

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3381/2026

Raj Tilak Kanwar D/o Shri Shankar Singh W/o Late. Shri Chand Singh Rathore, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Village Brahmano Ka Luhariya Post Gothra, Tehsil Hindoli, District Bundi, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

Secretary Rajasthan Service Selection Board, Rajasthan Krishi Prabandh Sansthan Parisar, Durgapura, Jaipur Rajasthan.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Sukhraj Singh Rathore
For Respondent(s)	:	

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Order

23/02/2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner submitted her application form pursuant to advertisement No.19/2024 for recruitment on the post of Class-IV employees. Learned counsel submits that although the petitioner belong to EWS Widow, yet on account of bona fide error, which is attributable to the computer operator, instead of submitting application for EWS Widow, the petitioner has applied under EWS Divorcee category.
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.
3. It would reveal by perusing the advertisement No.19/2024 dated 12.12.2024 that in Clause-17, it has been specified by the recruiting agency i.e. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board that after submitting online application form, in order to

rectify any error in the category of reservation/domicile/category of special ability, opportunity would be granted to the respective candidate. Such opportunity would be of seven days from the last date of submitting application form as prescribed in the advertisement.

4. Admittedly, the petitioner never submitted any application for correction of her category within the period of correction window prescribed in the advertisement. As per petitioner, first time representation was submitted by the petitioner on 12.02.2026 i.e. much after declaration of result, which is nothing, but an after thought as well as against the scheme of recruitment examination.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the order dated 02.03.2021 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.13517/2019 (Smt. Khushbu Sharma Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.)**. However, bare perusal of the aforesaid order would make it clear that facts in that case were altogether different. The petitioner in the above case of **Smt. Khushbu Sharma (supra)** was married till the last date of filing the application form, however, thereafter, her husband unfortunately expired, therefore, taking the said incident to be an act of god, which does not have any control of any person, category was allowed to be changed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. Such facts are not in the instant case, therefore, order in the case of **Smt. Khushbu Sharma (supra)** is not applicable.

6. It is settled proposition of law as held by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court at Principal Seat, Jodhpur in **D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15900/2021 (Mustak Khan vs. The**

Rajasthan High Court Jodhpur & Ors.), the relevant portion of the aforesaid order is reproduced as hereunder:-

"5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents while relying on the judgment of this Court in Sunil Bhanwariya v. Registrar, Examination Cell, RHC, Jodhpur & Anr. submits that the petitioner having participated in the preliminary examination in the General category cannot raise this issue at belated stage after declaration of the result for the post of District Judge.

8. In the considered opinion of this Court, having participated in the examination and knowing that he has applied in the General category, he cannot be allowed to change his category from General to OBC (NCL) category. No prima facie case is made out by the petitioner. He did not file any proof to the effect that he made any endeavour to change his category in the application form from General to OBC (NCL)."

7. In the light of above, there is no case for interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Hence, the writ petition filed by the petitioner, is hereby dismissed.

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

(ANAND SHARMA),J