RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT JODHPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3804/2024

Rajesh Sharma S/o Shri Ramesh Chandra Sharma, Aged About 48 Years, R/o 3/353/ Rajasthan Housing Board Colony, Goverdhan Vilas, Sector 14, Saweena (Rural), Po Udaipur H Magri, District Udaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
2. Principal Secretary, Women And Child Development Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Director, Integrated Child Development Services, Rajasthan, Women And Child Development Department, Jaipur.
4. Additional Director (Administration), Integrated Child Development Services, Rajasthan, Women And Child Development Department, Jaipur.
5. Deputy Director, Integrated Child Development Services, Rajasthan, Women And Child Development Department, Udaipur.

----Respondents

Along with connected matters

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Mukesh Rajpurohit, Mr. R.S. Choudhary, Mr. Rishabh Tayal, Mr. Yashpal Khileree, Mr. Manoj Bohra, Mr. R.C. Joshi, Mr. Kshitij Vyas, Mr. Deepak Nehra, Mr. Narpat Singh, Mr. Manish Patel, Mr. Vikas Bijarnia, Mr. Sushil Solanki, Mr. Ripudaman Singh, Mr. A.D. Ujjwal, Mr. Kapil Purohit, Mr. Manoj Kumar, Mr. D.K. Ojha, Mr.G.R. Bhari, Mr. O.P. Sangwa, Mr. D.K. Godara, Mr. R.S. Champawat, Mr. Pankaj Kumar Gupta, Mr. Shankar Dayal, Mr. Bharat Shrimali, Mr. Rajat Arora, Mr. Ashok Singh, Mr. Sandeep Kalwania, Mr. V.S. Bhawla, Mr. R.P. Singaria, Mr. Vivek Firoda, Mr. J.S.

		Bhaleria, Mr. Kunal Upadhyay, Mr. K.R. Saharan, Mr. Jogendra Singh, Mr. Pradeep Kumar Paliwal, Mr. Manjeet Godara, Mr. Vinod Jhajharia, Mr. Hapu Ram, Mr. H.S. Sidhu, Ms. Tanya Mehta, Mr. B.R. Chahar, Dr. Rohit Kaswan, Mr. R.C. Bishnoi, Mr. P.K. Rawla and Mr. S.S. Choudhary.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. N.S. Rajpurohit, AAG with Mr. Deepak Bora, AGC & Ms. Rakhi Choudhary Mr. I.R. Choudhary, AAG with Mr. Pawan Bharti Dr. Praveen Khandelwal, AAG with Ms. Yashvi Khandelwal Mr. Mukesh Dave, AGC with Mr. Tanuj Jain Mr. Subhash Choudhary Mr. Nitesh Mathur Mr. Kuldeep Vaishnav

---

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Order (Oral)

05/02/2025

1. Vide 73rd Amendment to the Constitution of India, the Panchayati Raj Institution was significantly empowered by bringing 29 vital departments, as listed in the 11th Schedule, under its jurisdiction. In furtherance of the said constitutional mandate, the Rural Development and Panchayati Raj Department, Rajasthan took an administrative decision to transfer certain activities, including financial resources and personnel, from the earlier respective departments to the Panchayati Raj Department. For smooth devolution of power, the State of Rajasthan also enacted the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj (Transferred Activities) Rules, 2011, envisaging legal framework governing the transfer of State Government employees. Notably, Rule 8 of these rules explicitly stipulates the mode and manner of the transfer of employees.

2. In all the petitions, as per Appendix A, B and C of the instant order, common assertion is that not only the transfers of petitioners are in mechanical exercise of mind but also in blatant non-compliance of applicable Rules. Facts of individual cases are thus not being gone into, as what is under challenge herein simplicitor is the procedure, legality and the administrative propriety of the transfers/postings of the petitioners. Vide this common order, all the Appendix [(A) to (C)], ibid are being disposed of as similar issues are involved therein.

3. First and foremost, reference may be had to Rajasthan Panchayati Raj (Transferred Activities) Rules, 2011 (for short 2011 Rules), in particular Rule 8 thereof, which reads as under:-

> *"**8. Transfer -***
> *Transfer of such transferred employees shall be made under the transfer policy and directions issued by the State Government from time to time, by:-*
>
> *i. the Administration and Establishment Committee of the Panchayat Samiti concerned within the same Panchayat Samiti.*
>
> ii. *the Administration Establishment Committee of the Zila Parisad concerned from one Panchayat Samiti to another Panchayat Samiti within the same District.*
>
> *iii. the department concerned from one district to another district with the consent of the Panchayati Raj Department."*

Non compliance of sub rule (ii) and/or (iii), ibid is complained by the petitioners.

4. Some of the petitioners also allege violation of Rule 31 of the Rajasthan Scheduled Areas Subordinate, Ministerial and Class-IV Service (Recruitment and other Service Conditions) Rules, 2014

(2014 Rules). The said rule, for ready reference, is also reproduced hereinbelow:-

> ***"31. Appointment to the service.-***
> *Appointment to post(s) in the Service by direct recruitment or by promotion, as the case may be, shall be made by the Appointing Authority on occurrence of substantive vacancies from the candidates selected under rule 25 in order of merit and by promotion from the persons selected under rule 29 of these rules. The persons so appointed shall be transferable from one place to the other within the Scheduled Areas irrespective of the place of appointment taking the entire Scheduled Area as a Unit i.e. the entire Scheduled Area shall be the closed cadre. When a person so appointed cannot be transferred out side this closed cadre in any capacity which also includes deputation & reverse deputation."*

5. Effectively thus, the bunch of petitions herein can be segregated into three categories, i.e.:-

(A) Those, where the petitioners (Appendix-A) are aggrieved by alleged violation of Rule 8 (ii) of the Rules of 2011, ibid contending that the District Establishment Committee of the ZilaSamiti has not passed the order while transferring them from one Panchayat Samiti to another within the same District.

(B) Where (Appendix-B) petitioners are aggrieved with alleged violation of Rule 8(iii) of the Rules of 2011, ibid, stating that consent of Panachayati Raj department has not been taken.

(C) Where, apart from alleged violation of Rule 8 of the Rules of 2011, transfers have been carried out either from TSP Area to Non-TSP Area or vice versa averring non compliance of Rule 31 of the Rules of 2014. (Appendix-C).

6. First category of petitioners pertain to Rule 8(ii). A perusal of the transfer orders clearly reveals that the same have been passed by an authority, who lacks the administrative competence. Rule 8(ii) of the Rules of 2011, in no uncertain terms, states that

in case of transfer of an employee from one Panchayat Samiti to another Panchayat Samiti within the same district, the authority competent to pass such an order is District Establishment Committee of Zilla Prishad. There is no quibble about the proposition that sub rule (ii) is mandatory in nature. None has argued that interpretation of Sub Rule (ii) is to be such that it is directory and nor, in any case, that is the position in law, as is borne out from the bare reading of the Rule, ibid.

7. As an upshot, the impugned transfer orders in the bunch of petitions in Appendix (A) have since concededly not been passed by respective District Establishment Committees, the same are set aside. Liberty is however given to the respondents to pass fresh orders by complying with the statutory mandate, if administrative exigency so warrants.

8. Adverting now to the second category of the petitioners as per Appendix-B i.e. the ones who are alleging violation of Rule 8(iii) of the Rules of 2011, i.e., no consent from the Panchayati Raj Department has been obtained. Argument in unison, by all the learned counsel representing the petitioners, is that consent so envisaged has to be prior and in writing. Lack thereof, vitiates the transfer orders and, therefore, same ought to be set aside.

9. In fact, at the very out set, it is pertinent to note that the aforesaid controversy is no more res integra. Suffice it would be reproduce relevant extract of judgment rendered by a Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***State Of Rajasthan Versus Rekha Kumari : D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 284/2022,*** decided on 17.08.2022:-

"6. It is noteworthy from the affidavit that as per the distribution of Departments amongst the Cabinet of Ministers, Shri Parsadi Lal Meena, the Minister for Medical and Health Services, Government of Rajasthan has been given independent charge of Medical and Health Services under the Panchayati Raj Department.

7. After obtaining legal opinion and referring to the Division Bench judgment in the case of Mool Shankar (supra), the file was moved for grant of ex-post facto sanction to validate the transfer orders passed earlier by the Medical and Health Department. The Departmental officers proposed issuance of expost facto sanction and the Minister Shri Meena has approved the said proposal on 21.03.2022.

8. As a consequence of the above development, we are of the view that the Panchayati Raj Department has lawfully granted ex-post facto sanction as per the requirement of Rule 8 of the Rules of 2011 to validate the questioned transfer orders.

9. It was the fervent contention of the learned counsel for the respondent employees that ex-post facto consent does not relate to the transfer orders at hand because the date mentioned in the office note is 22.11.2021. This contention is not tenable for the simple reason that this date refers to the distribution of departments amongst the Ministers, whereby independent charge of Medical and Health Services coming under the purview of Panchayati Raj Department was assigned to Shri Parsadi Lal Meena, the Minister for Medical and Health Services. As is evident from the note-sheets annexed with the additional affidavit, both the Departments have concurred on the transfers, which are subject matter of challenge in this litigation. The action so taken is compliant of the view taken by the Division Bench in the case of Mool Shankar (supra) and hence, the requirement of consent of the Panchayati Raj Department for effecting transfers of the transferred employees of the Panchayati Raj Department has been satisfied."

(emphasis supplied)

Significantly, what has thus been held is that once the consent of Panhayati Raj department is there, be it pre or post ex facto, the requirement of compliance of Rule 8(iii) stands satisfied.

10. Similar opinion has recently been further enunciated by in the case of ***State Of Rajasthan Vs. Aakashdeep Poonia :D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 799/2024,*** decided on 20.09.2024, wherein

speaking for the Division Bench, my learned brother Shree Chandrashekhar, J. observed/held as under:-

> *"4. In our opinion, the apprehension expressed by the learned Additional Advocate General is unfounded. This has never been in the realm of any doubt that a decision by the Court governs the parties to the litigation except in very exceptional kind of cases where the Court itself directed extending benefits to similarly situated persons. In our opinion, the observations made by the learned Single Judge regarding post facto approval dated 16th March 2024 accorded by the Department of Agriculture and Panchayati Raj shall not affect transfer of the other persons in the transfer order dated 22nd February 2024. This is too well known that transfer of any employee is a policy decision which sometimes is taken in the administrative exigencies. The Court shall have no power to interfere with the order of transfer unless it is demonstrated before the Court that the transfer order was without jurisdiction or contrary to the extant Rules. Mr. Indra Raj Choudhary, the learned Additional Advocate General has drawn attention of this Court to the judgment rendered by a Division Bench of this Court in D.B. Special Appeal Writ No.284 of 2022 titled as "State of Rajasthan v. Rekha Kumari" with analogous matters. We accord our concurrence to the judgment in "Rekha Kumari" which also indicates that post facto approval granted by the Department would suffice and save the transfer order even if the same was issued without taking prior approval as mandated under clause (iii) of Rule 8 of Rajasthan Panchayati Raj (Tansferred Activities) Rules, 2011."*

11. In the light of above, I am unable to persuade myself with the arguments being canvassed on behalf of the petitioners. Moreover, learned counsels appearing for the respondents have brought the official administrative note-sheet in the Court. A perusal of the same clearly reveals that the transfer file was moved at different levels inter-se department of Medical & Health and Panchayati Raj Department and both the administrative Secretaries, i.e. Medical & Health Department and Panchayati Raj Department, concur on the proposal of the transfers including the Hon'ble Minister who is holding charge of both the departments.

12. No doubt, the approval of the Secretary of Panchayati Raj Department is ex-post facto but the same per-se does not vitiate the requirement of seeking consent in terms of Rule 8(iii) of the Rules of 2011. The compliance envisaged in Rule 8(iii) of the Rules of 2011 does not necessarily have to be prior to passing of the orders. Many a time, the administrative exigencies are such that based on verbal deliberation, administrative orders are passed, subject of course to the post-facto written approval.

13. As long as the compliance has been carried out, be it pre or ex-post facto, no interference is warranted. Accordingly, the bunch of petitions contained in Appendix (B) are dismissed. However, if, in certain individual cases in this set of petitions, ex-post facto approval has not been obtained, the respondents shall do the needful within a period of 30 days of passing of the instant order.

14. Let us now deal with the cases where transfers have been carried out either from TSP Area to Non-TSP Area or vice versa, in the teeth of Rule 31 ibid. My attention has been drawn to foot-note (7) of the impugned order, which is self speaking. It, in no uncertain terms, envisages that those of the transferred officials who can provide proof of their belonging to the scheduled area (but have been sent to outside the said scheduled area) will not be transferred upon furnishing of the same. However, the time period qua the needful exercise has been left open ended.

15. Accordingly, since the respondents themselves concede in the impugned transfer orders itself, that those who have been sent out of the assigned scheduled area, their transfer orders will be revisited, I am of the view that no adjudication is warranted qua

alleged violation of Rule 31. However, the respondents are directed that upon the petitioners approaching them within 7 days with the proof of their belonging to a particular scheduled area, in case it is so found that they have indeed been transferred outside their scheduled area, they shall then pass fresh remedial orders within a period of 30 days thereafter.

16. All the writ petitions mentioned in Appendix (C) are accordingly disposed of. Till the passing of the fresh orders, as above, the interim orders operating in favour of the petitioners, shall continue to enure to their benefit.

17. In the parting, I may also hasten to add that the approval does not have to be necessarily conveyed to the concerned transferee official. The entire intent of approval being that the Panchayati Raj Department is not kept in dark and, there is a certain transparency, which is envisaged under the constitutional scheme which led to enactment of Panchayati Raj Act read with Rules framed therein.

18. Conversely, in case the Panchayati Raj Department does not approve of the transfer, in that event, the concerned employee is entitled to have the said information and it shall then be conveyed in writing, both to the department where the services of such official(s) has/have been deputed as well as to the concerned official(s) so as to enable him/them to seek appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

19. There is another aspect of the matter, i.e. many transferred employees have voiced deep distress over the severe hardships imposed upon them by mass transfer orders with no application of

mind, what so ever. The haste in which it has been done is absolutely without consideration of their genuine difficulties or even affording them a chance to present them. These abrupt decisions have upended their lives in complete disregard of the struggle they would to face. To that extent, I am of the view that certain indulgence is warranted so as to not leave them remediless altogether.

20. Illustratively, in SBCWP Nos.3804/2024 and 3588/2024, the petitioners have been transferred 700 kms. Away and given the meager salaries, which they are earning, they can ill-afford to relocate themselves within the financial constraints. On the other hand, to maintain two dwelling units, is also completely impractical apart from resulting in hardship to the entire family.

21. Likewise, in SBCWP No.2118/2025, petitioner as well as his spouse, are both the Government employees. In SBCWP No.1661/2025, the petitioner is slated to retire in July, 2026 and seeks quashing of his transfer on the additional ground of violation of Division Bench judgment rendered in ***Dr. (Smt.) Pushpa Mehta Vs. Rajasthan Civil Services Appellate Tribunal & Ors. Reported in 2001(1) RLR 398***. In SBCWP No.1976/2025, mother of the petitioner is suffering from Cancer as well as she herself is undergoing matrimonial discord with her husband, which has resulted into registration of criminal case by her against her husband at the current place of hearing posting and her transfer would thus result in an extreme hardship in travel and health to attend the court hearing apart from resulting disruption of medical treatment to her mother.

22. In SBCWP No.6209/2024 and 6214/2024, the transfer was directed for a limited period of 100 days to meet administrative exigency, which, in any case, owing to the interim orders passed by this Court, is long over and thus, the competent authority may have to re-visit the decision.

23. In SBCWP No.2359/2025, it seems to be again a case where the slated date of retirement is 31.05.2026, yet it has gone unnoticed by the competent authority while passing the transfer order, apart from the petitioner herself being cancer patient. Similar is a case at SBCWP No.2976/2025 where once again it is stated that the petitioner is a cancer patient.

24. The circumstances highlighted above serve as a glaring example of the reckless haste with which transfer orders are being passed, reducing the process to a mere mechanical exercise devoid of any consideration for the affected employees. Such an arbitrary approach cannot be countenanced, to say the least. The competent authority must ensure that transferred employees are given a fair chance to present their case, especially when extenuating circumstances exist—be it terminal illness, widowhood, divorce, extreme relocation hardships, imminent superannuation, or maternity-related pre or post-natal challenges. In these deserving cases, anything short of a humane and compassionate approach would be a grave injustice. Thus, in the deserving cases humanitarian outlook must be adopted.

25. Reverting to the present bunch, only the writ petitions, which have been specifically mentioned in the foregoing part of this paragraph, the competent authority shall not implement the

transfer orders qua those petitioners for a period of 30 days and make an endeavor to ascertain the work exigencies as an alternative place of posting and either in the same district or in the vicinity thereof so as to enable them to commute on daily basis.

26. At this stage, learned counsels appearing for the respondents, submit that passing of the fresh orders requires prior sanction from the competent authority in view of the ban imposed by the Chief Secretary vide an administrative order dated 03.01.2024. In view thereof, in order to obviate any procedural hurdle, it is made clear that since the transfer orders have been put on hold by mandamus of this Court, thus taking fresh administrative decision qua the petitioners shall be construed to be in continuation of the earlier transfer orders. No prior sanction would thus be required in terms of the circular dated 03.01.2024 issued by the Chief Secretary.

27. The entire bunch of petitions is disposed of as above.

28. All pending application (s), shall also stand disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA),J

119-Jitendra/skm/-

Whether fit for reporting : Yes / No

Appendix 'A'

S.No.	Writ Petition Number	Party Name	
1.	3126/2025	Vimla	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
2.	5860/2024	Surendra Devasi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
3.	6209/2024	Dr. Naveen Kumar Bairwa	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.

4.	1712/2025	Vinod Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
5.	1818/2025	Santosh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
6.	1820/2025	Sarika Verma	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
7.	1861/2025	Sunil Kumar Dhakar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
8.	1896/2025	Veena Meena	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
9.	1897/2025	Manju Khargawat	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
10.	2065/2025	Kishanlal Patel	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
11.	2104/2025	Khuman Singh Maida	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
12.	2168/2025	Dr. Suryaveer Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
13.	2416/2025	Chanda Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
14.	2445/2025	Sunita Gurjar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
15.	2489/2025	Sushil Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
16.	3437/2025	Sangeeta Garasiya	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
17.	1432/2025	Suman	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
18.	1635/2025	Ashok Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
19.	2371/2025	Rehana Bano	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
20.	2389/2025	Shakuntla	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
21.	2441/2025	Geeta Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
22.	2524/2025	Saroj Budania	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
23.	2579/2025	Rajulal Gurjar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
24.	2633/2025	Praveen Kumar Manat	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
25.	2733/2025	Nirmala Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
26.	2846/2025	Satyendra Kumar Meena	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
27.	2874/2025	Deepak Kumawat	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
28.	3018/2025	Savitri	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
29.	3040/2025	Roshni Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.

Appendix 'B'

S.No.	Writ Petition Number	Party Name	
30.	3804/2024	Rajesh Sharma	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
31.	3588/2024	Vipul Joshi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
32.	6214/2024	Dr. Kailash Chander Saraswat	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
33.	944/2025	Surendra Kumar Poonia	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
34.	1661/2025	Dr. Ashvini Kumar Maurya	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
35.	1666/2025	Surendra Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
36.	1667/2025	Narendra Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
37.	1671/2025	Ramniwas	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
38.	1676/2025	Sunil Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.

39.	1727/2025	Chetna Rajput	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
40.	1729/2025	Naval Singh Meena	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
41.	1757/2025	Ramawatar Meghwal	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
42.	1759/2025	Vinod Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
43.	1761/2025	Rajkumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
44.	1763/2025	Manoj Suhalka	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
45.	1779/2025	Om Prakash Tard	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
46.	1787/2025	Hanuman Ram Jalwaniya	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
47.	1788/2025	Kamlesh Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
48.	1795/2025	Basanti Patel	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
49.	1806/2025	Kanta Rawat	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
50.	1815/2025	Ganga Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
51.	1819/2025	Sumitra	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
52.	1848/2025	Poonama Ram	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
53.	1850/2025	Sunita	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
54.	1865/2025	Devendra Choudhary	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
55.	1866/2025	Pradeep Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
56.	1910/2025	Nathulal Machar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
57.	1912/2025	Jyoti Saharan	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
58.	1929/2025	Mukesh Daukiya	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
59.	1932/2025	Bhaira Ram Godara	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
60.	1976/2025	Kajal	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
61.	1990/2025	Bhagwati Dangi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
62.	2013/2025	Poonam Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
63.	2026/2025	Gurmeet Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
64.	2047/2025	Laxmi Meena	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
65.	2059/2025	Pavan Kumar Pargi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
66.	2061/2025	Pushpa Kharadi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
67.	2070/2025	Yogesh Pargi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
68.	2073/2025	Santo Lal Roat	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
69.	2079/2025	Naresh Kumar Kharadi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
70.	2096/2025	Mukand Ram	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
71.	2097/2025	Manju Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
72.	2111/2025	Sandeep Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
73.	2118/2025	Shiv Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
74.	2122/2025	Vasim Khan	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
75.	2124/2025	Nitu Pargi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
76.	2125/2025	Arjun Khadda	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
77.	2149/2025	Narpat Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
78.	2180/2025	Snehalata Dave	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
79.	2196/2025	Suresh Kumar Dhaka	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.

80.	2206/2025	Parmod Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
81.	2231/2025	Partapa Ram	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
82.	2233/2025	Sarla Choudhary	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
83.	2250/2025	Rita Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
84.	2254/2025	Sudarshana	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
85.	2262/2025	Darshana Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
86.	2264/2025	Chandrakala Doot	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
87.	2274/2025	Prithvi Raj Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
88.	2280/2025	Ram Pratap Godara	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
89.	2288/2025	Kanhaiya Lal	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
90.	2290/2025	Kailash Chandra Goswami	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
91.	2293/2025	Ram Kumar Bhadu	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
92.	2297/2025	Bhea Ram	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
93.	2299/2025	Ajay Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
94.	2302/2025	Bharat Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
95.	2306/2025	Ramnivas Choudhary	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
96.	2307/2025	Imilal Rojh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
97.	2310/2025	Ravi Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
98.	2315/2025	Kanta Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
99.	2319/2025	Shankar Lal Bijarnia	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
100.	2321/2025	Vikas Jandu	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
101.	2324/2025	Ugarsen	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
102.	2327/2025	Satpal	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
103.	2334/2025	Sahab Ram	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
104.	2337/2025	Kisturi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
105.	2428/2025	Rajbala	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
106.	2431/2025	Vidhya Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
107.	2443/2025	Devendra Saini	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
108.	2449/2025	Suman Kaswa	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
109.	2453/2025	Kiran	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
110.	2493/2025	Sudarshan Raigar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
111.	2526/2025	Surender Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
112.	2528/2025	Het Ram	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
113.	2530/2025	Kamlesh Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
114.	2539/2025	Pushpa Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
115.	2604/2025	Vijaylakshmi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
116.	2610/2025	Nirmala Sharma	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
117.	2676/2025	Richa Banshiwal	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.

118.	2552/2025	Sajjan Kaur	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
119.	2170/2025	Sharda Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
120.	2186/2025	Raju Ram Godara	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
121.	2314/2025	Kuldeep Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
122.	2359/2025	Sushila Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
123.	2439/2025	Ramrati	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
124.	2513/2025	Babli Poonia	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
125.	2514/2025	Subhita	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
126.	2519/2025	Karan Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
127.	2522/2025	Angrej Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
128.	2533/2025	Mahendra Kaur	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
129.	2540/2025	Meena Upadhyay	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
130.	2546/2025	Anguri	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
131.	2551/2025	Shakuntla Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
132.	2554/2025	Anita Saran	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
133.	2593/2025	Sunil Kumar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
134.	2638/2025	Urmila Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
135.	2643/2025	Rajbala	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
136.	2645/2025	Rajbala	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
137.	2663/2025	Nitin Tolambiya	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
138.	2711/2025	Satish Katija	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
139.	2713/2025	Ramavatar Dhboi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
140.	2726/2025	Inderjeet Singh	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
141.	2727/2025	Ramesh Chandra Meena	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
142.	2749/2025	Krishan Lal	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
143.	2774/2025	Mahendra Bhargava	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
144.	2794/2025	Dr. Rajan Choudhary	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
145.	2800/2025	Rakesh Jeengar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
146.	2944/2025	Mahendra @ Mahendra Saini	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
147.	2848/2025	Manga Ram Choudhary	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
148.	2853/2025	Ram Singh Bhabhor	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
149.	2948/2025	Manisha Kanwar Rathore	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
150.	2956/2025	Kiran Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
151.	2960/2025	Sunita Bai	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
152.	2962/2025	Hari Babu Meena	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
153.	2974/2025	Sunita Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.

154.	2976/2025	Anguri Devi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
155.	3015/2025	Vikram Singh Yadav	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
156.	3027/2025	Saraswati	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
157.	3029/2025	Santosh Bai	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
158.	3041/2025	Vinod Kumar Bairwa	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
159.	3042/2025	Mukesh Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
160.	3046/2025	Anita Pareek	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
161.	3047/2025	Mahendra Ram	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
162.	3055/2025	Satyanarayan	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
163.	3062/2025	Satpal Singh Maan	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
164.	3067/2025	Devilal	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
165.	3191/2025	Rajesh Bugasara	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
166.	3204/2025	Sitaram Dara	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.

Appendix 'C'

S.No.	Writ Petition Number	Party Name	
167.	1793/2025	Kishan Lal	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
168.	1849/2025	Praghya Patidar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
169.	2046/2025	Kailash Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
170.	2055/2025	Shahud Khan	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
171.	2060/2025	Natwar Lal	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
172.	2063/2025	Savita Kumari Meena	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
173.	2066/2025	Rakesh Kumar Khat	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
174.	2235/2025	Sushila Yadav	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
175.	2763/2025	Faruk Mohammed	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
176.	2016/2025	Seema Pargi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
177.	2187/2025	Urmila Kumari Pargi	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
178.	2189/2025	Sheela Masar	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
179.	2223/2025	Shankar Lal Yadav	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
180.	2236/2025	Dinesh Chandra Ninama	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
181.	2240/2025	Urmila Kumari	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
182.	2492/2025	Santosh Dhaka	STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.

***