits that the advertisement dated 04.10.2022 issued by the Rajasthan Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as "RPSC") pertained to recruitment for the post of Assistant Town Planner to the Rajasthan Town Planning Service under the Rajasthan Town Planning Service Rules, 1966. The applications were duly submitted and in pursuance thereof, the written examination was conducted by the RPSC on 16.06.2023. The select list was thereafter, declared on 15.05.2024, and the selected candidates were called for document verification on 06/07.06.2024. The appointment letters were accordingly issued to 24 eligible candidates; however, the private respondent was not included in the said list. The reason for her non-inclusion was duly communicated to her, namely that her



claimed work experience for the post of Assistant Town Planner did not meet the prescribed standard and was not upto the mark. The RPSC informed her that her candidature for appointment on the post of Assistant Town Planner stood rejected on account of non-fulfillment of the eligibility criteria pertaining to educational qualifications and work experience. The rejected candidates were accordingly notified, pursuant to which the challenge in the writ petition came to be filed.

6.2 Learned AAG also submits that the writ petition has been allowed by the learned Single Bench, while dealing that there are certain Bank statements and the record of the JDA indicate that the respondent was in service for about six months and for rest of the period, the certificates from the private agency is on record. The dedicated consultancy as per the learned AAG and the counsel representing the RPSC Mr. Rajpurohit ought to have carried on sufficient record so as to demonstrate the continuous and uninterrupted experience of the respondent whereas the Bank statements placed on record pertained only to the period from 26.08.2013 to 31.03.2014 whereas a grey area of 31.03.2014 to 28.10.2015 remained.

6.3 Learned AAG further submits that the Committee formation has examined the documents at length and recorded specific findings. The certificates which appeared to be unclear, unreliable, and unauthentic could not have been accepted at face value, and once the Expert Committee had applied its mind, thereafter, unless any cogent and directly demonstrable material is placed on



record to the contrary, the Hon'ble Court may not be inclined to interfere in the matter.

6.4 Learned AAG also submits that the claimed work experience was directly co-related to work executed for the JDA, and accordingly the records and documentation of the JDA authorities were required to be carefully examined. Though the agency appeared to have undertaken work for the JDA during a particular period in 2013-14, the same could not be construed to automatically establish that the respondent was discharging the same professional duties throughout the entirety of the claimed experience period, more particularly in the absence of any corresponding salary credit in her Bank account.

7. *Per contra*, Mr. Beniwal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent vehemently submits that the learned Single Bench had rightly arrived at a conclusion that the work experience of the respondent was appropriate and duly established and that in view of her merits, the appointment ought to have been conferred upon her. He further submits that once a proper certificate was in place and the agency has discharged its contractual obligations towards the JDA for the relevant period, there was no reason whatsoever to disbelieve the same and particularly, when the Committee itself had not verified the documents as stated by them in their conclusion.

7.1 Mr. Beniwal also tried to persuade this Court that once the nexus between the JDA and private agency, which has issued the appointment order and experience certificate, stood established,



there remained no sustainable ground to doubt the authenticity or veracity of such certificate or it was merely a co-relative transaction, which would have happened and which would have resulted into the said experience having been obtained by the concerned respondent for the purpose of entitling her to be eligible and meritorious for appointment to the said post.

7.2 Mr. Beniwal further pointed out that the Committee has appropriately taken into account certain Bank accounts, but the State and the RPSC could not have ignored that for some months, the payment of a private agency could have been made by cash.

7.3 In support of his submissions, Mr. Beniwal placed reliance upon the precedent law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Krishan Lal v. State of Haryana and Others : (2009) 14 Supreme Court Cases 745***, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court had held that non-paying of PF amount to a particular employee does not amount to a conclusion that he was not actually an employee and rather PF was a requirement which as per the entitlement an employee would get or not get, but such conditions would not indicate that whether he was a continuous employee or not.

7.4 Mr. Beniwal has also submitted that once a certificate of experience is duly issued by a competent authority, the same ought to be accepted unless it is verified from the concerned company and it is established that such company, despite having a working relationship with the JDA, had not actually discharged the functions claimed, or that the circumstances necessary to substantiate the claimed experience were not made out.



8. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

9. This Court is of the considered opinion that the recruitment process for the post of Assistant Town Planner stipulated a mandatory condition of two years' work experience, and the scrutiny of such experience was within the domain of the Expert Committee. The limited parameters on which the impugned conclusion has been arrived at in respect of the private respondent pertain to the requirement of two years' experience. Though the experience certificate was issued by a private agency, the same could not be corroborated through the bank records. The bank details relied upon by the learned Single Bench relate only to a limited period of approximately six months and do not indicate any salary transactions for the entire period for which the experience certificate has been issued. Moreover, the JDA itself has not confirmed that the private respondent possessed two years' experience so as to substantiate the certificate issued by the private agency.

10. This Court further finds that, on the face of the record, the respondent has not been able to establish any substantive professional relationship with the JDA or that any town planning work was in fact assigned to her. If the experience certificate were to be accepted as genuine, it would reasonably follow that she received remuneration commensurate with such engagement, which, in contemporary practice, would ordinarily be reflected through bank transactions. However, no such bank records or corresponding income-tax details, either of the concerned



company or of the individual, have been placed on record to substantiate the claim. The draft format of the experience certificate, placed at page 56 of the paper book, clearly stipulates the following requirement:

“प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि उक्त अवधि में इनका कार्य संतोषजनक रहा है।

संलग्नक :- नगर नियोजन से संबंधित कार्यों के कार्य आदेश की प्रति, मासिक वेतन बिलों की प्रति एवं उपरोक्तानुसार संबंधित दस्तावेज इत्यादि की प्रति।”

11. Thus, this Court also finds that the monthly bills and other relevant documents evidencing regular and continuous engagement were required to be produced before the Committee in a clear and demonstrable manner. In the absence of a cogent demonstration establishing the existence of an employer–employee relationship and the authenticity of the claimed prior experience, the findings arrived at by the Committee do not warrant interference by this Court.

12. Accordingly, the special appeals (writ) are allowed and the order and judgment dated 25.07.2025 passed by the learned Single Bench is hereby quashed and set aside. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J