

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 24963/2025

Kaushal Tripathi S/o Shri Vijay Tripathi, Aged About 30 Years, R/o 160, Balaji Road, Masuriya, New Kohinoor Road, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Local Self Government Department, G-3, Rajmahal Residential Area, C-Scheme Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Director And Joint, Local Self Government Department, G-3, Rajmahal Residential Area, C- Scheme Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Jodhpur Municipal Corporation, Jodhpur, Rajasthan Through Its Commissioner.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Nihar Jain

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Yuvraj Parmar

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FARJAND ALI

Order

27/03/2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the issue involved in the instant writ petition is squarely covered by the order passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this court in the case of ***Manoj Purohit Vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.3665/2011)*** decided on 25.04.2011.

2. For ready reference, the aforesaid order is reproduced hereunder :-

"Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

In this writ petition, the claim of the petitioner is that he was working on the post of Computer Operator from last so many years and his case was considered

by the Municipal Board and a resolution was passed for regularizing his services along with 21 persons working on different posts. The case of the petitioner is that after passing resolution, time and again the Municipal Board is sending recommendation from last three years to the State Government for granting sanction but State Government is not deciding the matter of regularization of the petitioner's services though he is working from last so many years and his case was considered for regularization by the Municipal Board and recommended to the State Government for the purpose of sanction. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that decision taken by the Municipal Board for regularizing the services of the petitioner is in consonance with the judgment rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Secretary, State of Karnataka vs. Uma Devi, reported in (2006) 4 SCC 1. Therefore, it is prayed that the State Government may be directed to accord the sanction for the purpose of regularizing the services of petitioner in pursuance of the resolution passed by the Municipal Board and communicated to the State Government.

In this view of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the State Government to finally decide the matter of sanction with regard to regularizing the services of the petitioner, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It is made clear that if service of the petitioner is regularized then petitioner will be entitled for all benefits as provided under the Rules."

3. Accordingly, the instant writ petition is disposed of in light of the order referred to supra with the direction to the State

Government to finally decide the matter of sanction with regard to regularizing the services of the petitioner, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It is made clear that if services of the petitioner are regularized then petitioner will be entitled for all benefits as provided under the Rules.

4. Till the representation is decided, no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioner.

(FARJAND ALI),J

53-Samvedana/-