

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10922/2023

Aseem Khan S/o Sh. Saif Ullah Khan

-----Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Rajasthan

-----Respondent

Connected With

1. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10544/2023
2. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10923/2023
3. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10925/2023
4. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10929/2023
5. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10931/2023
6. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10934/2023
7. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10955/2023
8. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11448/2023
9. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14796/2023
10. S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 736/2024

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Tarun Jain Mr. Vibhu Nirmal for Mr. Rahul Kamwar Ms. Shashi Bala Sharma for Mr. Manoj Kumar Avasthi
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. B. S. Chhaba, AAG Mr. Lokesh Kumar Sharma Mr. Aditya Godara for Ms. Mahi Yadav, AAG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAMEER JAIN

Order

23/04/2026

1. Application (IA No. 1/2025) has been filed *qua* the withdrawal of petitioner No.1 from the array of petitioners.
2. For the reasons stated in memo of the application, the same is hereby allowed.

3. It is directed that the name of petitioner No. 1 be deleted from the cause-title of the instant petition.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to file the amended cause-title.
5. In the instant matter, the short controversy involved for adjudication is whether a 'tourist guide' can be equated with a 'nature guide'.
6. Learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Lokesh Sharma, submits that the said professional designations are entirely distinct and are not synonymous to each other. It is submitted that the requisite qualifications, specialized training, and operational requirements for both roles are fundamentally different. It is next submitted that if general tourist guides, who allegedly lack the specific ecological training and qualifications, are permitted to encroach upon the designated domain of specialized nature guides, it would completely frustrate the exclusive rights and livelihood of the latter.
7. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-State wants accommodation to apprise this Court as to whether the present subject matter and the respective qualifications of the guides are squarely covered by the State policies formulated in the year 2010, and whether the said policy framework remains in currency as on date.
8. Time, as sought for, is granted.
9. List the matter on 28.04.2026 in the supplementary cause list.
10. The concerned Officer-in-Charge is directed to remain present before this Court on the next date of hearing, along with



[CW-10922/2023]

the entire relevant records and policy documents to effectively assist the learned counsel for the respondent-State as well as this Court.

(SAMEER JAIN),J

Pooja /53-63