HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9554/2017
CNR: RJHC020823922017 | URN: CW / 16838U / 2017

Smt. Monika W/o. Sh. Suresh Kumar, R/o. Village Baijwadi, Dhanni Beejli Kothi, Tehsil Nangalrajavtan, District Dausa Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan, through its Chief Secretary, Government Secretariat, Jaipur Rajasthan
2. District Collector, District Dausa.
3. Deputy Director, Women And Child Welfare Department, District Dausa.
4. Geeta W/o. Pyari Lal Meena, R/o. Village Baijwadi, Dhanni Dagda Wali, Tehsil Nangalrajavtan, District Dausa Rajasthan

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	None Present
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Akshay Dutt Sharma with Mr. Ashish Nagarwal Mr. Arvind Rana for Ms. Minakshi Jain, GC

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP TANEJA
Order

29/10/2026

1. No one appeared on behalf of the petitioner on 28.10.2026. In the interest of justice, the matter was adjourned. Even today, no one has appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

2. The case of the petitioner is that respondent No.3 issued an advertisement dated 30.12.2016, inviting applications for various posts, including the post of Karyakarta, Anganbari Kendra. Pursuant to the said advertisement, the petitioner, belonging to the B.P.L. category, applied for the aforesaid post. However, despite being eligible, the petitioner was not selected, whereas

Digitally signed by
AVINASH GULERIA
Date: 2026.10.31
11:15:50 IST

respondent No.4, who was allegedly less meritorious than the petitioner, was selected. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. The respondents have filed reply to the writ petition, stating therein that the eligibility criteria for appointment to the said post required a candidate to possess a Secondary Education qualification and to be between 21 and 35 years of age as on the date of the advertisement. It has further been stated that the petitioner's date of birth is 04.10.1996 and that, as on the date of the advertisement, she was aged 20 years, 2 months and 26 days. Accordingly, her candidature was rejected solely on the ground that she had not attained the minimum prescribed age.

4. The petitioner has not filed any rejoinder controverting the specific averments made in the reply submitted by the respondents.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the respondents and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that, as per the advertisement, a candidate was required to have attained the minimum age of 21 years as on the date of the advertisement. Since the petitioner had not attained the prescribed minimum age on the relevant date, she did not fulfil the requisite eligibility criteria. Therefore, no illegality has been committed by the respondent authorities in not considering her candidature.

6. In view of the above discussion, the present writ petition, being devoid of merit, is dismissed.

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

(SANDEEP TANEJA),J

111-SA-/AVINASH GULERIA