HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16478/2026
CNR: RJHC020768432026 | URN: CW / 34676U / 2026

Omprakash Koli S/o Kaluram Koli, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Vpo Khohra Malawali, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Alwar, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Principal Secretary, School Education, Department, Govt. Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Alwar.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter)), Elementary Education, Alwar.
5. The Chief Block Education Officer, Block Laxmangarh, District Alwar.

----Respondents

Connected with

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16482/2026
CNR: RJHC020751132026 | URN: CW / 34683U / 2026

Brij Lal Sharma S/o Bhajan Lal, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Paprera, Bharatpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Principal Secretary, School Education, Department, Govt. Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Bharatpur.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Elementary Education, Bharatpur.
5. The Chief Block Education Officer, Block Kumher, District Bharatpur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Ram Pratap Saini

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Order

31/08/2026

1. By way of filing the writ petitions, petitioners have prayed for a direction against the respondents to extend the services of the petitioners on the post of Panchayat Sahayak up to the age of 65 years or up to the 17.02.2028 & 15.02.2028.

2. Case of both the petitioners is that they were appointed on the post of Panchayat Sahayak under the Rajasthan Contractual Hiring to Civil Posts Rules, 2022 (for short, 'the Rules of 2022'), for a period of five years, however, before completion of five years, the respondents were adamant to retire the petitioners.

3. Petitioners submitted that the term of their appointment is required to be regulated by the terms and conditions mentioned in appointment order and since appointment order stipulates about continuing the services for a period of five years from the date of appointment orders, therefore, respondents cannot retire the petitioners prior to the date mentioned in the appointment orders.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the record.

5. Bare perusal of the appointment orders would make it clear that it is the term of the appointment order that service conditions of the petitioners shall be governed by the Rules of 2022. Rule 11 of the Rules of 2022 would make it clear that no employee shall be allowed to continue after attaining the age of 60 years.

6. In both the cases, petitioners have already attained the age of 60 years, therefore, in view of Rule 11 of the Rules of 2022, there is no scope for interference in the instant writ petitions and the same are hereby dismissed.

7. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

(ANAND SHARMA),J

3 & 13/DAKSH