

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7501/2026

Rohitashw Kumar S/o Sh. Birbal Singh, Aged About 57 Years,
Resident Of Village Peepal Kabas, Post Sonasar, Jhunjhunu.
333011 Presently Posted As Executive Engineer And Technical
Assistant, Public Health And Engineering Department Circle
Jhunjhunu

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Public Health And Engineering Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Deputy Secretary, Department Of Personnel, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. Superintending Engineer, Public Health And Engineering Department, Neem Ka Thana, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Ms. Gunjan Chawla Mr. Shubham Sharma
For Respondent(s)	:	-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MUNNURI LAXMAN

Order

29/04/2026

1. With the consent of learned counsel for the petitioner, the matter is heard for final disposal at the admission stage itself.
2. The present writ petition has been filed challenging the charge-sheet dated 10.10.2025 (Annexure-5). The challenge is made on two grounds: the first challenge to the charge-sheet relates to the alleged excess payment of an amount of Rs. 47.42 lakhs in respect of Tender No. 39/2021-22, without even receiving the material; and the second charge relates to excess supply by

the contractor in violation of the required quantity under the tender.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the first charge relates to excess payment in respect of the tender. It is her grievance that the amount so calculated does not partly cover the period during which the petitioner rendered services while dealing with the tender document and, therefore, such charge could not have been framed and the challenge has been made on the same ground.

4. It is also her submission that the second ground is vague. The tender involves multiple sites and there is no specification of excess supply of pipes as to which of the sites forming part of the tender document are concerned; therefore, such charge is vague and unsustainable.

5. Dealing with the first contention, the charge specifically refers to the period and it also specifically refers that the amount of Rs. 47.72 lakhs was excessively paid to the contractor under the tender notification without receiving any material. Contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that such amount does not relate to the entire period of the petitioner but also relates to some other employee. This could be the best defence for her while participating in the enquiry, or she can even raise such defence at the stage of filing a reply, which is required to be considered.

6. Dealing with the second charge, the charge does not refer to any particular site which is part of the tender notification. The tender notification involves multiple sites and the charge is relating to excess supply of pipelines by the contractor over and

above the quantity prescribed for the entire sites. This charge cannot be said to be a vague charge and it is very specific.

7. This Court feels that there is no ground for interference in the present writ petition at this stage. The contention which the petitioner has raised relates to the defence which the petitioner could set up in enquiry and the same can be dealt with at the appropriate stage.

8. In the result, the writ petition is ***dismissed***.

9. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(MUNNURI LAXMAN),J