

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

(1) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14328/2020

1. Vishnu Datt Saini S/o Govind Narayan, Aged About 28 Years, R/o 189 Maliyon Ki Dhani, Ward No. 03, Chomu Jaipur (303702) (Raj.).
2. Ajay Kumar S/o Subhash Chandra, R/o Vill.-Jawaharpura Post-Nua, Jhunjhunu (333041) (Raj.).
3. Sourabh Mahala S/o Jhabar Mal Mahala, R/o Mahala House, Ward No. 01 Navodi, Shrimadhopur,sikar (332715) (Raj.).
4. Pawan Saini S/o Gopal Lal Saini, R/o 70 Balekhan Mulgani Dhani, Loharwara,chomu,jaipur (303807) (Raj.).
5. Ravi Choudhary S/o Hans Raj Choudhary, R/o 51 Khatiyo Ka Mohalla, Ramchandrapura, Sanganer, Jaipur (303905) (Raj.).
6. Shimbhu Dayal Saini S/o Ram Kishor Saini, R/o Samod Road Nimadi Hathnoda Chomu Jaipur (303807) (Raj.).
7. Rahul Swarnkar S/o Dayalal Swarnkar, R/o Jain Mohalla Bagidora, Banswara (327601) (Raj.).
8. Devilal S/o Bhagirath Ram, R/o Siya Gav, Pur Jalor (343041) (Raj.).
9. Prabhu Ram Suthar S/o Pira Ram, R/o Aleri, Raniwara, Jalor (343049) (Raj.).
10. Punam Chand S/o Deva Ram, R/o Ward No.7 Phulasar, Bajju Khalasa, Bikaner (334305) (Raj.).
11. Mohd.jahid Usta S/o Zakir Hussain Usta, R/o 15-Mohalla Ustan, Near Big House, Bikaner (334001) (Raj.).
12. Vikash Saini S/o Sunder Lal, R/o Ward No.22 Maliyon Ka Mohalla, Hanuman Mandir Ke Pass Nohar, Hanumanharh (335523) (Raj.).
13. Meenu Saini S/o Gulab Chaand Saini, R/o Ward No.35, Raghunath Ji Ki Bagechi, Ringus Road, Chomu, Jaipur (303702) (Raj.).
14. Chhoutu Ram Farroda S/o Mehram Farroda, R/o Tegore School Ke Pass Manasar, Nagaur (341001) (Raj.).
15. Bhagwan Sahai Jat S/o Gopal Lal Jat, R/o Vpo Devgudha, Th. Amber Jaipur (303701) (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla, Teh. Murdaha Varansi, Uttar Pradesh Pin No. 221202.

-----Respondents

Connected With**(2) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1429/2020**

Bhanwar Lal Choudhary S/o Shri Parshuram Choudhary, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Morla, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk-304503 (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Agriculture Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ghooghra Ghati, Ajmer (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(3) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3256/2020

Jitendra Singh Bamboriya Son Of Shri Ram Kunwar Bamboriya, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Dhani Bamboriya Ki Dhani, Village And Post Mokhampura, Tehsil Mouzmbad, District Jaipur (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.

4. Ashvini Kumar Vyas S/o Shri Kishan Lal Vyas, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village And Post Bheemgarh, Tehsil Rashmi, District Chittorgarh.
5. Pinky Goyal D/o Shri Om Prakash Goyal, R/o Itawa, District Kota-325004.

-----Respondents

(4) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5209/2020

Dr. Kirti Sharma D/o Shri Dwarika Prasad, Aged About 31 Years, Caste-Brahmin, R/o H.no. 402-03, Krishna Nagar, Bharatpur, Rajasthan. (Hall Veterinary Officer (Adhoc), At Govt. Veterinary Hospital Pipla (Sewar) District- Bharatpur, Rajasthan).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Animal Husbandry, State Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Personnel (Gr.-Ii), Government Of Rajasthan, State Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Department Of Animal Husbandry, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Assistant Director, Department Of Animal Husbandry, Bharatpur, Rajasthan
5. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Through Its Secretary.

-----Respondents

(5) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14577/2020

1. Jitendra Singh Gangwal S/o Shri Madan Lal Gangwal, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village - Bibolaw, Post-Ganeti, Tehsil Todaraisingh, Distt. Tonk - 304505 (Raj.).
2. Aditya Kaswan S/o Liladhar Kaswan, Ward No. 23, Bhadra, Hanumangarh, 335501 (Raj.).
3. Ajay Kumar Jhajhariya S/o Om Prakash Jhajhariya, R/o Adarsh Colony, Nawalgarh Road, Ward No 40 Sikar 332001 (Raj.).
4. Ajay Kumar S/o Mahandra Singh Thakan, R/o Angasar, Abusar, Jhunjhunu 333001 (Raj.).

5. Akhil S/o Budharmal, Jandwa Ratangarh, Churu - 331022 (Raj.).
6. Akshaya Kumar S/o Om Prakash, R/o Jharewa, Sikar, 332316 (Raj.).
7. Alok Jat S/o Bharat Lal Jat, Kankoriya, R/o Farm House Ke Pass Khandar Dist Sawaimadhopur 322025 (Raj.).
8. Amba Lal S/o Dhana Ram Kumawat, R/o Nali Ka Balaji, Kuchaman City Nagaur 341508 (Raj.).
9. Amit Kumar S/o Om Prakash, R/o 68 Korani Johad Vali Dhani Togra Khurd Jhunjhunu 333707 (Raj.).
10. Anamika Saini D/o Ram Chander, R/o Ward No 01 Dhani Bandedi Udaipurwati Tehsil Jhunjhunu 333302 (Raj.).
11. Anil Kumar Khichar S/o Rajendra Singh, R/o 10/44 New Housing Board Jhunjhunu 330001 (Raj.).
12. Anil Kumar S/o Jagdeesh Chandra, R/o Ward No -09, 06Iks Lakhasar Dist Hanumangarh 335803 (Raj.).
13. Anita Kumari D/o Banwari Lal, Road No 3, R/o Ward No 09, Diesel Pump Service, Jhunjhunu, 333001 (Raj.).
14. Ankush Kumar Suman S/o Laxmi Narayan Suman, R/o Ward No 26, Jhalawar Road Khanpur 326038 (Raj.).
15. Ashish Kumar S/o Brij Lal, R/o Warispura, Tehsil Jhunjhunu Dist Jhunjhunu 333001 (Raj.).
16. Ashok Kumar S/o Madan Singh, R/o Near Bus Stand, Chachiwad Bada, Sikar - 332311 (Raj.).
17. Ashok Kumar Boori S/o Jagdeesh Prasad, R/o Mohan Ka Bas Post Karansar Renwal Jaipur (Raj.).
18. Ashok Kumar Keer S/o Rameshwar Lal Keer, R/o 43, Dhakd Mohalla Bilawati Kheda, Tehsil- Srward, Hingoniyan Junia Ajmer (305406) (Raj.).
19. Ayush Chaudhary S/o Raj Bahadur, R/o Vill - Hansalsar, Jhunjhunu, 333021 (Raj.).
20. Babita Kumari D/o Nathu Singh, R/o Tehsil - Nawalgarh Khojas Jhunjhunu - 333304 (Raj.).
21. Babu Lal S/o Ramesh Chand, R/o Lalpur Unch Nadbai, Bharatpur Raj 321602 (Raj.).
22. Babu Lal Yadav S/o Nanu Ram Yadav, R/o 56 Kariron Ki Dhani Renwal Road Chomu Jaipur 307302 (Raj.).

23. Bhanu Prakash S/o Nihal Singh, R/o Vpo - Shyopura, Tehsil - Chirawa, District - Jhunjhunu (Raj.).
24. Bhawani Singh S/o Keshar Singh, R/o Ward No 04, Jalpali Srimadhopur Dist Sikar 332715 (Raj.).
25. Chaman Patidar S/o Suresh Chand Patidar, R/o Village - Arniya, Post - Devad Dist. - Pratapgarh (312605) (Raj.).
26. Chandra Shekhar S/o Shiv Narayan Bishnoi, R/o Bher, Nagaur 341001 (Raj.).
27. Deepak Gahlot S/o Brij Mohan Gahlot, R/o Shiv Mandir Ke Samne, Ranisar Bash, Bikaner (334001) (Raj.).
28. Deepak Gill S/o Chandgi Ram, R/o Bugala, Jhunjhunu, 333305 (Raj.).
29. Dharm Chand Saini S/o Raghu Nath Saini, R/o Ward No 03, Dhani Bharanki, Thoi, Sikar 332719 (Raj.).
30. Dilip Kumar Yogi S/o Satyapal Yogi, R/o V/p. Rampura, Bega Ki Nangal, Neem Ka Thana Sikar, 332718 (Raj.).
31. Dinesh Kumar Dhaker S/o Suresh Chand Dhaker, R/o Thukrai, Chittorgarh 312023 (Raj.).
32. Dinesh Kumar S/o Ranjeet Singh, R/o V/p Ajeetpura Via-Kaseru, Mukundgarh Dist Jhunjhunu 333705 (Raj.).
33. Dinesh Kumar Saini S/o Tarachand Saini, R/o Ward No. 26 Patavari Ki Dungari Rajgarh. Tehsil-Rajgarh, District - Alwar (Rajasthan)
34. Dinesh Pratap Yadav S/o Suresh Chand Yadav, Dwarikapura Kotputali Jaipur (303107) (Raj.).
35. Dinesh S/o Kojaram, R/o V/p-Tadawas Dist Nagaur 341025 (Raj.).
36. Gara Ram Saini S/o Suva Lal Saini, R/o V/p- Modawala, Pragpura Tehsil- Kotputli, Jaipur 303107 (Raj.).
37. Ghanshyam S/o Nanak Ram Verma, R/o Jhiwana, Alwar, 301707 (Raj.).
38. Gurvinder S/o Rajpal, R/o Surajgarh, Jhunjhunu, 333029 (Raj.).
39. Harimohan Mali S/o Dhan Singh Mali, R/o Mahamadpur, Sapotra, Karauli 322255 (Raj.).
40. Hemant Kumar Saini S/o Ram Niwas Saini, R/o Near Old Water Works Ward No 22 Chandani Chowk Rajgarh

Sadulpur Churu 331023 (Raj.).

41. Hitesh Choudhary S/o Gheesa Ram Choudhary, R/o 128 Thakurwas, Pali 306023 (Raj.).
42. Indu Bala Choudhary D/o Hari Singh, R/o Behind Co Operative S/o City Jat Colony Nawalgarh Road Sikar Rajasthan.
43. Jagdish Das S/o Babu Das, R/o Vill. - Sankad, Ward No 7 Sado Ka Vas, Tehsil - Sanchore, Dist Jalore 343040 (Raj.).
44. Jai Prakash Khichar S/o Sanjiv Kumar Khichar, R/o Narsara Takhalsar Fatehsilpur Sikar 331024 (Raj.).
45. Jaideep S/o Bhoop Singh, R/o Ward No. 02, Vill. Bojhala, Bhadra, Hanumangarh, 335502
46. Jaskaran Singh S/o Sukhvinder Singh, R/o Vill 80 Baluwala Ward No 01, Shrikaranpur Dist Sriganganagar (Raj.).
47. Jayesh Nagar S/o Champa Lal Nagar, R/o Vip-Kawai Salpura Dist Baran 325219 (Raj.).
48. Jitendra Kumar S/o Mool Chand, R/o Vill-Dadiya, Via-Katrathal Tehsil Sikar 332024 (Raj.).
49. Kamal Sokhal S/o Om Prakash Sokhal, R/o Ward No. 11, House No. 520, Sukhwant Cinema Ke Piche, Purani Abadi, Ganganagar, 335001 (Raj.).
50. Khushiram Yadav S/o Desraj Yadav, R/o 7/26 Malviya Nagar Jaipur -302017 (Raj.).
51. Kirsan Kumar S/o Roopram, R/o Ward No 09 Bhadra Hanumangarh 335501 (Raj.).
52. Krishna Kumar Bagari S/o Raju Ram, R/o Ward No 8, Parbatsar, Nagaur, (Raj.).
53. Lakshmi Kant S/o Chob Singh, R/o Near Police Station, Gt Road, Maniyan Dholpur 328024 (Raj.).
54. Lalit Kumar S/o Tara Chand Yadav, R/o Bijorawas, Behror, Alwar 301701 (Raj.).
55. Lalit Kumar Jangid S/o Manohar Lal Jangid, R/o Ward No. 10, Dhobi Ke Pass, Chirawa, Jhunjhunu, 333026 (Raj.).
56. Lalit Kumar Saini S/o Sitaram Saini, R/o V/p-Hukampura Dist Tonk 304024 (Raj.).

57. Laxmi Narayan S/o Lalchand, R/o 18 Sanjay Colony Agrasen Nagar Sriganganagar 335001 (Raj.).
58. Lokesh Chahar S/o Ramkaran, R/o Amarpura, Alsisar, Jhunjhunu, 331025 (Raj.).
59. Mahesh Kumar S/o Maliram, R/o Ward No. 01, Hukampura, Jhunjhunu, 333012 (Raj.).
60. Mahipal S/o Vishan Singh, R/o Vpo-Alamsariya, Dhorimana, Barmer 344704 (Raj.).
61. Manoj Kumar Dhaka S/o Phool Singh Dhaka, Tehsil, R/o - Laxmangarh Via- Jajod Bhuma Bar, Sikar, 332318 (Raj.).
62. Manoj Kumar Kalwaniya S/o Hardev Singh, R/o Bhojasar, Chhota, Laxamangarh, Sikar, 332312 (Raj.).
63. Manoj Sharma S/o Ramkishan Sharma, R/o Ramkishan Medical Store, Toda Bhim District - Karauli (321611) (Raj.).
64. Manoj Yogi S/o Gajanand Yogi, R/o Bansur, Neemuchana, Alwar 301024 (Raj.).
65. Manphool S/o Ramkaran Singh, R/o Ward No 12, Dundlod Kachha Rastay Par Dhani Sankhu Sikar 332401 (Raj.).
66. Mohammad Zahoor S/o Mohammad Zaffar, R/o Subhash Marg, Mohalla Vyapariyan, Bikaner (Raj.).
67. Mohan Singh S/o Badan Singh, R/o 232 Nagla Ghadi Lakhan Penghore Kumher Bharatpur 321202 (Raj.).
68. Mohd. Saddam Syed S/o Shbbir Hussain Syed, R/o Ward No. 33, New Kotwali Road, Sikar (332001) (Raj.).
69. Mukesh Kumar S/o Gulab Singh, R/o Mundital, Churu, 331023 (Raj.).
70. Mukul Jethiwal S/o Madan Lal Jethiwal, R/o Near Senior Secondary School Sheeshyoo, Sikar 332405 (Raj.).
71. Narsi Ram Gora S/o Harkaran Ram Gora, R/o Sardar Singh Dhani Road Ramdev Colony, Kishangarh Ajmer 305801 (Raj.).
72. Nihal Singh Yadav S/o Ram Kunwar Yadav, R/o Vpo - Sujat Nagar Dhani Khariyya Tehsil Kotputli, Dist. -Jaipur 303107 (Raj.).
73. Nitin Raj Saini S/o Rajpal Saini, R/o Modi Ward No 01, Mehara Jatooas, Jhunjhunu, 333036 (Raj.).

74. Omprakash Natwaria S/o Ridmal Ram, R/o Sandan, Churu 331506 (Raj.).
75. Pawan Kumar S/o Bhup Singh, R/o Ward No 20 Sanjay Colony Rawatsar Dist Hanumangarh 335524 (Raj.).
76. Pawanesh Gahlot S/o Ram Prakash Gahlot, R/o 24, Pani Ki Tanki Ke Pass, Binchhaval, Bikaner - 334006 (Raj.).
77. Pradeep Pal Singh S/o Ramswaroop, R/o Gt Road Police Station Ke Pass Maniyan Dholpur 328024 (Raj.).
78. Prashant Saharan S/o Khayaliram Saharan, Vpo Beenjh Bayala, 47 Lnp 1, Ganganagar 335041 (Raj.).
79. Praveen Pilaniya S/o Vidyadhar Pilaniya, R/o Kishan Colony Near Kalpana Tailors, Nawalgarh Road, Sikar 332001 (Raj.).
80. Priya Saini S/o Lalaram Saini, R/o A-3, Bandhu Nagar, Jai Chamunda Colony, Murlipura, Jaipur - 302023 (Raj.).
81. Priyanka Kumawat D/okailash Chand Kumawat, R/o Ward 01, Baravalo Ki Dhani, Ringus Road, Chomu, Jaipur, 303802 (Raj.).
82. Pukhraj Mahala S/o Jodha Ram, R/o Kushalpura, Reengan Nagaur (Raj.).
83. Rahul Kumar S/o Krishan Kumar, R/o Bharti Bhawan, Narhar, Jhunjhunu, 333035 (Raj.).
84. Rahul Kumar Saini S/o Laxminarayan Saini, R/o Butoliya Karshi Farm Ke Pass, Hanuman Ji Ka Rasta, Ward No 30, Chomu Jaipur 303702 (Raj.).
85. Rajendra Singh S/o Rameshwar Lal Dhayal, R/o Ward No 07 Dhani Budh Singh Wali Kotari Dhayalan Sikar 332404 (Raj.).
86. Rajesh Kumar S/o Banwari Lal, R/o Ward No. 3, Bagriyo Ki Dhani, Sangarwa, Sikar - 332405 (Raj.).
87. Rajesh Kumar S/o Mohan Lal, R/o 3/391, Kisan Colony, Jhunjhunu, 333001 (Raj.).
88. Rajesh Kumar Saini S/o Richhpal Ram Saini, R/o Ward No. 08, Bdi Dhani, Modern School Ke Pass, Thoi, Sikar, 332719 (Raj.).
89. Rajnesh Kumar S/o Mahesh Kumar, R/o Khichdo Ki Dahni, Rahnawa, Sikar 332401 (Raj.).

90. Rakesh Gena S/o Inder Raj Gena, R/o Rajputo Ko Mohalla, Tabeeji Rural, Ajmer (305206) (Raj.).
91. Rakesh Kumar S/o Rajendra Prasad, R/o Ward No. 9, B.ed. College Dharma Wala Kuwa, Rajbhawan Udaipurwati, Jhunjhunu, 333307 (Raj.).
92. Rakesh Kumar S/o Hardayal Singh, R/o Gram Post - Nanau, Tehsil - Nohar, Hanumangarh - 335523 (Raj.).
93. Rakesh Kumar S/o Shishupal Singh, R/o Chanwra Road, Bijarniya Ki Dhani, Gudagorji Ka, Jhunjhunu 333022 (Raj.).
94. Rakesh Kumar Kharbas S/o Sultan Singh, R/o Ward No. 14, Tarpura, Sikar, 332024 (Raj.).
95. Rakesh Kumar S/o Ramniwas, R/o Madhopura, Sikar 332401 (Raj.).
96. Ram Lal S/o Mohanram, R/o 195, Jangid Colony, Paani Ki Tanki, Seva Nagaur, 341303 (Raj.).
97. Rameshwar Lega S/o Arjun Ram, R/o V/p Lega Ki Dhani Toshina Didwana Dist Nagaur 341319 (Raj.).
98. Ranjit Rewar S/o Girdhari Ram, R/o V/p - Singhana, Didwana, Nagaur (341303) (Raj.).
99. Ravi Kumar Yadav S/o Sube Singh, R/o K-37 Sanjay Nagar, Shastri Nagar, Housing Board, Jaipur (Raj.).
100. Ravindra Kumar S/o Raghuvir Singh, R/o Panne Singh Pura, Post- Bhudanpura, Tehsil - Surajgarh, Jhunjhunu, 202966 (Raj.).
101. Rohan Kumar Yadav S/o Naresh Kumar Yadav, R/o Opp. Bsnl Office, Renwal Road, Ward No. 06, Chomu 303702 (Raj.).
102. Rohit Nagar S/o Purushotam Nagar, R/o 376, Rajiv Gandhi Nagar, Kota (324005) (Raj.).
103. Roop Chand S/o Nagarmal, R/o Sulkhania Bara, Rajgarh, Churu 331303 (Raj.).
104. Sangeeta W/o Dharmendra Ola, R/o Shanti Nagar Rajgarh Road Pilani 333031 (Raj.).
105. Sanjeev Kumar S/o Rameshwar Lal, R/o Barwasi, Jhunjhunu 333042 (Raj.).
106. Sardar Singh Jat S/o Gigaram, R/o Kalyanpura, Shrimadhampur, Sikar (Raj.).

107. Shripal Siyak S/o Prem Sukh Siyak, R/o Khairwa, Degana, Nagaur, 341503 (Raj.).
108. Sohan Lal Saini S/o Shyam Sundar Saini, R/o Ringas Road Near Puliya Chandoliyo Ki Dhani Chomu Jaipur 33802 (Raj.).
109. Subhash Chand Yadav S/o Babu Lal Yadav, R/o Ward No 33, Krishna Residency, Thana Moad, Kasba Bansur Puliya Ke Pas, Alwar, 301402 (Raj.).
110. Sukhveer Singh S/o Ramnivas, R/o Doodana Ka Vas Jhunjhunu (333707) (Raj.).
111. Suman Kumari D/o Jagdish Prasad, R/o Nahar Singhani Mukundgarh Jhunjhunu 333705 (Raj.).
112. Sumit Karwa S/o Ramniwas Karwa, R/o Village-Chandpura Tehsil Kuchaman City, Post- Jiliya, Dist Nagaur 341508 (Raj.).
113. Sunil Kumar S/o Mahendra Singh, R/o Ward No. 13, Khemchand Ki Dhani, Dhamora, Jhunjhunu, 333308 (Raj.).
114. Sunil Kumar Prajapat S/o Chunni Lal Prajapat, R/o Samode, Chomu, Jaipur (303806) (Raj.).
115. Sunil Kumar S/o Suresh Kumar, R/o V/p- S/otwara, Tehsil - Nawalgarh, Jhunjhunu 333707 (Raj.).
116. Sunil Kumar S/o Manoj Kumar, R/o Ward No 7 Mukund Garh, Jhunjhunu 333705 (Raj.).
117. Suresh Kumar Bhadu S/o Swai Ram Bhadu, R/o Juliyasar Tehsil - Laxamngarh, Sikar Dist Sikar 332318 (Raj.).
118. Suresh Singh S/o Jeevan Singh, R/o V/p Adhaiya Khurd Tehsil Kumher Dist Bharatpur 321202 (Raj.).
119. Sushil Kapri S/o Shanti Ram, R/o Kapriwas, Nagaur - 341511 (Raj.).
120. Talib Husen Rajer S/o Hafad Khan, R/o Rajer Aakal Barmer 344704 (Raj.).
121. Tejendra Rav S/o Hari Ram Rav, Madpura, Nagaur - 341025 (Raj.).
122. Umesh Kumar Choudhary S/o Ammi Lal, Plot No. 91, Dronpuri Colony, 200 Feet Bypass, Heerapura, Girdharipura, Jaipur, 302021(Raj.).

123. Vikas Kumar S/o Sumer Singh, R/o Plot No 306, Shyam Sarowar, Govindpura, Kalwar Road, Jaipur, 302012 (Raj.).
124. Vikas Kumar S/o Chhotu Ram, R/o Tehsil Fatehsilpur Tejsar Dist Sikar 332301 (Raj.).
125. Vikas Kumar Sain S/o Ramesh Chand Sain, Gomti Colony, Bayana Moad, Hindaun, Karauli - 322230 (Raj.).
126. Vikash Kumar S/o Bhagirath Singh, House No. 162, Tehsil - Ratangarh, Biramsar Churu (331022) (Raj.).
127. Vikram Punia S/o Bhagirath Singh, Vpo - Jajod, Tehsil - Laxmangarh, Sikar (332318) (Raj.).
128. Vikram S/o Satya Narayan, R/o Chirawa Road Ward No 03 Surajgarh Jhunjhunu 333029 (Raj.).
129. Vikramjit Singh S/o Vijendra Singh, R/o Behind Iti College Sardar Patel Nagar Pawanpuri Bikaner 334003 (Raj.).
130. Vimallesh Kumar S/o Hanumana Ram Choudhary, 114, Sampurn Ganv, Kitnod, Barmer, 344022 (Raj.).
131. Vinit Kumar S/o Deendayal Khayaliya, R/o Katrathal, Sikar 332024 (Raj.).
132. Vipin Chandra S/o Maniram Sohu, R/o Ward No 02 Jejusar Jhunjhunu 333707 (Raj.).
133. Vishal Suman S/o Hiralal Suman, 13 Vishal Medical Store, Chand Khedi Road, Khanpur, Jhalawar, 326038 (Raj.).
134. Yogesh Kumar S/o Ramlal Birodi, R/o Chhoti, Laxamangrh, Sikar - 332316 (Raj.).
135. Yogesh Saini S/o Babu Lal Saini, R/o Raghunath Das Ki Bagichi Ke Pass Raiyo Ki Dhani Ward No 30 Chomu Jaipur (Raj.).
136. Nitika D/o Rajendra Prasad, R/o Ward No.01, Mankdo, Jhunjhunu, 303504 (Raj.).
137. Vinod Kumar S/o Krishan Kumar, R/o Behind Pwd Colony, Nohar, Hanumangarh 335523 (Raj.).
138. Nitesh Kumar S/o Mukhram, R/o Ghisa Ki Dhani, Doomra, Jhunjhunu (Raj.).
139. Mahender Milind S/o Lakeshar Satyapal, R/o Lakeshar, 83 Patel Nagar, Mehila Park Ke Pass, Purani Abadi Ward No.11, Shri Ganganagar 335001 (Raj.).

140. Dinesh Kumar Saini S/o Sita Ram Saini, R/o Ward No. 1, Near Ganesh Mandir, Shrimadhopur, Distt. Sikar (Raj.).
141. Prashant Kumar S/o Gambhir Singh, R/o Tuhiya, Tehsil And District Bharatpur (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p.).

-----Respondents

(6) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 161/2021

1. Anil Kumar S/o Mahendra Singh Sura, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ward No. 9, Basantpura, Ked Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
2. Sanjeev Kumar S/o Ram Gopal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Ward No. 02, Lohara Road, Surajgarh, Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
3. Prakash Kumawat S/o Mohan Kumawat, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Raj Wala Bera, Jaswantpura, Tehsil Pisangan, District Ajmer (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla, Distt. Banaras (U.p.)

-----Respondents

(7) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12003/2023

1. Ajit Sherawat S/o Shri Laxman Sherawat, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Ward No. 10, Sherawarto Ki Dhani, Village Harota, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur (Raj.).

2. Vikash Choudhary S/o Shri Ramdev Singh Choudhary, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Mabkali, Post Jaitusar, Village Rengus, Sikar (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p.).

-----Respondents

(8) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19715/2023

1. Dr. Sandeep Bissu S/o Devkaran Singh, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Purohiton Ki Dhani, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
2. Dr. Sushil Kumar S/o Ramkumar, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ward No. 4, Bajju Khalsa, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. Dr. Vinod Kumar Palsaniya S/o Harinarayan, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ward No. 3, Dhani Badawail, Shahpura, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Dr. Vikas Kumar S/o Manohar Lal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Vpo Jaluwala, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
5. Dr. Bhagirath Mal S/o Mohan Lal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Karanpura, Post Koor, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan.
6. Dr. Prakash S/o Chandra Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Near Railway Station, Alai, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.
7. Dr. Sarvesh Kumar S/o Prahlad Ram, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Vpo Ghanau, Swamiyon Ka Mohalla, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Animal Husbandry Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(9) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19720/2023

1. Dr. Harsh Kumar Meena S/o Bhabuti Lal Meena, Aged About 25 Years, R/o 9, Shubham Colony, Near S.h.p. School, Pushkar Bypass Road, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
2. Dr. Mahaveer Prasad Meena S/o Satyanarayan Meena, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Unda, Post Ratawad, Tehsil And District Baran, Rajasthan.
3. Dr. Batti Lal Meena S/o Badri Lal Meena, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Vpo Shreema Dabara Ki Dhani, Tehsil Lalsot, District Dausa, Rajasthan.
4. Dr. Sunil Kalasua S/o Shanker Lal Kalasua, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Sohanvadli, Post Sendola, Tehsil Cheekhali, District Dungarpur, Rajasthan.
5. Dr. Lokesh Gadat S/o Ram Lal Gadat, Aged About 28 Years, R/o 6/164, Rhb Colony, Housing Board, Dungarpur, Rajasthan.
6. Dr. Vipul Kumar Meena S/o Amrit Lal Meena (Parmar), Aged About 27 Years, R/o 31, Jai Shree Nagar-Ii, Teetaradi, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
7. Dr. Kishor Singh Deshval S/o Amar Singh Deshval, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Near Old Post Office, Ware House Road, Katra, Nadbai, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan.
8. Dr. Kuldeep Dayma S/o Krishna Kumar Dayma, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Gayatri Kunj, Gayatri School, Mohalla Khatikan, Jhajhar Road, Nawalgarh, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Animal Husbandry Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(10) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20155/2023

1. Anil Kumar S/o Shri Ashok Kumar, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village- Jeevan Niwas, Post Dhadhot Khurd, Tehsil- Buhana, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)

2. Dr. Ashish Meel S/o Shri Rajendra Prasad Meel, Aged About 26 Years, R/o 41, Sundarvan, Nawalgarh Road, Sikar (Raj.)
3. Dr. Bharat Singh Mahak S/o Shri Nekiram Mahak, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ward No.8, Hameerwas, Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
4. Dr. Praveen Ratnu S/o Shri Narendra Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Vardhman Nagar, Matharia, Jodhpur (Raj.).
5. Dr. Sunil Kumar S/o Shri Ramjas, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Kumaharn Vali Dhani, Topriya, Tehsil Rawatsar, District Hanumangarh (Raj.).
6. Dr. Yashank Sen S/o Shri Laxminarayan Sen, Aged About 27 Years, R/o 51, Shri Ram Nagar, Nandri Road, Banar Road, Jodhpur (Raj.).
7. Dr. Arjun Gehlot S/o Shri Devraj Gehlot, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Behind M.s. College, Ranisar Bas, Bikaner (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p.)

-----Respondents

(11) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20191/2023

Kuldeep Singh Gurjar S/o Vikram Singh Gurjar, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Dungarpura, Post Morda, Tehsil Todabhim, District Karauli, Rajasthan

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan
2. The Director, Animal Husbandry Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.



-----Respondents

(12) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20581/2023

Rakesh Saini S/o Ramawatar Saini, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Dhani Dewawali, Jairampura, Vpo Bassi, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Animal Husbandry Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(13) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 103/2024

Vipin Singh Poonia S/o Shri Raghuveer Singh, Aged About 35 Years, R/o A/29, Vivek Vihar, Kisaan Colony, Jhunjhunu (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p).

-----Respondents

(14) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 250/2024

Dr. Lokendra Singh Nitharwal S/o Phool Chand Nitharwal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Vpo Ranipura, Kasarda, Tehsil Khandela, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Animal Husbandry Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(15) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 835/2024

Prateek Sahani S/o Shri Deokaran Singh, Aged About 37 Years,
R/o Vpo Sotwara, Via Doomara, Tehsil Nawalgarh, District
Jhunjhunu (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary,
Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of
Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through
Its Secretary,
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o
Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p)

-----Respondents

(16) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2431/2024

Hemant Kumar S/o Nandram Bhaskar, Aged About 30 Years, R/o
Plot No. 75, Street No. 4, Surya Nagar, Hanumangarh Town,
District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary,
Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of
Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through
Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o
Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p.)

-----Respondents

(17) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3883/2024

Amar Singh S/o Shish Ram Jat, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Dhani
Harajeewala, Vpo Babai, Tehsil Khetri, District Neem Ka Thana,
Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its
Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

2. The Director, Animal Husbandry Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(18) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4191/2024

1. Dr. Dinesh Kumar Sunda S/o Shri Harlal Singh Sunda, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Plot No. 27, Anand Vihar Colony, Vishwabharti Pg College Ke Pass, Jaipur Road, District Sikar, Rajasthan -332001.
2. Radhey Shyam S/o Dev Karan, Aged About 27 Years, R/o 2/242, Gyan Marg, Near City Square Mall, B-Block, Panchsheel Nagar, Ajmer, Rajasthan-305004.
3. Kuldeep Singh S/o Deda Ram, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village-Dhani Lawanda, Post- Thedi, Tehsil Ramgarh Shekhawati, Sikar, Rajasthan-331024
4. Yashpal Choudhary S/o Sanjesh, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Ward No. 11, Ghassu, Sikar, Rajasthan-332315
5. Puneet Choudhary S/o Dilip Singh, Aged About 26 Years, R/o V.p.o Wahidpura, Via Mandate, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan- 333704
6. Mukesh Kumar Bajia S/o Kajor Mal Bajia, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Dhani- Ramsayaz, Village-Lakhani Via Rengus, District-Sikar, Rajasthan-332409.
7. Hemant Panchal S/o Sajjan Lal Panchal, Aged About 26 Years, R/o 150, Prem Nagar, Jagatpura, Rajasthan.
8. Hemant Patidar S/o Nakendra Patidar, Aged About 26 Years, R/o G-608 Neelkanth Apartment, Baran Road, Borkheda, Kota, Rajasthan-324001.
9. Aarav Kumar S/o Rajesh Kumar, Aged About 26 Years, R/o V.p.o Wahidpura, Via Mandawa, District-Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan- 333704
10. Deepak Jayaswall S/o Harish Jayaswall, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Scheme No. 10, A- 22, Vivek Vihar, District-Alwar, Rajasthan- 301001.
11. Nisar Ahmad S/o Samay Deen Khan, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Chhilori, District-Alwar, Rajasthan-321633
12. Dr. Anil Kumar Dhaker S/o Raghunath Dhaka, Aged About 29 Years, R/o 201, Chetak Vihar, Agra Road, Jamdoli, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

13. Richa Soni D/o Shri Arvind Kumar Soni, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Plot No. 497-498 Shivaji Park, Alwar, Rajasthan- 301001.
14. Arvind Kumar S/o Shri Chhote Lal Singh, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Village And Post Bandanwada, Tehsil Bhinai, Kekri, Ajmer, Rajasthan-305621
15. Swarup Charan S/o Chhagan Dan, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Mahadev Colony, Ward No. 22, Balotra, District-Barmer, Rajasthan-344022.
16. Dr. Naveesh Kumar Nehra S/o Shri Jai Singh Nehra, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Ward No.25, Bhadra, District-Hanumangarh, Rajasthan-335501.
17. Krishan Kumar Singh S/o Ghanshyam Singh, Aged About 34 Years, R/o 228 Gas Godam Road, Pushp Vatika Colony, Bharatpur, Rajasthan
18. Manoj Kumar S/o Bachchu Singh, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Sinsini, Bharatpur, Rajasthan
19. Shalendra Kumar Yadav S/o Moolchand Yadav, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Vpo Banar, Tehsil Kotputli, District Kotputli- Behror, Rajasthan

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p.)

-----Respondents

(19) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4634/2024

Vivekanand Bairva S/o Ramlal Bairva, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Bairwa Basti, Gram Post Sewa, Gangapur City District-Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary Ajmer, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Animal Husbandry Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(20) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4989/2024

1. Monika Singh, D/o Birbal Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Ward No. 42, Janta Colony, Nawalgarh Road, Distt. Sikar, Rajasthan.
2. Dr. Ashok Kumar Koori S/o Sh. Mangoo Ram Koori, Aged About 30 Years, R/o V.p.o Rajpura Nosal, Teh. Danta Ramgarh , Distt Sikar, Rajasthan.
3. Mukesh Kumar S/o Sh. Nand Lal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ward No. 1, V.p.o Bharonda Kalan, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan
4. Anil Kumar Soni S/o Manohar Lal Soni, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Vpo Narhar, Tehsil Chirawa, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan
5. Satyaveer Singh S/o Kedar Singh, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village And Post- Hatizer, Tehsil Weir, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan- 321028.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p.).

-----Respondents

(21) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7771/2024

1. Gajanand Kumawat S/o Mool Chand Kumawat, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Bhojpura Kalan, Tehsil Jobner, District Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303328.

2. Manish Jajara S/o Chenaram Jajara, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Plot No. 47, Redu Nagar, Govindpura Link Road, District Jaipur- 302012.
3. Prahlad Singh Dhaka S/o Heera Lal Dhaka, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village Ramsinghpura, Post Kalak, Tehsil Phulera, District Jaipur- 303328.
4. Rajendra Jangid S/o Madan Lal Jangid, Aged About 29 Years, R/o D-244, Kardhani Scheme, 9 Dukan, Kalwar Road, Jhotwara, Jaipur - 302012.
5. Ramniwas S/o Sukharam, Aged About 29 Years, R/o R/o Plot No. 47, Redu Nagar, Govindpura Link Road, District Jaipur- 302012.
6. Sohan Lal Boori S/o Mohan Lal Boori, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Neem Wali Dhani, Mohan Ka Bas, Post Karansar, Tehsil Kishangarh Renwal, District Jaipur- 303328.
7. Madhu Kumari D/o Madan Lal Khati, Aged About 30 Years, R/o D-244, Kardhani Scheme, 9 Dukan, Kalwar Road, Jhotwara, Jaipur - 341509.
8. Sita Ram Bijarnia S/o Govardhan Lal Bijarnia, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Moonwara, Post Sinodiya, Tehsil Phulera, District Jaipur- 303328.
9. Tejpal Bajaya S/o Ram Narayan Bajaya, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village-Gumanpura, Post-Jorpura, Teh-Phulera, District Jaipur -303328.
10. Madhu Kumari Jakhar D/o Pitha Ram Jakhar, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Vpo Mundiagarh, Tehsil Kishangarh Renwal, District Jaipur- 303603.
11. Shankar Lal Choudhary S/o Ghisa Ram Jat, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Vpo Pachar, Tehsil Jaipur, District Jaipur- 303706.
12. Santosh Ola D/o Cheta Ram Ola, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Vpo Pachar, Tehsil Jaipur, District Jaipur- 303706.
13. Mali Ram Ola S/o Cheta Ram Ola, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Plot No.4, Shankar Path, Omvatika First, Kalwar Road, Govindpur, District Jaipur- 302012.

-----Petitioners

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.

----Respondents

(22) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7772/2024

1. Dr. Abhishek Khoja S/o Ramjivan Khoja, Aged About 29 Years, R/o 115/217, Jalana Chhore, Mansarovar, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Lokesh Prajapat S/o Durga Lal Prajapat, Aged About 34 Years, R/o 115/217, Jalana Chhor, Near D-Mart Mansarovar, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioners

Versus


1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p)

----Respondents

(23) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8512/2024

1. Naveen Saini S/o Makkhanlal Saini, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Bhagawati Bhawan, Near Naveen Petrol Pump, Patan, Neem Ka Thana, Rajasthan- 332718.
2. Vipin Giri S/o Malu Ram, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Doshi Bas Sardarpura, Tehsil- Bhadra, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan- 335501

----Petitioners



Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi (U.p).

----Respondents

(24) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8722/2024

1. Mukesh Choudhary S/o Ram Narayan Choudhary, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Vpo Surpura, Boraj, Via Phulera, Tehsil Mozmabad, District Jaipur- 303338.
2. Mangal Chand Dhaka S/o Hira Lal Dhaka, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village Ramsinghpura, Via Jobner, District Jaipur- 303328.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District Bhilwara- 311602.

----Respondents

(25) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8872/2024

Sushila Bhathesar D/o Sh. Ramdhan Bhathesar, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Lohrana, Tehsil Nawa, Chosla, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur-303604.

----Respondents

(26) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8876/2024

1. Anil Sevda S/o Ram Niwas Sevda, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Plot No. 179, Vardhman Nagar, Near Teja Circle, Jaipur.
2. Poonam D/o Bhagirath Mal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Bakra Road, Bhani Nagar, Ward No.22, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan - 333001.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District Bhilwara- 311602.

----Respondents

(27) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8920/2024

Urmila Choudhary D/o Mohan Lal Choudhary, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Ganeshpura, Post Kalakh, Via Jobner, District Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303328

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Teshil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur-303604
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District Bhilwara-311602.

----Respondents

(28) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8962/2024

1. Ashok Choudhary S/o Shivji Ram Choudhary, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village And Post Kothun, Tehsil Chaksu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303901.
2. Banshee Lal Kumawat S/o Bholoo Ram Kumawat, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Jugmalpura, Post Jobner, Tehsil Phulera, District Jaipur, Rajasthan- 303328.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District Bhilwara- 311602.

-----Respondents

(29) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9302/2024

1. Mahendra Yadav S/o Anandilal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Vpo Dhodhsar, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303712.
2. Kanheya Lal Yadav S/o Gopal Lal Yadav, Aged About 30 Years, Village Vijaygovindpura, Post Bhojpura Kalan, Tehsil Jobner, District Jaipur, Rajasthan- 303328.
3. Om Prakash Rolaniya S/o Arjun Lal Rolaniya, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Rolaniya Ki Dhani, Choota Gudha, District Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303602.
4. Rajneesh Yadav S/o Mohan Lal Yadav, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Khijuriya Village, Post Bhainsawa, Tehsil Jobner, District Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303603.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District Bhilwara- 311602.

-----Respondents

(30) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9313/2024

Yogendra Kumar Budania S/o Balveer Singh, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Plot No. 47, Redu Nagar, Govindpura Link Road, District Jaipur, Rajasthan-302012.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, , R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District Bhilwara- 311602.

----Respondents

(31) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9333/2024

Vishnu Gurjar S/o Man Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Dayapur, Tehsil Bhusawar, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan - 321406.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.

5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District Bhilwara- 311602.

----Respondents

(32) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9895/2024

Sonu Berwal D/o Narasi Ram Berwal, Aged About 25 Years, R/o 285, Janpat, Nirman Nagar, Lane No. 3, District Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302019.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District- Bhilwara- 311602.

----Respondents

(33) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10340/2024

Babu Lal S/o Nanda Ram, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Plot No. 1, Sarasvati Vihar, Kandira Marg, Jhotwara, Near By Sahid Major Alok Mathur Park, District Jaipur, Rajasthan -302012.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur-303604.
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District Bhilwara-311602.

-----Respondents

(34) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10341/2024

Karan Singh Choudhary S/o Mahesh Choudhary, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Plot No. 135, Ganesh Nagar-5, Near Tagore Iti, Vki Road, No.5 Macheda, Murlipura, Rajasthan-302012.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur-303604.
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District Bhilwara-311602.

-----Respondents

(35) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10457/2024

1. Manphool Phoolphagar S/o Dhannaram Phoolphagar, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Khanwar, Tehsil Jayal, Dist. Nagaur, Rajasthan.
2. Rajesh Kumar S/o Omprakash, Aged About 33 Years, Vpo Kaseru, Tehsil Nawalgarh, Village, Ajitpura, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry And Dairy Department, Govt, Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
3. Ankit Kumar Singh S/o Shri Ghanshyam Singh, R/o Village Ekla Murdha, Distt. Varanasi(U.p.)

----Respondents

(36) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10624/2024

1. Mohani Sunda D/o Kanaram Sunda, Aged About 30 Years, R/o 191, Heeranagar-A, Heerapura, 200 Ft Bypass, Ajmer Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan - 302021.
2. Mukesh Kumar Jat S/o Prakash Chand Jat, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Aamload, Post Dhawali, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303806.
3. Saroj Jat D/o Shimbu Dayal Jat, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Vpo Shivsinghpura, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur- 303806.
4. Anita Yadav D/o Badrinarayan Yadav, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Nopura, Post Hastera, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur- 303712.
5. Pawan Kumar S/o Krishan Kumar, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Ward No. 6, Vpo Barwali, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh- 335504.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.

5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years,
R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District
Bhilwara- 311602.

-----Respondents

(37) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11931/2024

Shankar Lal Bijarnia S/o Ram Narayan, Aged About 31 Years,
R/o Village And Post Murlipura, Vaya Jobner, Tehsil Kishangarh
Renwal, District Jaipur, Rajasthan- 303328.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District- Jaipur- 303604.
5. Ankit Kumar S/o Chitar Lal Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Chand Ji Ki Kheri, Tehsil Bijoliya, District- Bhilwara- 311602.

-----Respondents

(38) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13797/2024

Ashok Yadav S/o Prakash Chand Yadav, Aged About 27 Years,
R/o Jalim Singh Ka Bas, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan
- 303801.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.

----Respondents

(39) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1653/2025

Pushpendra Kumar S/o Jagan Singh Rohlania, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Jaswantpura, Kanchanpur, District Sikar, Rajasthan - 332715.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.

----Respondents

(40) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4963/2025

1. Amit Bhadu S/o Rai Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o 823/f1, Ranisati Nagar, Janpath Lane No. 12, Nirman Nagar, Jaipur- 302019.
2. Prabhat Saharan S/o Prem Kumar, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Home Number 198, Sharda Colony, Mahesh Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.

----Respondents

(41) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16440/2025

1. Pooja Nunia D/o Ram Kumar, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Lamba, Police Station Bagar, Tehsil Chirawa, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan- 333023.
2. Heeralal Bijarniya S/o Ishwar Lal, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Preampura, Post Dansroli, Dantaramgarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan- 332742

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.

----Respondents

(42) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 18735/2025

1. Rohit Kumar S/o Sadul Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Ward No. 12, Village And Post Kharakhera, Tehsil Tibbi, District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.
2. Sunil Kumar S/o Hari Ram, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village And Post Mohakam Wala, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, District Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan- 335051.
3. Shivdutt S/o Balwant Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Ward No. 15, Village Chamar Khera, Po Budhrawali, Sadulshahar, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan- 335062.
4. Udaideep Balihara S/o Rameshwar Balihara, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Ward No.3, Village And Post Satipura, District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan- 335512.



5. Sanjeev Kumar S/o Jagdeesh Chander, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Ward No.10, Chak 28 As B, Gp 2 Mld A, Gharsana, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan- 335707.
6. Sushil Kumar S/o Pappu Ram, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Chak 9 Lsm, Village And Post Khokharanwali, Tehsil Anoopgarh, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan- 335701.
7. Kirtpal Singh S/o Paramjeet Singh, Aged About 32 Years, R/o 14 Apd, Ramsinghpur Police Station, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan- 335701.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.

----Respondents

(43) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 18865/2025

Omprakash Godara S/o Bhanwar Lal Godara, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Nakodesar, Post Kaloo, Tehsil Lunkarnsar, District Bikaner, Rajasthan-334602.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur-303604.

----Respondents

(44) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19075/2025

Lal Chand Yadav S/o Kalyan Sahay Yadav, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Damba Ka Bas, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan- 303712.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Krishi Pant Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Puroshotam Sharma S/o Jeeva Ram Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Vpo Mokhampura, Tehsil Mauzamabad, District Jaipur- 303604.

----Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Akshit Gupta Advocate with Ms. Aditi Vats Advocate, Mr. Shreyansh Dhariwal Advocate, Ms. Pragya Seth Advocate, Mr. Nakul Bansal Advocate and Mr. Kamlesh Sharma Advocate Mr. Harender Neel Advocate Mr. Tanveer Ahamad Advocate through VC with Mr. Illyas Khan Advocate and Mr. Umer Alam Advocate Ms. Sushila Kalwania Advocate for Mr. Pradeep Kalwania Advocate Mr. Aamir Khan Advocate for Mr. Ram Pratap Saini Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. Rajendra Prasad, Advocate General assisted by Mr. Sheetanshu Sharma Advocate, Ms. Harshita Thakral Advocate, Ms. Dhriti Laddha Advocate and

Mr. Tanay Goyal Advocate
Mr. Yuvraj Samant Advocate with
Ms. Neha Amola Advocate and
Mr. Tilak Vaid Advocate
Ms. Neha Swami Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Saxena Advocate
Mr. Hardik Singh Advocate with
Ms. Mahi Choudhary Advocate for
Mr. B.S. Chhaba, Additional Advocate
General.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Judgment

REPORTABLE

Date of conclusion of arguments	::	12.03.2026
Date on which judgment was reserved	::	12.03.2026
Whether the full judgment or only the operative part is pronounced	::	Full Judgment
Date of pronouncement	::	25.03.2026

1. The present batch of writ petitions has been filed by the petitioners, primarily laying a challenge to the screening result dated 26.11.2020 declared by the respondent-Rajasthan Public Service Commission (for short 'RPSC') for the post of Veterinary Officer. In some of the writ petitions, a challenge has been made to the result for recruitment on the post of Assistant Agriculture Officer, wherein also, the scheme of examination and governing rules are *pari materia*.
2. The grievance of the petitioners, who belong to Other Backward Classes (OBC) category, in the present batch of petitions emanates from a common cause of action, alleging infringement of their fundamental rights in the matter of public employment. For the purpose of understanding the question under consideration as also the dispute involved and for the sake of convenience, with the consent of learned counsel for the parties, although all the above writ petitions were heard analogously, the

facts stated in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14328/2020 (Vishnu Datt Saini & Others vs. The State of Rajasthan & Others) are being taken into consideration for deciding this batch of writ petitions by this common judgment.

3. The selection in question originates from an advertisement dated 22.10.2019, issued for filling up 900 posts of Veterinary Officer by direct recruitment, comprising 816 fresh vacancies and 84 backlog vacancies, under the Rajasthan Animal Husbandry Service Rules, 1963 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the Rules of 1963'). The candidates possessing Bachelor's degree in Veterinary Science or Animal Husbandry or its equivalent degree issued by a recognised University, were eligible to participate in the process of recruitment.

4. Process of selection has been prescribed in the advertisement in the following manner:

चयन प्रक्रिया	अभ्यर्थियों के चयन हेतु चयन प्रक्रिया निम्नानुसार रहेगी :-			
	संवीक्षा परीक्षा में प्राप्तांकों का 40 प्रतिशत भारांक की गणना <u>Marks Secured in Screening Test</u> x 40 Total Marks of Screening Test	अकादमिक का भारांक	साक्षात्कार का भारांक	कुल पूर्णांक
	40 अंक	20 अंक	40 अंक	100 अंक

5. The aforesaid advertisement also provides for a screening examination, which as per the documents placed on record was held on the basis of Multiple Choice Questions carrying maximum 300 marks. The screening test consisted of 150 objective-type questions carrying one mark each, with a provision of one-third negative marking. Candidates, who qualified the screening examination in the ratio of 1:3 of the vacancies advertised, were to be allowed for Interview. As per the prescribed scheme of selection, for the purpose of preparing the select list after interview, candidates would be given marks out of maximum

100, out of which marks obtained in screening shall carry a weightage of 40 marks on the basis of formula prescribed in the advertisement, 20 weightage marks were assigned to academic qualifications and 40 weightage marks were assigned to the interview.

6. The petitioners, having applied pursuant to the said advertisement, appeared in the screening examination conducted on 02.08.2020. According to the petitioners, despite their meritorious performance, they were excluded from the list of candidates shortlisted for interview.

7. It is specifically pleaded that certain OBC candidates, including the petitioners, who had secured comparatively higher marks, such as Chhoutu Ram Farroda with a tentative score of 149 marks, were excluded from the zone of consideration, whereas candidates belonging to the general category with significantly lower marks, such as Ankit Kumar Singh with 78 marks, were included, as would be reflected from the comparative OMR sheets. The petitioners further asserted that upon seeking information, the respondent-RPSC disclosed that the shortlisting had been carried out on category-wise basis, by adopting a ratio of twice the number of vacancies in each category, but declined to disclose the cut-off marks and deferred publication of the final answer key till completion of the entire selection process.

8. The aforesaid selection process has been assailed by the petitioners contending that although the screening test carried substantial weightage of 40% in the final merit, it has effectively been treated as a mere qualifying examination without any transparency in the shortlisting process. The exclusion of higher-

scoring candidates from the reserved categories, coupled with the inclusion of lower-scoring candidates from the general category, is alleged to be manifestly arbitrary. Further, the non-disclosure of the criteria for awarding academic marks and not adding the same in order to shortlist the candidates for interview as also the absence of a fair and rational shortlisting mechanism, such as an overall merit-based zone of consideration with due adjustment for reservation are stated to have compounded the illegality.

9. The respondent-RPSC opposed the writ petition by way of filing reply and submitted that the recruitment process has been conducted strictly in accordance with the applicable rules and the notified scheme of examination. It is the specific stand of the RPSC that under the Rules of 1963, particularly Rule 19, the selection is essentially based on interview and the RPSC is vested with the discretion to scrutinise applications and call candidates for interview in such number as deemed appropriate. In exercise of such discretion and pursuant to a Full Commission decision dated 29.08.2019, candidates were shortlisted category-wise in the ratio of 1:3 against the advertised vacancies. Accordingly, 1878 candidates were declared successful in the screening test and called for interview. It is further explained that in certain categories, adequate candidates were not available in the prescribed ratio. The respondents have further contended that the category-wise shortlisting is in accordance with the rules and the terms of the advertisement and, therefore, no comparison can be drawn between candidates of different categories at this stage. It is also asserted that the petitioners' contention regarding the existence of multiple stages of examination is misconceived, as

the Rules of 1963 contemplate only one stage of selection, i.e., interview with the screening test serving merely as a shortlisting mechanism.

10. It would be relevant to mention that since one of the ground raised in writ petitions was that the list of successful candidates for the purpose of calling them for interview was prepared without adding the weightage marks of academic to the marks secured by the candidates in the screening test, only on that ground earlier the writ petitions filed by the petitioners were allowed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide judgment/order dated 08.03.2022 and the result declared by the Respondent-RPSC dated 26.11.2020 was quashed and the RPSC was directed to declare the result afresh after adding weightage marks of academics with the marks of screening. However, other questions raised in the writ petitions were left open by the Co-ordinate Bench.

11. Feeling aggrieved by the judgment/order dated 08.03.2022, the RPSC filed intra-court appeals before Division Bench of this Court, led by D.B. Civil Special Appeals (Writ) No. 568/2022 (The Rajasthan Public Service Commission vs Vishnu Datt Saini & Others). The above batch of appeals was allowed by the Division Bench of this Court vide judgment dated 19.05.2023 with following observations and directions:

"28. We have arrived at conclusion on factual premise that the advertisement also does not lay down the order in which the selection would be held in different stages and, therefore, in such a case, the procedure as adopted by the Public Service Commission cannot be said to be arbitrary, unfair or discriminatory.

29. Once we have held that the procedure adopted by the Public Service Commission was neither in contravention of the applicable recruitment rules, nor in violation of the procedure laid down in the advertisement, it being not a

case of changing rules of game after the process of selection had begun and further that the procedure adopted does not suffer from any irrationality, arbitrariness or unfairness, the scope of judicial review is extremely limited.

33. In view of above consideration of facts and legal position as analysed by us, we are unable to uphold the conclusion drawn by the learned Single Judge that the procedure adopted by the Public Service Commission in calling the candidates for interview without adding the weightage marks of academics was contrary to the terms of the advertisement. Impugned orders are, therefore, unsustainable and set aside. The conclusion arrived at hereinabove will be applicable in the other appeals, except D.B. Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No. 914/2022, arising out of orders passed in writ petitions involving challenge to recruitment to the posts of Veterinary Officer, Assistant Agricultural Research Officer (Agriculture Chemistry), Assistant Agriculture Research Officer (Agriculture Chemistry), Botany, Assistant Agricultural Officer and Assistant Fisheries Development Officer because all those cases are based on the common ground and pari materia provision contained in respective recruitment rules, identical terms, conditions and recitals in the advertisements though for different category of posts.

34. In the result, all the appeals, except D.B. Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No. 914/2022, are allowed. D.B. Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No. 914/2022 is disposed off.

35. Consequently, writ petitions are restored and remanded for adjudication on issues which were left open, except one decided in these appeals."

12. It would also be relevant to refer that against judgment dated 19.05.2023 passed by the Division Bench, some of the petitioners approached Hon'ble Supreme Court by way of filing Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No(s). 38962/2023, in which while issuing notices vide order dated 06.10.2023, the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed interim order to the effect that the interviews of the shortlisted candidates were not to be interdicted. However, it was directed that appointments should not be made without the leave of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The above interim order dated 06.10.2023 was further modified vide order dated 31.05.2024, whereby the Hon'ble Supreme Court granted liberty to the RPSC to declare the result and issue letter(s) of appointment to the selected candidates. However, the same was made subject to outcome of the above SLP. Each one of the

selected candidate was directed to be notified of such fact, so that he/she would not claim any equity only on issuance of appointment order. However, finally the above SLP was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 02.04.2025 declining to interfere with the judgment of Division Bench dated 19.05.2023.

13. Thus, it is clear that the interviews were conducted under the interim orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which were followed by issuance of appointment letters to the selected candidates on account of modification of interim order by the Hon'ble Apex Court. Ultimately, SLPs filed by the petitioners were dismissed.

14. Since, vide judgment dated 19.05.2023, the Division Bench, while allowing the appeals filed by the respondent-RPSC, remanded the writ petitions to the Single Bench for adjudication of the issues which were left open by the Co-ordinate Bench, while earlier allowing the writ petitions, hence, the writ petitions were pressed by the petitioners on other issues.

15. Mr. Akshit Gupta, Mr. Harender Neel and Mr. Tanveer Ahmed, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners vehemently argued that the screening test in the present selection process cannot be treated as a mere qualifying or shortlisting examination, inasmuch as it carries 40% weightage in the final merit. It is urged that once the marks obtained in the screening test form an integral component of the final selection, the said examination assumes the character of a substantive written examination and, therefore, the respondents were under an obligation to disclose the category-wise cut-off marks and final answer key at the stage

of declaration of the screening result itself. It is further contended that the respondents have acted arbitrarily in shortlisting candidates category-wise in the ratio of 1:3, which has resulted in exclusion of more meritorious candidates belonging to reserved categories while including less meritorious candidates from the general category. Placing reliance on judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Rajasthan High Court & Another vs Rajat Yadav & Others (Civil Appeal no. 14112 of 2024 & other connected appeals decided on 19.12.2025)** relating to migration of meritorious reserved category candidates to the open category, it was argued that merit ought to prevail at every stage of selection and that denial of opportunity to such candidates at the stage of interview is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

16. Per contra, Mr. Rajendra Prasad, learned Advocate General assisted by Mr. Yuvraj Samant, learned counsel for respondent-RPSC submitted that the entire selection process is governed by the Rules of 1963, particularly Rule 19, which confers wide discretion upon the Commission to scrutinise applications and to call such number of candidates for interview as it deems desirable. It is contended that the selection under the rules is essentially interview-based and the screening test has been introduced only as a method of shortlisting candidates, though a limited weightage has been assigned to it, yet it would be relevant at the stage of interview and the criteria is for the purpose of guidance for preparation of the final merit. It is further submitted that the RPSC, by a conscious decision of the Full Commission, adopted a uniform method of calling candidates in the ratio of 1:3

category-wise against the advertised posts, which is a well-recognised and reasonable method of shortlisting. It was also contended that comparison between candidates of different categories at the stage of shortlisting is misconceived, as the shortlisting has been undertaken category-wise in accordance with the number of vacancies reserved for each category. It was also argued that the judgment of **Rajasthan High Court & Another vs Rajat Yadav & Others (supra)** is distinguishable in view of the exception carved out in the judgment itself.

17. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the core issue which arises for consideration is as to whether the action of the respondent-RPSC in shortlisting candidates for interview in the ratio of 1:3 category-wise, excluding allegedly more meritorious candidates belonging to reserved categories while including less meritorious candidates from the general category i.e. without migration of the reserved category candidates possessing more marks than the unreserved category candidates at the stage of result of screening examination, suffers from arbitrariness or illegality warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India or not ?

18. At the outset, it is to be noted that the selection in question is governed by Rule 19 of the Rules of 1963, for recruitment on the post of Veterinary Officer and by Rule 20 of the Rajasthan Agriculture Subordinate Service Rules, 1978 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the Rules of 1978') for the post of Assistant Agriculture Officers, which are reproduced as under:

"Rajasthan Animal Husbandry Service Rules 1963:

19. Scrutiny of Applications- The Commission shall scrutinize the applications received by them and require as many candidates qualified for appointment under these Rules as seem to them desirable to appear before them for interview:

Provided that the decision of the Commission as to the eligibility or otherwise of a candidate, shall be final.

Rajasthan Agriculture Subordinate Service Rules, 1978

20. Scrutiny of applications.- The Commission or the Appointing Authority, as the case may be, shall scrutinize the applications received by them and require as many candidates qualified for appointment under these rules as seem to them desirable to appear before them for interview:

Provided that the decision of the Commission or the Appointing Authority, as the case may be, regarding the eligibility or otherwise of a candidate shall be final."

19. Since both the aforesaid Rules are *para-materia*, therefore, to avoid any kind of repetition, this Court deems it proper to consider and discuss Rule 19 of the Rules of 1963 for the purpose of adjudication of the dispute involved in the present cases.

20. Bare reading of Rule 19 of the Rules of 1963 makes it clear that the rule empowers the Commission to scrutinise applications and to require as many candidates as it deems desirable to appear for interview. The language employed in the rule confers a wide discretion upon the Commission in the matter of shortlisting and the proviso further declares that the decision of the Commission as to the eligibility or otherwise of a candidate shall be final. Thus, the statutory scheme itself recognises the authority of the Commission to adopt an appropriate method for limiting the number of candidates to be called for interview. As per Rule 19 of the Rules of 1963, the Commission is required to scrutinise all applications received from candidates, meaning thereby that it will examine whether the applicants fulfill the prescribed eligibility conditions. After such scrutiny, the

Commission has the authority to call for interview only such number of candidates as it considers desirable for appointment under the Rules. This makes it clear that mere fulfillment of eligibility conditions does not confer an automatic right upon every candidate to be called for interview and the Commission is empowered to shortlist candidates on a reasonable basis. The expression "as seem to them desirable" confers a wide degree of discretion upon the Commission in the matter of shortlisting. It may adopt suitable criteria such as screen test, qualifications, experience, or limit the number of candidates to a reasonable proportion of available vacancies or adopting any other just criteria. Thus, even among eligible candidates, only those who meet the criteria fixed by the Commission may be called for interview.

21. The proviso to Rule 19 of the Rules of 1963 further stipulates that the decision of the Commission regarding the eligibility or otherwise of a candidate shall be final. This indicates that the determination made by the Commission on such issues is ordinarily binding and not open to challenge. However, in legal terms, the finality attached to such a decision is not absolute and the scope of judicial review remains available in limited circumstances. Courts may interfere where the decision is shown to be arbitrary, unreasonable, actuated by mala fides, or in violation of the statutory rules. Thus, the Rule 19 of the Rules of 1963, when read as a whole, confers upon the Commission the power to scrutinise applications, apply appropriate standards for shortlisting and take a final decision on eligibility, while at the

same time, requiring such power to be exercised in conformity with principles of fairness and legality.

22. The contention of the petitioners that the screening test, by virtue of carrying 40% weightage, ceases to be a shortlisting examination, cannot be accepted in its absolute form. The scheme of the advertisement, as well as the clarification furnished by the respondents, makes it evident that the screening test was introduced primarily as a mechanism to shortlist candidates for interview, while at the same time, assigning a certain weightage to ensure that performance therein is not rendered otiose. Merely because a component of the selection process carries weightage in the final merit, it does not lose its character as a screening or shortlisting tool, particularly when the governing rules continue to treat the selection as interview-centric.

23. The adoption of the ratio of 1:3 for shortlisting candidates for interview is also a well-established practice to balance administrative feasibility with fairness in selection. In the present case, the respondents have applied this ratio category-wise against the advertised vacancies. Such a course of action is in consonance with the reservation policy and ensures that adequate representation from each category is available at the stage of interview. The argument that more meritorious reserved category candidates have been excluded while less meritorious general category candidates have been included proceeds on a misconception that *inter se* merit across categories must be the sole criterion even at the stage of shortlisting. The principle that meritorious reserved category candidates are entitled to be

considered in the open category operates primarily at the stage of final selection and preparation of merit list and not necessarily at the stage of preliminary shortlisting, which is structured with reference to category-wise vacancies.

24. At the outset, it is to be noted that the written examination, by its very nature, is only a preliminary or intermediate stage intended for the purpose of screening and shortlisting candidates for participation in the interview. The final merit of a candidate is not crystallised at this stage, inasmuch as the performance in the subsequent tier i.e. interview materially contributes to the ultimate determination of merit.

25. It is a well-settled principle of service jurisprudence that the rule of migration of a reserved category candidate to the unreserved category is to be applied only at the stage of preparation of the final select list, i.e., after completion of all stages of the selection process. The benefit of migration is, thus, not available at intermediate stages such as screening tests, preliminary examinations or shortlisting exercises undertaken for the purpose of narrowing down the field of candidates. Acceptance of the petitioners' contention would amount to fragmenting the selection process and applying the rule of migration at multiple stages, which is impermissible in law.

26. A candidate belonging to a reserved category cannot claim placement in the unreserved category merely on the basis of marks obtained in the written examination, for the reason that such examination constitutes only one component of the overall selection. The final *inter se* merit can be determined only after all candidates have successfully undergone each stage of the

selection process and their cumulative performance is assessed. Until such stage is reached, any claim for migration would be premature and legally untenable.

27. The argument advanced on behalf of the petitioners also overlooks the broader constitutional scheme relating to affirmative action. The guarantee of equality enshrined in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India is not confined to formal equality but extends to substantive equality, which permits reasonable classification and affirmative measures to uplift disadvantaged sections of society. It is not in dispute that the candidates belonging to reserved categories are entitled to compete in the open category on merit; however, such adjustment is to be effected at the stage when the final merit list is prepared. It is only at that stage that it can be determined whether a candidate has secured a position on merit without availing any concession and is thus eligible to be adjusted against the unreserved category.

28. A careful consideration of the reliance placed by the petitioners on the judgment in **Rajasthan High Court & Another vs Rajat Yadav & Others (supra)** reveals that the same is inapplicable to the facts of the present case. Paragraph 69 of the said judgment itself clarifies that the principles relating to migration of reserved category candidates at different stages of examination would be applicable only in cases where the statutory rules and the scheme of examination are similar or *pari materia* to those which were under consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above case of **Rajasthan High Court & Another vs Rajat Yadav & Others (supra)**. Thus, the applicability of the

said principle is not universal, but is contingent upon the nature of the governing rules and the structure of the selection process.

29. Details of the scheme of examination and the governing rules in the case of **Rajasthan High Court & Another vs Rajat Yadav & Others (supra)** has been given in Division Bench Judgment of this Court, namely **Rajat Yadav & Others vs. Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur through Registrar General & Another** reported in **2023 SCC OnLine Raj 1732** in following manner:

"22. The respondents issued an advertisement on 05.08.2022 for filling up vacancies of Junior Judicial Assistant in the establishment of the Rajasthan High Court, vacancies of Judicial Assistant in State Legal Services Authority, District Legal Services Authority and Clerk Grade-II in State Judicial Academy and in the District Judge establishment, it being a joint recruitment process. The advertisement stated that the aforesaid recruitment shall be governed by the provisions contained in Rajasthan High Court Staff Service Recruitment Rules, 2002 (as amended), (hereinafter referred to as 'the Rules of 2002') and Rajasthan District Courts Ministerial Establishment Rules, 1986 (as amended), (hereinafter referred to as 'the Rules of 1986')- The petitioners have not called in question the process of joint recruitment being governed by the aforesaid two rules, however, one of the principal contention is that the process of shortlisting after the written examination is in contravention of the provisions contained in Notification dated 05.12.2002 issued by the Hon'ble Chief Justice in pursuance of Rules 4, 5, 7 & 22 of the Rules of 2002. Part-1 A of the aforesaid Notification deals with the methods of recruitment of ministerial staff. Point (ii) of Part-I A deals with examination which provides as below:—

***"(ii) EXAMINATION.** - A competitive examination shall be held to test the ability of the candidate in the following subjects & each subject will carry the number of marks shown as under:—*

(a) SECTION - A

*(i) **WRITTEN TEST-** The written test shall consist of one paper of 300 marks comprising of:—*

Part A	Hindi	100 Marks
Part B	English	100 Marks
Parte	General Knowledge	100 Marks

Each Part shall have 50 Multiple Choice Questions bearing two Marks for each question.

(ii) Duration : Two Hours

(b) SECTION - B

(i) TYPE-WRITING TEST ON COMPUTER

There will be Speed Test on Computer.

***Speed** : Minimum speed should be 8000 depressions per hour on computer. Data will have to be fed in English Language or in dual language, i.e., English and Hindi.*

The test will be of 100 marks which will consist of speed test and efficiency test carrying 50 marks each (total 100 marks).

(ii) Duration : Ten Minutes

Note:

(i) The syllabus and scope of each subject of the written examination will be as prescribed by the High Court from time to time and will be intimated to the candidates within stipulated time through web-site or in the manner as the High Court deem fit.

(ii) Those candidates who secure minimum 45% marks and 40% marks in case of Specially abled persons and SC/ST candidates in the written test shall be eligible for appearing in the type writing test on computer, subject to the extent of 15 times of the number of vacancies or as the Appointing Authority may deem appropriate but in the said range all those candidates who secure the same percentage of marks shall be included.

(iii) No candidate who failed to secure 50% in the aggregate with at least 40% marks in case of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribes & Specially Abled Persons and 45% marks in case of all other categories, in each test, at the competitive examination shall be selected. If two or more of such candidates obtain equal marks in the aggregate, their names shall be arranged on the basis of general suitability."

30. It would also be fruitful to extract para 69 and 73 of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Rajat Yadav (supra), which are as under:

"69. We, however, sound a note of caution that our observations above are relatable to the selection process of the kind under consideration. It has not been shown with reference to the recruitment rules that the same ordain otherwise. If, at all, the recruitment rules governing any selection process ordain otherwise than what is observed above, obviously the recruitment rules would have precedence subject to the condition that such rule passes the test of constitutionality.

73. Now, turning to **Chattar Singh (supra)** which was heavily relied on by the appellants, we have to record that the ratio laid down therein must be appreciated in its proper context. In that case, the scheme of examination clearly provided that the marks obtained in the preliminary examination would not be considered for the determination of final merit. The rule therein, appearing from paragraph 5 of the decision, read as follows:

5. Rule 13 of the Rules prescribes the mode of conducting preliminary as well as Main Examination. It reads as under:

"13. Scheme of Examination, personality and viva voce test.— The competitive examination shall be conducted by the Commission in two stages, i.e., Preliminary Examination and Main Examination as per the scheme specified in Schedule III. The marks obtained in the Preliminary Examination by the candidates, who are declared qualified for admission to the Main

Examination will not be counted for determining their final order of merit...

(emphasis ours)

*It is in view of this rule that this Court held that the claim of reserved category candidates to be accommodated in the open category on the basis of marks obtained will be determined at the final stage. We find no reason to differ from that principle. However, the facts of the present case stand on a distinct footing. First, the main written examination here is not a mere preliminary/screening test but an integral and substantive component of the selection process, carrying 300 marks out of a total of 400 - constituting 75% of the final assessment. Its weight and determinative value distinguish it from the limited preliminary stage examination contemplated in **Chattar Singh (supra)**, thereby rendering that ratio inapplicable to the present factual matrix. Secondly, the inclusion of a reserved category candidate in the open merit list at the stage of shortlisting cannot be equated with 'migration', for no benefit or concession of reservation is availed. Such inclusion is purely merit-based and, therefore, stands on a plane distinct from the concept of 'migration' as addressed in **Chattar Singh (supra)**."*

31. Upon a comparative analysis of the scheme of examination involved in the case of **Rajat Yadav & Others (supra)** and the present selection, this Court finds a clear and material distinction. In **Rajat Yadav & Others (supra)**, the stages of examination were composite in nature, each stage contributing determinatively to the assessment of merit, thereby justifying consideration of migration at different stages. In contradistinction, the scheme under the present Rules of 1963, particularly Rule 19, unequivocally provides that the ultimate selection is to be based on merit determined primarily on the basis of interview, with the preliminary examination serving only a limited purpose of shortlisting candidates for participation in the interview. Merely because a certain weightage is subsequently assigned to the marks obtained in the preliminary examination, to be reckoned along with academic weightage and performance in interview at the stage of final evaluation, would not alter the fundamental character of the preliminary examination as a

screening test. The preliminary stage does not, by itself, constitute a determinative stage for adjudging *inter se* merit so as to attract the principle of migration. The essence of the process remains that merit is finally crystallised only after the interview stage, upon application of the prescribed weightage criteria.

32. It is also significant to note that Rule 19 of the Rules of 1963 does not contemplate the preparation of any merit list at the stage of the preliminary examination. The category-wise lists prepared after the preliminary test, in the ratio of 1:3 of the advertised vacancies, are merely for the purpose of shortlisting eligible candidates to appear in the interview. Such lists cannot be equated with a merit list, nor can they be treated as a basis for conferring any right of migration from a reserved category to the unreserved category.

33. In view of the aforesaid distinction in the statutory framework and the scheme of examination, this Court is of the opinion that the ratio laid down in **Rajasthan High Court & Another vs Rajat Yadav & Others (supra)** on account of exceptions carved out in the judgment itself by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, does not advance the case of the petitioners.

34. Lastly, it is also pertinent to note that the petitioners, having participated in the selection process with full knowledge of its structure and procedure, cannot be permitted to turn around and challenge the same at an intermediate stage merely because the outcome is not favourable to them. The doctrine of acquiescence would, therefore, operate against them.

35. In view of the aforesaid discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the claim of the petitioners for migration

to the unreserved category at the stage of written examination or shortlisting is misconceived and contrary to the settled principles of law.

36. This Court is also of the considered opinion that the impugned screening result dated 26.11.2020 and the methodology adopted by the respondent-RPSC for shortlisting candidates for interview do not warrant interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction. The above writ petitions, being devoid of merit, are accordingly dismissed.

37. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

38. Office is directed to place a copy of this judgment on record of each writ petition.

(ANAND SHARMA),J

MANOJ NARWANI /