

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3499/2026

1. Yogesh Sharma Son Of Satish Sharma, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 4, Mohalla Mandir Chala, Post Chala, District Sikar (Raj.)
2. Keshav Dev Son Of Mahesh Chand Sharma, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Awar, Bharatpur (Raj.)
3. Rajesh Rajput Son Of Kedar Rajput, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Karsoli, Karauli (Raj.)
4. Gyan Singh Son Of Padam Singh, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Badh, Post Karsoli, Tehsil Hindaun City, District Karauli (Raj.)

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Administrative Reforms, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, State Agriculture Management Insitute Premises, Durgapura, Jaipur (Raj.) 302018
3. The Director, Medical, Health And Family Welfare Services, Directorate, Swasthya Bhawan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur.
4. The Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
5. The Director, Department Of Consumer Affairs, Rajasthan Jaipur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Anshul Sharma

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Rahul Verma for
Mr. Archit Bohra, AGC

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Order

24/03/2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the issue raised in the present writ petition is squarely covered by judgment passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Manoj Khandelwal & Ors. vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.: S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7283/2014***, decided on 16.07.2014 and

the said judgment has been followed in ***Krishan Lal & Ors. vs. The State of Rajasthan & Ors.*** S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. **19179/2017**, decided on 30.10.2017. The petitioners are also entitled to the same relief as granted in the case of ***Manoj Khandelwal (supra)*** and ***Krishan Lal (supra)***.

2. In view of the limited request of learned counsel for the petitioners with regard to granting liberty for filing representation and having regard to the facts of the case, the present writ petition is disposed of requiring the petitioners to make a representation to respondent No.2 along with a copy of this order, who shall, after verifying the facts stated above, consider and decide the same by a speaking order within a period of three months from the date of its making, addressing the grievance of the petitioners for extending the relief as prayed for, as the candidate, who stood lower in merit, are getting benefit of higher pay, seniority, annual grade increments and other service benefits including the selection scales. If the respondent No.2 decides to place the petitioners above in seniority than the candidates who stood lower in merit, then the petitioners would be entitled to all benefits of seniority but he would be entitled only to notional benefits.

3. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

4. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(ANAND SHARMA),J