

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9623/2026

URN: CW / 21491U / 2026

Abhishek Sharma S/o Mahaveer Prasad Sharma, Aged About 37
Years, R/o Of Jyoti Colony Deoli, District Tonk, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary,
Medical And Health Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan
2. Director, Medical And Health Services, Government Of
Rajasthan, Swasthya Bhawan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme,
Jaipur, Rajasthan
3. Chief Medical And Health Officer, Tonk, Rajasthan
4. Medicare Relief Society, Sub-District Hospital, Deoli
(Tonk), Through Its Member Secretary
5. M/s Krsnaa Diagnostics Limited, Pune, Through Its
Authorized Officer, Having Its Office At S. No. 243, A-
Hissa No. 6/6, Cts No. 4519, Near Mayur Trade Centre,
Chinchwad, Pune, Maharashtra- 411019

-----Respondents & Ors.

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Laxmi Kant Malpura Ms. Madhavi Vyas Mr. Jeet Ram Choudhary
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Archit Bohra, AGC

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA BORANA

Order

30/06/2026

1. The present petition has been filed laying a challenge to order dated 15.05.2026 (Annexure-5) whereby the services of the petitioner had been terminated. However, it is an admitted fact that subsequent to order dated 15.05.2026, vide office order dated 08.06.2026, the petitioner has been taken back in the job,

although under a different scheme i.e. CM Chiranjeevi Arogya Scheme.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only grievance of the petitioner now is that he had already put in a service of about 10 years under the earlier scheme and vide order dated 08.06.2026 he has been engaged under a new scheme, meaning thereby, the benefit of his earlier period of service would not be granted to him.

3. However, learned counsel for the respondent relied upon a judgment of the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***Manish Dotasara Vs. State of Rajasthan; S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7228/2026*** (decided on 29.04.2026) wherein the Court while disposing of the writ petition observed and directed as under:

"12. In view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the present writ petitions are disposed of as follows:

(i) This Court is not inclined to interfere in the order of termination, however, the respondents, who had already instructed to the private entity which is offering consolidated services of infrastructure as well as manpower to take the services of the petitioners and in view thereof, it is an obligation on part of the respondents to see that the persons, who are working under the old scheme, if they are willing to work, they shall be continued their services under the new scheme also.

*(ii) It is also responsibility of the respondents to see that the **pay protection**, which is extended to the manpower of similar nature of duties, who are sponsored from outsourcing agencies, if the Government is taking services, shall also be directed to be adopted by the labs, under which, the new scheme is executing."*

4. A bare perusal of the above observations and directions reflect that the Court has already directed the respondents to ensure the pay protection of the manpower who is re-engaged by the government.

5. In view of the above, it is hereby observed that the above ratio shall apply to the present petitioner too. With the above observation, the present writ petition is **disposed of**.

6. Stay petition and the pending application(s) if any, also stand **disposed of**.

(REKHA BORANA),J