

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 90/2025

URN: SAW / 279U / 2025

Mohammad Yaseen Khan Son Of Shri Natthi Khan, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of College Road, Near New Mandi, Patel Nagar, Gangapur City, District Sawaimadhopur.

----Appellant

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Medical Secretary, Medical, Health And Family Welfare Directorate, Government Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur.
2. Director, Medical And Family Welfare Directorate, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Chief Medical And Health Officer, Sawaimadhopur.

----Respondents

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Vikram Beniwal.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Vigyan Shah, Additional Advocate General.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJEET SINGH

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP TANEJA

Order

13/07/2026

1. This appeal has been filed by the appellant challenging the order dated 07.01.2025 whereby the writ petition filed on behalf of the appellant was dismissed by the learned Single Judge.
2. Grievance of the appellant is that the respondents have not considered the case of the appellant for appointment on the post of GNM despite having merit. Counsel for the appellant further submits that the Chief Medical Officer in a mala fide manner has not considered the case of the appellant for appointment.
3. Reply to the writ petition has been filed by the respondents.

Para No.3 is as under:

*"That in this regard it is
submitted that according to the*

*advertisement and format of application form the petitioner did not submit Secondary Mark Sheet for verification of date of birth due to that selection committee rejected his candidature. Thus it is a lapse on part of the petitioner and therefore petitioner deserves no sympathy. Photostat Copy of the Order dated 16.6.2007 whereby selection committee was constituted and also the Rejection List (Relevant Page Abstract Copy) is filed and marked as **Annexure R-1 and R-2** respectively."*

4. Learned Additional Advocate General submits that the appellant has failed to submit the Marksheet of Secondary School Examination. Therefore, he was denied appointment at the time of document verification. Counsel further submits that the documents were verified by a Four Member Board.

5. Heard counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. This appeal filed on behalf of the appellant deserves to be dismissed for the reasons; firstly, the documents of the appellant were scrutinized by not only one member but a board consisting of four members. Therefore, the document submitted by the respondents i.e. (Annexure R-1) cannot be doubted; lastly, although the appellant has leveled allegations of mala fides on respondents in not considering his case for appointment. However, he has failed to implead any person by name as party in the writ petition.

7. In that view matter, this appeal stands dismissed.

(SANDEEP TANEJA),J

(INDERJEET SINGH),J