

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8359/2025

Neetu Jangir W/o Shri Vikas Jangir, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Ward No. 05, Balaji Ka Nada, Dharmshala Beri, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Consumer Affair Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Chairman, Rajasthan State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Jaipur.
3. Rakesh Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Somdutt Sharma, Full Time Member Of District Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, District Sikar.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Ripu Daman Singh Naruka
For Respondent(s)	:	

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR JAIN

Order

08/12/2025

1. Instant writ petition is preferred by petitioner with following prayer:

“i) The impugned appointment notification dated 25.04.2025 may kindly be quashed and set aside so far as appointment of respondent no. 3 is concerned with further direction to the respondents to allow appointment to the petitioner on the post of Member of District Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Sikar with all consequential service benefits.

ii) Any other order which the Hon'ble Court may deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances

of the case also be passed in favour of humble petitioner along with cost of writ petition.”

2. Learned counsel for petitioner while referring and relying upon order dated 16.07.2025 in **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.10038/2025** titled as **Abhishek Mirdha Vs. State of Rajasthan and Anr.** submits that the controversy and the issue raised herein is already settled by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Hon’ble Court at Principal Seat, Jodhpur (on the basis of ratio laid down in case of **Kedar Lal Gupta Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. : S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.7767/2020** decided on 17.05.2023). He further submitted that instant writ petition be disposed of in accordance with aforesaid order.
3. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for petitioner and also material placed on record, the writ petition may be disposed in light of **Abhishek Mirdha Vs. State of Rajasthan and Anr.** (supra).
4. Considered the grievance raised herein, the petitioner is given a liberty to submit a representation to the respondents-Authority within a period of 30 days raising all grounds and the respondents-Authority are directed to consider and decide the representation in light of ratio laid down in case of **Abhishek Mirdha Vs. State of Rajasthan and Anr.** (supra) and **Kedar Lal Gupta Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.** (supra), but in case of deviation with a reasoned and speaking order within a period of 30 days from date of receipt of representation. After the decision, the respondents are under an obligation to communicate the

order to the petitioner either by way of speed post or through E-mail, if petitioner has provided E-mail in her representation. If the petitioner is still aggrieved, she has a liberty to approach this Court with fresh petition.

5. Needless to say that if ratio is applicable upon facts of the case as claimed by the petitioner, then same benefits be extended.
6. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition with pending application, if any, stands disposed of.

(ASHOK KUMAR JAIN),J