

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8842/2014

Priyanka Kumawat Daughter of Shri Babu Lal Kumawat aged about 22 years, R/o A-103, Verma Colony, Shastri Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

The State of Rajasthan through the law Secretary, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

The District and Session Judge, Dausa, Rajasthan.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Abhishek Pareek Mr. Chirayu Sharma
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Yash Joshi, AAAG Mr. Deepak Mittal Ms. Monisha Agarwal Mr. Vivek Guwalani for Mr. Vigyan Shah, AAG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJEET SINGH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI CHIRANIA

Order

26/02/2026

1. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayer:-

"It is, therefore, humbly and most respectfully prayed that this writ petition may kindly be accepted and allowed and the action of the respondents may kindly be declared unconstitutional and the merit list (annex.2) may kindly be quashed and set aside and petitioner may kindly be given appointment on the post of LDC under the judgeship of Dausa.

Any other writ order or direction which may be deemed proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be issued in favour of petitioner."

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner had applied for the post of Lower Division Clerk (LDC) in pursuance to the Advertisement dated 10.03.2014 issued by the Office of the

District and Sessions Judge, Dausa. Learned counsel submitted that the respondents had not calculated the marks of the petitioner as per the Rules.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondents have wrongly calculated the marks of the petitioner and denied the appointment on the basis of wrong calculation of marks in the Computer Typing Test. Learned counsel relied upon the reply to the Right To Information application filed on behalf of the respondents and submitted that the petitioner secured more than 30% marks in the Computer Typing Test, whereas they have wrongly denied the appointment.

4. Reply to the writ petition has been filed by the respondents, in which they have denied the allegations leveled by the petitioner, more particularly they relied upon reply to Para 3 and 4, which reads as under:-

"3. That the contents of this Para of the writ petition are replied in terms that the petitioner secured 133 marks in written examination, 40 marks in efficiency test and 0 marks in speed. In computer typing speed test petitioner typed 1472 key depression including 256 mistake key depressions and thus deducting it and adding 74 key depressions for the human error, petitioner made net 1290 key depression which is less than the minimum key depression. As such, as per norms of ITI ibid, the petitioner has been given '0' marks in the computer typing test. Efficiency on the computer was not compulsory but computer typing speed as stated above was compulsory because for the second phase examination computer typing speed and speed & efficiency both of the efficiency test was held one unit. As such petitioner has been declared fail in the said examination because the petitioner could not fulfill the minimum prescribed typing speed on computer as per the rules.

4. That the contents of this Para of the writ petition are replied in terms that as per ITI norms 20 marks are prescribed on 1330 correct on more than key 1330 depression and correct key depression 1 mark for each 40 depression is prescribed, as such it is wrong to state on part of the petitioner that 1 mark is prescribed for each 40 depression. Since depression of in the petitioner computer speed were less than the minimum prescribed depression as such the lesser depressions ranging between 1 to 1299 have same no meaning and deserve equal '0' marks in computer speed."

4. We have gone through the record and more particularly reply submitted on behalf of respondents, according to which the petitioner secured zero (0) marks in Computer Typing Test. Out of 50 marks, she scored zero (0) marks in Computer Typing Test, therefore, since the petitioner has not acquired 30% marks in individual paper of Computer Test, she was not selected. No rejoinder to the reply has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, despite an opportunity given to her.

5. In that view of the matter, considering the reply submitted on behalf of respondents, since the petitioner has secured zero marks in Computer Typing Test, no case is made out for interference.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(RAVI CHIRANIA),J

(INDERJEET SINGH),J