HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1092/2015

1. Pankaj Oswal Son Of Shri Maliram, By Caste Oswal, Aged About 30 Years, 205, Ranisati Nagar, Ajmer Road, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Ram Singh Chauhan Son Of Shri Phularam, Aged About 38 Years, Village Post Hasalsar, Tehsil Udaipurwati, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
3. Naresh Kumar Son Of Shri Mangal Chand, Aged About 31 Years, Village Post Chanana, Tehsil Chirawa, District Jhunjhunu
4. Rakesh Kumar Verma Son Of Shri Shree Chand Verma, Aged About 32 Years, 301, Dhikhanda Mohalla, Ward No. 6, Village Meeradhanu, Tehsil Malsisar, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
5. Prem Prakash Patel Son Of Shri Dadam Chand Patel, Aged About 32 Years, Village Post Sukhaniya Via Badodiya, Tehsil District Banswara (Raj.)
6. Deepak Rathore Son Of Shri Bhawawati Lal, Aged About 29 Years, Nichla Moiwada, Near Devda Hotel Banswara (Raj.)
7. Nimesh Tailor Son Of Shri Gopal Tailor, Aged About 30 Years, Sadar Bazar, Near Jama Masjid Banswara (Raj.)
8. Rakesh Kumar Son Of Shri Makhan Lal Meena, Aged About 32 Years, 84/345, Pratap Nagar, Sanganer, Jaipur (Raj.)
9. Jagdish Prasad Gurjar Son Of Shri Baluram Gurjar, Aged About 27 Years, 88-89, Pratap Nagar Extn., Near Pency Children Academy, Murlipura Scheme, Jaipur (Raj.)
10. Mahesh Chand Yadav Son Of Shri Sharwan Lal, Aged About 29 Years, Village Jhaag, Tehsil Maujmabad, District Jaipur (Raj.)
11. Mukesh Verma Son Of Shri Narayan Lal Verma, Aged About 28 Years, 6/240, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur (Raj.)
12. Rajendra Prasad Gurjar Son Of Shri Madan Lal Gurjar, Aged About 30 Years, Village Post Kachhor, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, District Sikar (Raj.)
13. Mukesh Chandra Verma Son Of Shri Tulsiram Verma,

Aged About 32 Years, Village Tond, Post Jastana, Tehsil Boli, District Sawai Madhopur (Raj.)

14. Subhash Chand Gurjar Son Of Shri Jagdish Prasad, Aged About 25 Years, Vilage Sevran, Post Tevdi, Tehsil Virat Nagar, District Jaipur (Raj.)

----Appellants

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer
2. State Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Directorate Bikaner
4. Ramchandra Rundla Son Of Shri Ghanshyam Dutt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, Village Post Jajekalan, Via Shahpura, District Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1106/2015

1. Kamlesh Kumar Yadav S/o Shri Suraj Mal Yadav, Aged About 27 Years, Village Udawala, Post - Ghasipura, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur
2. Hanuman Singh Yadav S/o Shri Ramlal Yadav, Aged About 34 Years, Kurawato Ki Dhani, Govindgarh, Jaipur
3. Krishna Kumari D/o Shri Devi Lal, Aged About 29 Years, Village P.o. Jasana, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh
4. Yogesh Suredia, S/o Shri Ramesh Chandra Suredia, Aged About 29 Years, Village Jatgaonwara, Post Jakhrana, Tehsil Behror, District Jaipur
5. Suman Kumawat W/o Shri Shirish Kumawat, Aged About 29 Years, New Colony, Visa Karma Marg, Near Salary Birla Kalyan Mandapam, Village P.o. Kuchaman City, District Nagaur
6. Vivek Kumar S/o Shri Ramniwas, Aged About 29 Years, Village Jisukh Ka Bas, Post Hamiri, Tehsil Malsisar, District Jhunjhunu

----Appellants

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary
2. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner
4. Ramchandra Rundla S/o Shri Ghanshyam Dutt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, V Jalekalan Via Shahpura, District Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1107/2015

1. Omprakash Sharma S/o Shri Ram Kishore Sharma, Aged About 42 Years, 9, Naagmani Colony, Sanganer, Jaipur
2. Mukesh Sharma S/o Shri Shankar Lal Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, 29, Shyam Vatika, Chatrashaal Naga, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur
3. Mahaveer Prasad S/o Shri Hanuman Sahai, Aged About 36 Years, 18, Raghunath Vihar, Panchyawala, Jaipur
4. Umesh Kumar Jangid S/o Shri Ramgopal, Aged About 31 Years, Village And Post Dumra, Tehsil Nawalgarh, District Jhunjhunu
5. Bharat Singh S/o Shri Durgadan, Aged About 30 Years, Village Gemliyawas, Jalsu Kalan, Tehsil Degana, District Nagaur
6. R.s. Sharma S/o Shri Omprakash Sharma, Aged About 26 Years, A-163, Murlipura Scheme, Jaipur
7. Praveen Sharma S/o Shri Devi Lal Sharma, Aged About 32 Years, Amrawali Dhani, Kishangarh, Renwal , Jaipur
8. Mahesh Kumar S/o Shri Ramawatar Jangid, Aged About 32 Years, Village Peepal Ka Bass, Post Bagisar, Mandava, District Jhunjhunu
9. Vijay Kumar Jhanjhdiya S/o Shri Hanuman Singh, Aged About 29 Years, Village Post Kuhad Via Mandava, District Jhunjhunu
10. Bheem Singh S/o Shri Ramjeevan, Aged About 25 Years, Village And Post Bhatpura, Tehsil Nagar, District Bharatpur
11. Girraj Prasad Raigar S/o Shri Chiranji Lal, Aged About 32 Years, Post Ajabpura, Vila Narayanpura, Tehsil Dhanagaji,

Alwar

12. Vivek Sharma S/o Shri Krishan Chand Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, C/o Nishant Sharma, Near Jain Nursing Home, Station Road, Gangapur City, District Sawai Madhopur

13. Shriram Pareek S/o Shri Rajendra Prasad Pareek, Aged About 27 Years, Village And Post Dungri Khurd Via Kishangarh, Renwal, Jaipur

14. Kailash Chand S/o Shri Matadeen Meena, Aged About 34 Years, Village Dhani Raisingh, Post Choklata, Via Ganeshwar, Tehsil Neem Ka Thana, Sikar

15. Manoj Kumar Rai S/o Shri Mangal Chand Bunkar, Aged About 32 Years, R-C-173, Jamnapur, Murlipura, Scheme, Jaipur

16. Onkar Mal Dudhwal S/o Shri Bhanwararam Dudhwal, Aged About 25 Years, Village And Post Nagwada, Via Kukanwali, Tehsil Nanwa, District Nagaur

17. Mahendra Kumar S/o Shri Harish Chand, Aged About 30 Years, 31/22, Unsari Gate, Soni Mohalla, Nawab Ka Beda, Ajmer

18. Kunjbihari S/o Shri Heeralal, Aged About 29 Years, Near Dargad Dharamshala, Shivaji Nagar Madanganj Kishanganj, Ajmer

19. Ganesh Lal Kalal S/o Shri Kurji Kalal, Vp Nimboda, Tehsil Sarada, District Udaipur

20. Lalit Jangu S/o Shri Kishan Jangu, Aged About 28 Years, Village Gunsali, Post Kiroda Via Badi Khantu, District Nagaur

21. Narayan Lal Hingad S/o Shri Tarachand, Aged About 37 Years, Ramdhun Chowk, Barli Sardi, Post Sardi, Teshil Desuri, District Pali

22. Jagdish Chand Panchal S/o Shri Raghunath Panchal, Aged About 33 Years, Vpo Cheenj, Tehsil Bagidaura, District Banswara, Rajasthan

23. Hitesh Meena S/o Shri Pannalal Meena, Aged About 31 Years, Village And Post Obri, Tehsil Saagwada, Dungarpur

24. Ramesh Chand Meena S/o Shri Ladu Ram Meena, Aged About 31 Years, Village And Post Shivdaspura, Tehsil Chaksu, District Jaipur (Raj.)

25. Rajesh Jatav S/o Shri Lalaram Jatav, Aged About 34 Years, Out Of Dehli Door, Near Laldas Ji Temple, Alwar

26. Kailash Vishnoi S/o Shri Bagda Ram, Aged About 29 Years, Village Nenas, Post Khiyas, Via Renn, Tehsil Degana, District Nagaur

27. Taramati Jangid D/o Shri Sitaram Jangid, Aged About 33 Years, Dwara Purshottam Jangid, Ward No. 13, Jato Ka Mohalla, Surajgarh, District Jhunjhunu

28. Ramawatar Beda S/o Shri Asharam, Aged About 32 Years, Village/post Mokalpur, Tehsil Mertacity, District Nagaur

29. Vishnu Dutt Joshi S/o Shri Laxminarian Joshi, Aged About 33 Years, Sarda Chowk, Purani Lane Gangasahar, Bikaner-334401

30. Mukesh Kumar Joshi, S/o Shri Kanti Lal Joshi, Aged About 30 Years, Village And Post Punali, District Dungapur

31. Kalpana Garasiya D/o Shri Sukhlal Garasiya, Aged About 31 Years, 1 E, Vardhman Nagar, Se-12, Savita Roshan Ji Ki Badi, Udaipur

32. Alok Sharma S/o Shri Suresh Chand Sharma, Aged About 35 Years, Matrachaya, Kansara Gali, Sangwada, District Dungarpur-314025

33. Surendra Kumar S/o Shri Surta Ram, Aged About 31 Years, Gali No. 7, Near Vicha Bharti Rampura Basti, Bikaner

34. Arvind Gupta S/o Shri Dinesh Chand Gupta, Aged About 31 Years, Adarsh Nagar (A), Bagicha Colony, Bajaria, Sawai Madhopur

35. Rajeev Kumar Shrimal S/o Shri Indra Kumar Shrimal, Aged About 32 Years, Plot No. 4, Ganesh Nagar -B, Maan Houn, Sawai Madhopur

36. Maansingh Shekhawat S/o Shri Sawai Singh Shekhawat, Aged About 25 Years, Ambey Niwas, Near Hospital, Village And Post Malasar Dungar, Swaimadhopur

37. Pukhraj S/o Shri Hararam, Aged About 32 Years, Chatriyon Ka Bas, Salawas, Tehsil Luni, Jodhpur

38. Kapil Joshi S/o Shri Murali Lal Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, 29, Gayatri Nagar, Ward No. 38, Near Vandematram Chowk, Radhakrishanpura, Sikar

39. Yaghya Prakash Somani S/o Shri Omprakash Somani,

Aged About 31 Years, Via Hmt Gaon Dorai, District Ajmer

40. Sapna Biyani S/o Shri Laxminaiyan Biyani, Aged About 39 Years, Chippo Ka Mohalla, Near Balaji Temple, Ward No. 09, Bajaj Road, Sikar

41. Bhartaram Siddhu S/o Shri Kishnaram Siddhu, Aged About 32 Years, Murlidhar Vyas Colony, Gajner Road, Bikaner

42. Mahesh Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Narayan Sharma, Aged About 27 Years, Village Barala, Post Khijuria, Tehsil Bassi, Via Shivdaspura, Jaipur

43. Rachna Walia D/o Suresh Chandra Walia, Aged About 34 Years, 9/154, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur

44. Surendra Kumar Kadhayala S/o Shri Jugal Kishore Kadhayala, Aged About 39 Years, 570, Chudi Chatarpura, Post Chudi, Ajitgarh, Jhunjhunu (Raj.)

45. Goverdhan Panchariya S/o Satyanarayan Panchariya, Aged About 36 Years, Pugal Road, Bangla Nagar, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

4. Ramchandra Rundla S/o Shri Ghanshyam Dutt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, V Jajekalan, Via- Shahpura, District Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1108/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission; through its Secretary, Ghooghara Ghati, Jaipur Road, Ajmer.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Dinesh Chand Tailor, S/o Shri Kailash Chand Tailor, B/c Tailor, aged about 26 years, R/o 53, Vivek Vihar, New Sanganer Road, Sodala, Jaipur.

2. Pramod Kumar Gupta S/o Shri Satish Gupta, aged about 36 years, R/o 65, A- Block, Ward no.20, Raisingh Nagar, Dist.- Ganganagar.

3. Lekhraj Godara, S/o Shri Ram Phal, aged 29 years, b/c SBC, R/o Kathumbar, Dist.- Alwar.

4. Hanuman Prasad, S/o Shri Hari Chand, aged 35 years, b/c SC, R/o Ward No. 16, Padampur, Dist.- Ganganagar.

5. Mukesh Verma S/o Shri Ishwarlal Verma, B/c SC, R/o Plot No. 4, Shanker Colony, Naya Khera, Ambabari, Jaipur

6. Vijay Solanki, S/o Shri Chitar Lal Solanki, B/c OBC, aged 32 years, R/o B-96, Sanjay Colony, Bhilwara.

7. Mukesh Kumar, S/o Shri Om Prakash, B/c OBC, R/o Ward No. 10, Kesrisinghpur, Sri Ganganagar.

8. Ram Gopal Swami S/o Shri Mohandas, B/c OBC, R/o Ward no. 12, Kasumbi (Jakhala), Tehsil Ladnu, Dist. - Nagaur.

9. Prabha Bindal, D/o Shri Poonam Chand Bindal, b/c Mahajan, aged 39 years, R/o Mitra Niwas Colony, Opp. MSS Prep School, Madanganj, Kishangarh, Dist.- Ajmer.

10. Amit Kumar Sharma, S/o Shri Narayanlal Sharma, b/c Brahmin, aged 31 years, R/o Dhadhich Colony II, Krishnapuri, Madanganj, Kishangarh, Distt- Ajmer.

11. Kamlesh Kumar Yadav S/o Shri Surajmal Yadav, b/c Yadav, aged 26 years, R/o Udawala, Post- Ghasipura, Tehsil-Shahpura, Dist.- Jaipur

----Respondent/Petitioners

12. State of Rajasthan; through Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.

13. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner (Rajasthan).

Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1109/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Bhom Singh Shekhawat S/o Anop Singh Shekhawat, Aged About 30 Years, Village Post Losal Chhoti, Via Losal, Tehsil Distt. Sikar (Raj.).

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1110/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ram Nivas Meena S/o Ram Narain Meena, Aged About 33 Years, Village Malera, Via Samod, Distt. Jaipur 303806
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate Bikaner
4. Pooja Jain , D/o Rajesh Jain, Wife Of Shri Deepak Jain, Aged About 34 Years, A-25, Navjeevan Vihar, 200 Feet Bypass, Gandhi Path, Lalpura, Jaipur
5. Lokendra Pal Singh, Son Of Shri Hari Kishan Singh, Aged About 30 Years, Behind Church, Mathura Gate,bharatpur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1112/2015

1. Smt. Minakshi Sharma Wife Of Shri Abhishek Kaushik, D/o Shri Jai Krishan Dutt Sharma (R. No. 646716, Rank-14 , Category General), Aged About 36 Years, G-930, Gandhi Nagar, Jaipur
2. Smt. Vimlesh Kumari, Wife Of Shri Yashpal Singh D/o Shri Brijendra Singh (R. No. 613559, Rank 28, Category Obc), Aged About 30 Years, 79/126, Sector-7, Block-79, Agarwal Farm, Mansarovar , Jaipur
3. Smt. Bhagwati Verma, Wife Of Shri Inderjeet Satyawana, D/o Shri Ramdev Verma (R. No. 114045, Rank 43 , Category Sc), Aged About 34 Years, 864/32, Laxman

Chowk, Jadugar, Ajmer

4. Smt. Mukta, Wife Of Shri Parveen Kumar Goyal, D/o Shri N.m. Gupta (R. No. 546542, Rank 25 , Category General), Aged About 34 Years, Goyal Niwas, Ward No. 9, Govt. Hospital Road, Sadul Shahar, Sri Ganganagar

5. Smt. Surbha Wife Of Shri Rakesh, D/o Shri Dalip Ram (R. No. 551149, Rank 38 , Category Obc), Aged About 30 Years, Ward No. 2, Khichdan Bas, Sadul Shahar, Sri Ganganagar

6. Smt. Poonam Joshi, Wife Of Anand, D/o Madanjoshi (R. No. 645859, Rank 20 , Category General), Aged About 34 Years, 101, Khawas Ji Ka Bagg, Durgapura, Ward No. 21, Jaipur

7. Smt. Kumkum Rankawat, Wife Of Shri Harish Chandra Sharma, D/o Shri Sohan Lal Rankawat (R. No. 396172, Rank 21, Category Obc), Aged About 35 Years, Ii C Road, Sardarpura, 539, Maliyo Ki Gali, Jodhpur

8. Smt. Seema Gaur, Wife Of Vikram Soni, D/o Rajendra Prasad Gaur (R. No. 216082, Rank 22, Category General), Aged About 39 Years, Snehdeep, Jail Well, Bikaner

9. Miss Neha Yadav, D/o Mahendra Singh Yadav, (R. No. 214330, Rank 46, Category Bc, Locomotor/c.p Disabled), Aged About 27 Years, K.g. Complex, Near Mata Ji Mandir, Rani Bazar, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Ramchandra Rundla, S/o Shri Ghanshyam Dutt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, V P Jajekalan, Via Shahpura, District Jaipur (Rajasthan)

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

3. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

4. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1117/2015

1. The State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Dinesh Chand Tailor Son Of Shri Kailash Chand, B/c Tailor, Aged About 26 Years, 53 Vivek Vihar, New Sanganer Road, Sodala, Jaipur
2. Pramod Kumar Gupta, S/o Shri Satish Gupta, Aged About 36 Years, 65 A, Block, Ward No. 20, Raisinghnagar, Distt. Ganganagar
3. Lekhraj Godara S/o Ram Phal B/c Sbc, Aged About 29 Years, Kathumar, District Alwar
4. Hanuman Prasad Son Of Shri Hari Chand, Aged About 35 Years, Ward No. 16, Padampur, District Ganganagar
5. Mukesh Verma S/o Shri Ishwarlal Verma, B/c Sc, 4, Shanker Colony, Naya Khera, Ambabari, Jaipur
6. Vijay Solanki, S/o Shri Chitar Lal Solanki, B/c Obc, Aged About 32 Years, B 96, Sanjay Colony, Bhilwara
7. Mukesh Kumar S/o Om Prakash By Caste Obc, Ward No. 10, Kesrisingpura, Sri Ganganagar
8. Ram Gopal Swami, S/o Mohandas, B/c Obc, Ward No. 12, Kasumbi (Jakhala), Tehsil Ladnu, District, Nagaur
9. Prabha Bindal D/o Poonam Chand Bindal, B/c Mahajan, Aged About 39 Years, Mitra Niwas Colony, Opp. Mss Prep School, Madanganj, Kishanpura Distt. Alwar
10. Amit Kumar Sharma, S/o Shri Narayanlal Sharma, B/c Brahmin, Aged About 31 Years, Dhadhich Colony Ii, Krishnapuri Madanganj, Kishangarh, District Ajmer
11. Kamlesh Kumar Yadav S/o Surajmal Yadav, By Caste Yadav, Aged About 26 Years, Udawala Post Ghasipura Tehsil, Shahpura, District Jaipur
12. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1118/2015

State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Sunil Kumar Sharma Son Of Shri Vishwanath Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, Ward No. 12, Near Goshala, Tehsil Chirawa, District Jhunjhunu, (Rajasthan)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1121/2015

1. Kamal Kishor Kothari Son Of Shri Ram Dayal By Caste Kothari, Aged About 37 Years, West Of Ganga Gaushala, Nokha, Bikaner (Raj.)
2. Ram Lal Godara Son Of Shri Bhanwar Lal Godara, By Caste Jat, Aged About 29 Years, Near Hanuman Dhok Dhora, Jorawarpura, Ward No. 28, Nokha, Bikaner (Raj.)
3. Ramuram Pancharia Son Of Shri Bajrang Lal Panchariya, By Caste Pancharia, Aged About 28 Years, Behind Vidya Bhawan School, Roda Road, Panchariya Chowk, Nokha, Bikaner (Raj.)

----Appellants

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Secretary, Secondary Education.department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner.
4. Ramchandra Rundia Son Of Shri Ghanshyam Dutt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, Village Post Jajekalan, Via Shahpura, District Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1132/2015

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principle Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Vikas Jangid Son Of Shri Bajran Lal Jagid, By Caste Jangid, Gulab Bag, Palsana Road, Khandela, Sikar (Raj.).
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1133/2015

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Om Prakash S/o Mohanlal Sharma, B/c Brahim, Aged About 27 Years, Vpo Anokhu, Via Dhodh, District Sikar.
2. Rakesh Kumar S/o Gopi Ram Khokhar, B/c Jat, Aged About 25 Years, Vpo Modunga, Via Dhodh, District Sikar.
3. Sandeep Kumar Tiwari S/o Sita Ram, B/c Brahmin, Aged About 28 Years, Doliya Ka Bas, Sikar.
4. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1134/2015

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Ravi Shankar Mahla S/o Khuma Ram Mahla, B/c Jat, Aged About 31 Years, Village Sami Via Khurd, Sikar
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1135/2015

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mahesh Kumar Yogi Son Of Shri Shankar Lal Yogi, By Caste Yogi, Aged About 31 Years, Ward No. 5, Vinayak Colony, Amarsar Road, Ajitgarh, Tehsil Shri Madhopur, District Sikar (Raj.)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1136/2015

State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Education Department (Secondary Education), Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Santosh Jangir S/o Shri Sitaram Jangir, Aged About 33 Years, Ward No.11, Manaksar Road, Suratgarh, District-Sriganganagar At Present Resident Of Plot No. 83, Shantinagar-B, Gurjar Ki Thadi, Jaipur (Rajasthan)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1137/2015

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Reetesh Jain S/o Shri Seetal Prasad Jain, Aged About 33 Years, C-49, Barkat Nagar Extension, Kisan Marg, Tonk Road, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1138/2015

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan,

Secretariat, Jaipur

2. Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Megha Agrawal D/o Gopal Lal Agarwal W/o Nikki Agarwal, Aged About 29 Years, Plot No. 43, Laxmi Vihar Colony, Infront Of Railway Station, Bundi (Raj.)

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1139/2015

1. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Kiran Acharya D/o Shri Ramakant Acharya W/o Shri Sunil Doshi, Aged About 43 Years, 6-D, R.k. Puram, Titardi, District Udaipur (Raj.)

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1140/2015

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principle Secretary, Govt. Secretraiat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Vishnu Shankar Sharma Son Of Shri Shyam Lal Sharma, By Caste Brahmin, Aged About 22 Years, Plot No. 37, Madhu Vatika, Behind Bandawala Guest, Purani Chungi, Aagra Road, Jaipur (Raj.)

2. Kapoor Chand Maharshi Son Of Shri Shyonarayan Sharma, By Caste Brahmin, Aged About 43 Years, Village Post Siwar, Ward No. 16, Nagar Nigam, Jaipur (Raj.)

3. Devendraraj Singh Son Of Shri Narayan Singh, By Caste Jat, Aged About 28 Years, 38, Govind Nagar, Rajbhatta,

Delhi Road, Alwar (Raj.)

4. Shankar Sharma Son Of Shri Jagdish Narayan Sharma, By Caste Sharma, Aged About 25 Years, Village Post Jitawala Via Kanota, Tehsil Bassi, District Jaipur (Raj.)

5. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Office At Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1161/2015

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretrait,jaipur

2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Ramchandra Randla S/o Shri Ghanshayam Dutt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, V Jajekalan, Via - Shahpura, District Jaipur (Raj.)

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1162/2015

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur

2. Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Sanju Kumari D/o Bhanwara Ram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o, C/o Shri Om Prakash Dhaka, 10/31, New Housing Board, Jhunjhunu

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1163/2015

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan,

Secretrait, Jaipur

2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ram Nivas Meena S/o Ram Narain Meena, Aged About 33 Years, Village Malera, Via Samod, Distt. Jaipur - 303806
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1164/2015

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Dirctorate, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Suman Kumari Meena D/o Rameshwar Prasad Meena W/o Shri Manmohan Meena, Aged About 25 Years, V P Natoj, Tehsil Kathumr, District Alwar (Raj.).
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1165/2015

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Mahendra Raj Khorwal S/o Jagdish Narayan, Aged About 27 Years, Indra Colony, Vpo- Achrol, Tehsil Amer, District Jaipur
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1166/2015

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Dharmendra Raj Singh Rao S/o Shri Narwar Singh Rao, Aged About 33 Years, Village Falabara, Post Malana, Tehsil Ghadi, District Banswara (Raj.).
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1167/2015

State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Bhairu Lal Jat S/o Shri Jagdeesh Jat, By Caste Jat, Aged About 40 Years, Village Post Chougai, Tehsil Peeplu, District Tonk (Raj.).
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1168/2015

State Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education (School), Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Hemant Manwani Son Of Shri Kanhiyalal Manwani, Aged About 30 Years, Satguru Colony, Ajay Nagar, Ajmer.
2. Rajesh Kumar Son Of Shri Laxmi Narayan, Aged About 34 Years, Behind Saraswati Girls School, Crpf Gc-1, Golf Course Road, Ajmer.
3. Nemi Chand Son Of Shri Lal Chand, Aged About 30 Years,

House No. 571/27, New Janta Colony, Pahar Ganj, Ajmer.

4. Manju Devi Panwar Daughter Of Shri Devi Singh Panwar, Aged About 43 Years, 319, Uit Colony, P.r.nagar, Bhagwan Ganj, Ajmer.

5. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary. Office At Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1190/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary,

----Appellant

Versus

1. Sunil Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Vishwanath Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, Ward No. 12, Near Goshala, Tehsil Chirawa, District Jhunjhunu (Rajasthan)

2. State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1191/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer.

----Appellant

Versus

Ramavatar Saini, S/o Govind Ram Saini, Aged About 31 Years, 27, Jyoti Vihar-1, Manyawash, Mansarover, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1192/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer.

----Appellant

Versus

Jai Singh Saini, S/o Banwari Lal Saini, Aged About 33 Years, C-1, Bal Nagar, Mahesh Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1193/2015

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

----Appellant

Versus

1. Nirmal Kumar Gupta, S/o Shri Babu Lal Gupta, By Cast Gupta, Aged About 39 Years, 7, Anand Vihar, Triveni Nagar, Near Sanskrit College, Gopalpura By Pass Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The State Of Rajasthan Through Secretary Higher Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.rajasthan.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1194/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Nidhi Trivedi, D/o Narottam Lal Sharma, Aged About 31 Years, 17, Shri Ram Nagar Colony, Morija Road, Chomu, Dist. Jaipur, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1197/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Dinesh Kumar Vishnoi, S/o Kailash Chand Vishnoi, Aged About 29 Years, Patola Mahadev Road, Pur, Bhilwara, Rajasthan
2. Shanker Das, S/o Mangal Das, Aged About 32 Years, Village Post Maler, Tehsil Suratgarh, Dist. Shri Ganganagar, Rajasthan

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1201/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Prakash Chand, S/o Mahar Chand, Aged About 39 Years, 76, Shivaji Park, Alwar, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1205/2015

1. Ashok Kumar Gupta S/o Shri Kailash Chand Gupta, Aged About 38 Years, V/ Balaheri, Tehsil Mahwa, District Dausa (Raj.)
2. Abhishek Kumar S/o Shri Amar Singh, Aged About 28 Years, Vpo Bhimsar, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
3. Asif Ali S/o Shri Anwar Ali, Aged About 30 Years, Vpo Nua, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
4. Islamuddin Ansari S/o Shri Bashir Mohammaed Ansari, Aged About 37 Years, Near Zahoor Clinic, Ansari, Mohalla City, Sawaimadhopur (Raj.)
5. Mohd. Javed Khan S/o Shri Mohd. Ishak Khan, Aged About 30 Years, Vpo Nua, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
6. Riyaz Ali S/o Shri Fayyaz Ahmed Khan, Aged About 32 Years, Vpo Nua, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
7. Rukhsana Bano D/o Shri Misbahul Hasan, Aged About 30 Years, Hajarat Kamruddin Sahah Dargah, Ward No. 8, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
8. Mohammed Arif Bhati S/o Shri Salumuddin Bhati, Aged About 36 Years, Near Islamia Senior School Ward No. 7, District Sikar (Raj.)
9. Aarif Ali S/o Shri Abdul Gaffar Chejara, Aged About 38 Years, Mertani Bawari, Near Kuba Masjid, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
10. Abid Ali Bhati S/o Shri Kasim Ali Bhati, Aged About 36 Years, Mohalla Naykan, Near Naykan School, Ward No. 03, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
11. Shabnam Khan S/o Shri Abid Ali, Aged About 30 Years,

Vpo Nua, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)

12. Intezar Ali S/o Shri Basir Ahmed Khan, Aged About 30 Years, Vpo Nua, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)

----Appellants

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary,
3. Sunil Kumar Sharma Son Of Shri Vishwanath Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, Ward No. 12, Near Goshala, Tehsil Chirawa, District Jhunjhunu (Rajasthan)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1210/2015

1. Mushtak Ahamad S/o Abdul Gafoor Khan, Aged About 33 Years, Village And Post - Shesha, Tehsil Malarna Doonger, District - Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
2. Mohammed Shakir S/o Alisher Khan, Aged About 30 Years, Village And Post - Malarna Doonger, Tehsil Malarna Doonger, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
3. Rauf Alam S/o Mahboob Khan, Aged About 32 Years, Vpo Bonli, Tehsil Bonli, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
4. Kaleem Ahmed S/o Abdul Kalam, Aged About 29 Years, Vpo Bhalim Para, Tehsil Malarna Doonger, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
5. Anwar Ali S/o Fazaruddin, Aged About 29 Years, Village Gogor, Post Setu, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
6. Mustak Ali S/o Multya Gaddi, Aged About 35 Years, Village And Post Makholi, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
7. Nafis Khan S/o Abdul Kayyum Khan, Aged About 42 Years, Village And Post Behter Tehsil Malarna Doonger, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
8. Idrish Ali Khan S/o Nasira Khan, Aged About 35 Years, Village Dubbi, Post Makholi, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan

----Appellants

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary
2. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner
4. Ramchandra Rundla S/o Shri Ghanshyam Dutt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, V Jalekalan Via Shahpura, District Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1211/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Jitendra S/o Ramveer Sharma, Aged About 28 Years, Tehsil Road, Mania, Dist.- Dholpur, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1212/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Harish Khatri, S/o Lila Ram Khatri, Aged About 34 Years, 53/4, Gandhi Nagar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1213/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Bhupendra Tiwari S/o Nanu Ram Tiwari, Aged About 33 Years, Village Post Dhamotar, Tehsil Dist. - Pratapgarh, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1214/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Raj Pal S/o Kashi Ram, Aged About 27 Years, Village Post Rajpura (46 Rbb), Tehsil Padampur, Dist.- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1215/2015

1. Banwari Lal Bairwa S/o Ram Chandra Bairwa, Aged About 32 Years, Village Guddha, Anand Pura, Post Rajwas Tehsil Niwai, District Tonk (Raj.) Rank No. 168 Category Sc
2. Nagar Mal S/o Bhagwana Ram, Aged About 39 Years, Village Post Ramsisar, Tehsil Ramgarh Shekahwati, District Sikar (Raj.) Rank No. 74 Category Sc
3. Saroj Bai Verma D/o Kesarlal, Aged About 32 Years, 44, Bhopal Nagar, Near Adarsh Nagar "b" Sawai Madhopur (Raj.) Rank No. 211 Category Sc
4. Mudassir Mubeen S/o Shri Abdul Mubeen By Caste Muslim, Aged About 32 Years, Village And Post Wazirpur, Tehsil Wazirpur, District Sawai Madhopur (Raj.) Rank No. 79 Category Obc
5. Shabnam D/o Inamuddin, Aged About 30 Years, House No. 4245, Jagannath Shah Ka Raasta, Ramganj, Jaipur (Raj.) Rank No. 139 Category Obc
6. Salim Khan Kayamkhani S/o Taj Mohammad Khan, Aged About 31 Years, Ladnu, Tehsil Ladnu, District Nagaur (Raj.) Rank No. 114 Category Obc
7. Imran Ali S/o Yousuf Khan, Aged About 31 Years, Gram Post Kindoli, Tehsil Dhod, Sikar (Raj.) Rank No. 24 Category Obc
8. Parvej Khan S/o Salim Khan, Aged About 29 Years, 7-C-5556, Vigyan Nagar, Kota (Raj.) Rank No. 58 Category Obc
9. Atiqur Rehman S/o Mukhtarul Rehman Rahil, Aged About 37 Years, House No. 791, Naal Bandari Ka Nasik, Jaipur (Raj.) Rank No. 16 Category General

10. Sushila Atal D/o Gangaram Atal, Aged About 36 Years, Ambedkar Circle Ke Pass Shivji Colony, Niwai, Tehsil Niwai, Tonk (Raj.) Rank No. 215 Category Sc

11. Nafeesunnisa D/o Mohammed Mustufa, Aged About 43 Years, Near Saeedi Clinic, Nazar Bag Gate Ke Pas, District Tonk (Raj.) Rank No. 142 Category Obc

12. Farnaz Siddique D/o Mohd Zakir, Aged About 36 Years, Mohalla Razwan, Tonk (Raj.) Rank No. 130 Category Obc

13. Abdul Rahman Ali S/o Alim Khan, Aged About 35 Years, Village And Post Mordunga, Tehsil Sikar, District Sikar (Raj.) Rank No. 55 Category Obc

14. Rashid Ali S/o Mumtaj Khan, Aged About 28 Years, Village And Post Bhagaran, Tehsil Fatehpur, District Sikar (Raj.) Rank No. 4 Category Obc

15. Mohammad Ibrahim S/o Abdul Maujeed, Aged About 30 Years, House No. 1, Shafat Colony, Shikariyo Kibmori Ghoda Nikas Road Ramganj Bazar, Jaipur Rank No. 13 Category General

16. Alka Kumari D/o Amar Singh, Aged About 19 Years, Village And Post Binasar, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.) Rank No. 146 Category St

17. Shabana Qureshi D/o Iqubaal Qureshi, Aged About 30 Years, Vpo Jairampura, Via. Jahota, Tehsil Amer, District Jaipur (Raj.) Rank No. 85 Category Obc

18. Mohammad Tofeek S/o Mohd Rafeeq, Aged About 31 Years, Dhani Swamiyon, Ward No. 13, Hisar Railway Crossing Ke Pas, Post Sadulpur, Tehsil Rajgrah, Churu (Raj.) Rank No. 113 Category Obc

19. Maksud Khan S/o Mukarab Khan, Aged About 29 Years, Village And Post Rajpura, Tehsil Tara Nagar, District Churu (Raj.) Rank No. 33 Category Obc

20. Shokat Ali Khan S/o Sultan Khan, Aged About 29 Years, Rajpura, Tehsil Tara Nagar, District Churu (Raj.) Rank No. 39 Category Obc

21. Fakhrunnisha Bano D/o Hasnuddin, Aged About 27 Years, 13, Kunjarwadi Niyargharon Ka Mohalla, District Udaipur (Raj.) Rank No. 96 Category Obc

22. Noorjahan Bano D/o Hasnuddin, Aged About 28 Years, 13 Kunjarwadi Niyargharon Ka Mohalla, District Udaipur (Raj.) 88 Category Obc

----Appellants

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Secretary
3. Sunil Kumar Sharma Son Of Shri Vishwanath Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, Ward No. 12, Near Goshala, Tehsil Chirawa, District Jhunjhunu (Rajasthan)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1219/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Satya Narayan Sharma S/o Sita Ram Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, Village Hathgi, Post Rajpura, Tehsil Malpura, Dist. - Tonk, Rajasthan
2. Raghuveer Sharma S/o Prahlad Sharma, Aged About 27 Years, Village Post Padri Topkhana, Tehsil Khandra, Dist. - Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
3. Mohan Singh S/o Shri Suraj Singh, Aged About 34 Years, Plto No. 13, Ward No. 16, Deendyal Colony, Newai, Dist. - Tonk, Rajasthan
4. Gopal Lal Jat, S/o Narayan Lal Jat, Aged About 37 Years, C/o Natthu Ji Godle, G-69, Gandhi Nagar Chittorgarh, Rajasthan
5. Surendra Singh Ashia, S/o Kailash Dan Ashia, Aged About 35 Years, Village Post Bhandiyawas, Tehsil Pachpadra, Dist. - Barmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1220/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Rekha Sharma D/o Ramavtar Sharma, Aged About 34 Years, Village Post Charawas, Via Chirawa, Tehsil Khetri, Dist. - Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1232/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Om Prakash Sadh, S/o Babu Lal Sadh, Aged About 33 Years, Village Post Panchu, Tehsil Nokha, Dist. Bikaner, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1238/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Sunil Kumar S/o Tarachand, Aged About 25 Years, Ward No. 15, Ambedkar Colony, Neem Ka Thana, Dist. - Sikar, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1239/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Reetesh Jain S/o Shri Sheetal Prasad Jain, Aged About 33 Years, C-49, Barkat Nagar Extension, Krishna Marg, Tonk Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1240/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mahendra Raj Khorwal, S/o Jagdish Narayan, Aged About 27 Years, Indra Colony, Vpo - Achrol, Tehsil Amer, Dist. - Jaipur, Rajasthan
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1241/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Priyanka, D/o Jagdev Singh, Aged About 26 Years, D-72, Sector-Ii B, Khetri, Dist. - Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1242/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ravi Shankar Mahla S/o Khuma Ram Mahla, B/c Jat, Aged About 31 Years, Village Sami Via Khurd, Dist,.- Sikar
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1251/2015

1. Pappu Singh S/o Shri Kesa Ram Prajapat, Aged About 29

Years, Village Salawas, Tehsil Luni, District Jodhpur (Raj.)

2. Narendra Singh S/o Shri Mahendra Singh B/c Charan, Aged About 29 Years, Village Rajala Tehsil Marwar Junction, District Pali (Raj.)
3. Sanju Charan D/o Shri Shambhu Dan B/c Charan, Aged About 33 Years, Indra Colony, Opposite Mahamandir Railway Station, Jodhpur (Raj.)
4. Rajul Maderna W/o Late Shri Charan Singh Maderna B/c Jat, Aged About 49 Years, 26, Sushil Nagar, Bhagat Ki Kothi, Jodhpur (Raj.)
5. Mamta Sharma W/o Late Shri Ajay Sharma D/o Shri J.k. Sharma, 631, Indra Colony, Jaisalmer (Raj.)
6. Renu Chaudhary D/o Shri Gordhan Singh, B/c Jat, Aged About 33 Years, Udai Mandir, Maliyo Ki Gali, Jodhpur (Raj.)

----Appellants

Versus

1. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary
2. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretrait,jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner
4. Ramchandra Rundla S/o Shri Ghanshyam Datt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, V Jalekalan, Via Shahpura, District Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1252/2015

Avnish Goyal S/o Shri Nemichand Gupta, Aged About 30 Years, 21, Rajendra Nagar, Radhaswami Satsang Road, Bharatpur (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer,rajasthan
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan
3. Archana Agarwal D/o Sh. Mohan Lal Gupta, Aged About

38 Years, 31/2, Adarsh Colony, Behind Hpo, Bharatpur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1257/2015

1. Smt. Rekha Chawla W/o Dr. Surendra Kumar Chandel, Aged About 33 Years, H.no. 1/85, Housing Board Colony, Tonk- 304001 (Rajasthan), Roll No. - 203571, Rank No.- 47, Category- Sc.
2. Smt. Sanju Bhadana W/o Shri Bhanu Pratap Gurjar, Aged About 35 Years, 434/9, Near Gautam School, Gurjar Bara Hathi Bhata, Ajmer -305001 (Rajasthan), Roll No.- 109126, Rank No. -39, Category-Sbc
3. Smt. Neeru Shekhawat D/o Shri Mangal Singh, Aged About 34 Years, Village Rasidpura, Tehsil Didwana, District Nagaur (Rajasthan), Roll No. 444687, Rank No. 5, Category- General
4. Smt. Jitendar Kaur D/o Makhan Singh, Aged About 33 Years, 7-C, Prem Nagar, Sriganganagar (Rajasthan), Roll No. 542214, Rank No 33, Category- Backward Class
5. Smt. Vinita Choudhary D/o Shri Raja Ram Potalia, Aged About 32 Years, 68, Sindhi Colony, Near Uit, Sriganganagar (Rajasthan(, Roll No. 542835, Rank No.- 32, Category- Obc

----Appellants

Versus

1. Ramchandra Rundla S/o Shri Ghanshyam Datt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, V Jajekalan, Via- Shahpura, District Jaipur (Rajasthan)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary,
3. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretrait,jaipur
4. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1259/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary,

----Appellant

Versus

1. Santosh Jangir S/o Shri Sitaram Jangir, Aged About 33 Years, Ward No. 11, Manaksar Road, Suratgarh, Dist. -Shri Ganganagar, At Present Resident Of Plot No. 83, Shantinagar, -B, Gurjar Ki Thadi , Jaipur, Rajasthan
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Education Department (Secondary Education), Government Secretariat, Jaipur. Rajasthan.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1260/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Amit Sharma S/o Gend Behari Sharma, Aged About 34 Years, 26, Ashirwad, New Akashwani Colony, Kota, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1261/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer , Rajasthan

----Appellant

Versus

1. Archana Agarwal D/o Sh. Mohan Lal Gupta, Aged About 38 Years, 31/2, Adarsh Colony, Behind Hpo, Bharatpur Rajasthan
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1262/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Chandrabhan Singh Chaudhary S/o Ajeet Singh Chaudhary, Aged About 36 Years, 69-C, Krishna Srovar, Dholai, Mansarovar, Jaipur, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1264/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary,

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajendra Prasad Saini S/o Govind Ram B/c Mali, Aged About 34 Years, Rampura, Via- Khandela, Dist- Sikar
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1265/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ramchandra Rundla, S/o Shri Ghanshyam Dutt Jat, Aged About 33 Years, V P Jajekalan, Via- Shahpura, District Jaipur, Rajasthan
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1266/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Kiran Acharya, D/o Shri Ramakant Acharya, W/o Shri Sunil Doshi, Aged About 43 Years, 6-D, R.k. Puran, Titardi, District Udaipur
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary

Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1267/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Jasleen Kour, D/o Jaswant Singh, 35, Ward No. 12, Sector No. 12, Surtagarh Road, Hanumangarh Junction, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1268/2015

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Megha Agarwal , D/o Gopal Lal Agarwal, W/o Nikki Agarwal, Aged About 29 Years, 43, Laxmi Vihar Colony, Infront Of Railway Station, Bundi, Rajasthan
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1270/2015

Bhairu Lal Jat Son Of Shri Jagdeesh Jat, By Caste Jat, Aged About 40 Years, Village Post Chougai, Tehsil Peeplu, District Tonk (Rajasthan)

----Appellant

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 29/2016

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Yogesh Kumar Jain Son Of Shri Devkinandan Jain, By Caste Jain, Aged About 30 Years, Jain Gift House, Main Market, Kshangarbhas, Alwar (Raj.)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Office At Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 30/2016

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Garima Dixit Daughter Of Shri Govind Prasad, By Caste Dixit, Aged About 30 Years, 38, Radha Kishanpura, Sikar (Raj.)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 31/2016

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ajay Kumar Sharma Son Of Shri Madan Lal Sharma, By Caste Sharma, Aged About 25 Years, Pareek Mohalla, Ward No. 9, Ajitgarh, Tehsil Shrimadhopur, District Sikar (Raj.)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan

Through Its Secretary, Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 32/2016

1. State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Aklesh Daughter Of Shri Pyare Lal Sihag, Aged About 25 Years, Village Nand, Tehsil Malsisar, District Jhunjhunu
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 33/2016

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Shikha Gupta Daughter Of Shri Pukhraj Gupta, By Caste Gupta, Aged About 35 Years, 161, Baldev Nagar, Masuriya, Near Sanchit Hospita, Jodhpur (Raj.)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 34/2016

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Manju Songara Daughter Of Shri Jugal Kishore Songara, By Caste Songara, Aged About 34 Years, Quarter No. K 66 Near Police Chowki, Pratap Nagar, Jodhpur (Raj.)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 35/2016

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ram Naresh Son Of Shri Mohan Singh, Aged About 52 Years, Village Garhijonabad, Post Devkhera, Tehsil Rajakhera, District Dholpur (Raj.)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 39/2016

State Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ajay Kumar Yadav S/o Shri Ramavtar Yadav, By Caste Yadav, Aged About 28 Years, Village Kaliyawas, Post Kanwat, Tehsil Khandela, District Sikar 332708
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 40/2016

State Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Vijay Kumar Saini S/o Gopal Saini, B/c Saini, Aged About 29 Years, Vpo Ganeri, District Sikar
2. Vinod Kumar Sharma S/o Sukhdev Sharma, B/c Brahamin, Aged About 35 Years, Vpo Chhapta, Tehsil Ladnu, District Nagaur
3. Anil Kumar Jangid S/o Ram Swaroop, B/c Jangid, Aged About 32 Years, Vpo Syalodra, Tehsil Neem Ka Thana,

District Sikar

4. Anita Surekha, D/o Om Prakash Surekha, W/o Govind Kumar, B/c Surekha, Aged About 31 Years, 558 Kh, Behind Balaji Mandir, Ward No. 9, Salasar, District Churu

5. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 41/2016

1. State Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary, School And Sanskrit Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

2. The Director Secondary Education, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Hemlata Sadhu D/o Shri Ram Niwas Sadhu W/o Shri Hitesh Vaishnav, Aged About 25 Years, In Front Of Rooprajat Gate, Lunawa, Tehsil Bali, District Pali, Rajasthan

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 59/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Dilip Kumar Saini, S/o Chiranji Lal Saini, Aged About 27 Years, Mori Gate, Mochiyo Ka Kua, Ward No. 13, Laxmangarh, Dist. Sikar, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 60/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Rajesh Kumar Swami, S/o Ramavatar Swami, Aged About 34 Years, Village Bhairupura, Post Navrangpura, Tehsil Virat Nagar, Via Maid, Dist.- Jaipur Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 61/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Kamlesh Chouhan, S/o Nand Lal Chouhan, Aged About 37 Years, Near Raghunath Temple, Village Duddu, Dist. Jaipur, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 62/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Daleep Singh S/o Shri Tara Chand, Aged About 29 Years, Village Maliya, Tehsil Nohar, Dist. Hanumangarh, Rajasthan
2. Manoj Kumar Meena S/o Madan Lal Meena, Aged About 24 Years, Village Post Bajar, Tehsil Talera, Dist. Bundi, Rajasthan

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 63/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Anita Saini D/o Ramji Lal Saini, Aged About 28 Years, Main Market Chopar, Modiyo Ki Gali, Ajeetgarh, Dist.- Sikar , Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 64/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Mukesh Kumar Meena S/o Jagdish Prasad Meena, Aged About 33 Years, Village Ghudasi, Post Autton Kalan, Tehsil Dist. Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 65/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Ram Chandra Yadav S/o Baloo Ram Yadav, Aged About 37 Years, Village Post Kishorpura, Dhani Mehta Wali, Via- Ajeetgarh, Tehsil Neem Ka Thana, Dist.- Sikar, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 94/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ram Naresh, S/o Shri Mohan Singh, Aged About 32 Years, Village Garhijonbad, Post Devkhera, Tehsil Rajakhera, District Dholpur (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principle Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 95/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Jhaman Bharatee, S/o Dharan Bharatee, Aged About 30 Years, Village Post Bajjo, Tehsil Kolayat, Dist. - Bikaner, Rajasthan
2. Sahab Ram S/o Jetha Ram, Aged About 34 Years, Village Post Sonari, Tehsil Nohar, Dist. - Hanumangarh
3. Himanshu Depawat, S/o Shreni Dan Charan, Aged About 37 Years, House No. 893, Pooja Nagar, Hiran Magri, Sector- 4, Udaipur, Rajasthan

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 96/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Amandeep Niwad, S/o Anand Prakash, Aged About 25 Years, Ward No. 11, Near Thakurdwara, Goluwala Niwadan, Village Post Goluwala, Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh (Raj.)

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 97/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Shikha Gupta, D/o Shri Pankaj Gupta, By Cast Gupta, Aged About 35 Years, 161, Baldev Nagar, Masuriya, Near Sanchit Hospital, Jodhpur (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 98/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Office At Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ajay Kumar Yadav, S/o Ramavtar Yadav, By Caste Yadav (Ahir), Aged About 28 Years, Village Kaliyawas, Post Kanwat, Tehsil Khandela, District Sikar -332708
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principle Secretary Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 99/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Radha Krishna Saini, S/o Shri Pyaralal Saini, Aged About 40 Years, Village Bhuda Ka Bans, Post Birodi-Bari, Via Bidasar, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Sikar (Raj.)

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 100/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary

----Appellant

Versus

1. Sanjeev K Grover, S/o Shri Kashmirilal, Aged About 38 Years, Jyoti Colony, Opposite Bus Stand, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 101/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Vipin Solanki, S/o Shri Jagdish Prasad Solanki, Aged About 32 Years, 709, Lodha Khan, Opp. Monark School, Vinay Sadan, Ajmer, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 117/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Lokesh Kumar Jat, S/o Chhaju Lal Jat, Aged About 32 Years, Plot No. 52, Shivaji Nagar, Near Pratap Nagar, Sector-7, Sanganer, Jaipur
2. Sitaram Jat, S/o Shri Ram Kishan Jat, Aged About 30 Years, Village Post Dosara, Tehsil Phagi, Distt. Jaipur
3. Kamlesh Meena S/o Sh Kailash Chand Meena, Aged About 28 Years, Village Post Jamuaram Gargh, Jaipur
4. Dinesh Kumar Meena, S/o Hari Narayan Meena, Aged About 28 Years, Village Post Hans Mahal, Via Banskho, Tehsil Bassim, Jaipur
5. State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretrait,jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 118/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Rukm Kesh Meena, S/o Shri Pyare Lal Meena, Aged About 40 Years, Village Post Bardala, Tehsil Nadoti, District Karauli

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 119/2016

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

----Appellant

Versus

1. Anil Kumar Sain, S/o Sheri Radhey Shyam Saini, Aged About 30 Years, Near Power House Circle, District Ajmer (Raj.)
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner, Rajasthan

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 120/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Om Prakash S/o Mohanlal Sharma, B/c Brahmin, Aged About 27 Years, Vpo Anokhu, Via Dhodh, Dist. Sikar
2. Rakesh Kumar S/o Gopi Ram Khokhar, B/c Jat, Aged About 25 Years, Vpo Anokhu, Via Dhodh, Dist. Sikar
3. Sandeep Kumar Tiwari, S/o Sita Ram, B/c Brahmin, Aged About 28 Years, Doliya Ka Bas, Sikar
4. State Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
5. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 121/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

Shanker Lal Meena S/o Shri Gopal Lal Meena, By Cast Meena, Village Post Luniyawas, Near Water Tank Via Jamdoli, Goner Road, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 122/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Sahil Choudhary S/o Shri Kailash Choudhary, By Cast Jat, Aged About 22 Years, Village Post Khoraladkhani, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principle Secretary, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 123/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Manju Songara, D/o Shri Jugal Kishore Songara, By Caste Songara (S.c.), Aged About 34 Years, Quarter No. K-66, Near Police Chowki, Pratap Nagar, Jodhpur (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principle Secretary, Govt. Secretraiat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 124/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary,

----Appellant

Versus

1. Hemant Manwani S/o Shri Kanhiyalal Manwani, Aged About 30 Years, Satguru Colony, Ajay Nagar, Ajmer
2. Rajesh Kumar S/o Shri Laxmi Narayan, Aged About 34 Years, Behind Saraswati Girls School, Crpf Gc - 1, Golf Course Road, Ajmer
3. Nemi Chand S/o Shri Lal Chand, Aged About 30 Years, House No. 571/27, New Janta Colony, Pahar Ganj, Ajmer
4. Manju Devi Panwar D/o Shri Devi Singh Panwar, Aged About 43 Years, 319, Uit Colony, P.r. Nagar, Bhagwan Ganj, Ajmer
5. State Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary,

Department Of Education (School), Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 146/2016

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Director Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Sanjeev K Grover S/o Shri Kashmirilal, Aged About 38 Years, Jhoti Colony, Oppostie Bus Stand, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Office At Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 147/2016

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principle Secretary, Govt. Secretraiat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ikbal Mohammad Qureshi Son Of Shri Imamudeen Qureshi, By Caste Qureshi, Aged About 32 Years, Near Maheshwari Dharmshala, Village Ajitgarh, Tehsil Shrimadhopur, District Sikar (Raj.)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission , Through Its Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 148/2016

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Rajendra Prasad Saini S/o Govind Ram, B/c Mali, Aged

About 34 Years, Rampura Via Khandela, District Sikar

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 150/2016

State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principle Secretary, Govt. Secretraiat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Sahil Choudhary S/o Shri Kailash Choudhary, By Cast Jat, Aged About 22 Years, Village Post Khoraladkhani, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission , Through Its Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 151/2016

The Director Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Appellant

Versus

1. Archana Agarwal D/o Sh. Mohan Lal Gupta, Aged About 38 Years, 31/2, Adarsh Colony, Behind Hpo, Bharatpur, Raj.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission , Through Its Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 154/2016

The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Vishnu Shankar Sharma, S/o Shri Shyam Lal Sharma, By Cast Brahmin, Aged About 22 Years, 37, Plot No.37, Madhu Vatika, Behind Bandawala Guest, Pruni Chungi, Agra Road, Jaipur (Raj.)

2. Kapoor Chand Maharshi, S/o Shri Shyonarayan Sharma, By Cast Brahmin, Aged About 43 Years, Village Post Siwar, Ward No 16, Nagar Nigam, Jaipur (Raj.)

3. Devendraraj Singh, S/o Shri Narayan Singh, By Cast Jat, Aged About 28 Years, R/o 38, Govind Nagar, Rajbhatta, Delhi Road, Alwar (Raj.)

4. Shankar Sharma, S/o Shri Jagdish Narayan Sharma, By Cast Sharma, aged 25 years, Village Post Jitawala Via Kanota, Tehsil Bassi, District Jaipur (Raj.)

5. State Of Rajasthan Secondary Education Department through its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 157/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Yogesh Kumar Jain, S/o Shri Devkinandan Jain, By Cast Jain, Aged About 30 Years, Jain Gift House, Main Market, Kishangarhbas, Alwar (Raj.).

2. State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department through its Principal Secretary, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 158/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Hemlata Sadhu, D/o Shri Ramniwas Sadhu, W/o Shri Hitesh Vaishnav, Aged About 25 Years, In Front Of Roopraj Gate, Lunawa, Tehsil Bali, District Pali, Rajasthan

2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary, School and Sanskrit Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

3. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 159/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Aklesh, D/o Shri Pyare Lal Sihag, Aged About 25 Years, Village Nand, Tehsil Malsisar, District Jhunjhunu
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of School Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 160/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ikbal Mohammad Qureshi, S/o Shri Imamuddeen Qureshi, Aged About 32 Years, Near Maheshwari Dharamshala, Village Ajitgarh, Tehsil Shrimadhopur, District Sikar (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 161/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Vikas Jangid, S/o Shri Bajrang Lal Jangid, By Cast Jangid, Aged About 27 Years, Gulab Bagh, Palsana Road, Khandela, Sikar (Raj.)

2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 167/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Ankita Jain, D/o Shree Ashok Kumar Jain, Aged About 28 Years, A- 39, Meera Market, Chittorgarh (Raj.).

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 168/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Suman Kumari Meena, D/o Rameshwar Prasad Meena, W/o Manmohan Meena, Aged About 25 Years, V P Natoj, Tehsil Kathumr, District Alwar (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 169/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Dharmendra Raj Singh Rao S/o Shri Narwar Singh Rao, Aged About 33 Years, Village Falabara, Post Malana, Tehsil- Ghadi, District Banswara (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 170/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Ashok Chopdar, S/o Om Prakash Chopdar, Aged About 34 Years, Ward No. 6, Near Power House, Mandawan, District Jhunjhunu (Raj.)

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 171/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Kamal Kumar Agarwal, S/o Ramgopal Agarwal, Aged About 26 Years, C/o Kanahaiya Lal Jodhi, Ward No. 9, Kumharo Ka Mohalla, Neem Ka Thana, District Sikar, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 185/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Renu, D/o Shri Om Prakash, Aged About 35 Years, Vpo Hamari Kalan, District Jhunjhunu

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 207/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Ajay Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Madan Lal Sharma, By Cast Sharma, Aged About 25 Years, Pareek Mohalla, Ward No. 9, Ajitgarh, Tehsil Shrimadhopur, District Sikar (Raj.)

2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary, Secondary Education, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 208/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mahesh Kumar Yogi, S/o Shri Shankar Lal Yogi, By Cast Yogi, Aged About 31 Years, Ward No. 5, Vinayak Colony, Amarsar Road, Ajitgarh, Tehsil Shri Madhopur, District Sikar (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary, Secondary Education Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 209/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Garima Dixit, D/o Shri Govind Prasad By Caste Dixit, Aged About 30 Years, Ward No. 38, Radha Kishanpura, Sikar (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan, Secondary Education Department, Through Its Principle Secretary, Govt. Secretraiat, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 210/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Sunita Kumari D/o Ram Singh, Aged About 31 Years, Mata Ji Ki Dhani, Navalgarh, Rajasthan

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 231/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary,

----Appellant

Versus

1. Vijay Kumar Saini, S/o Gopal Saini B/c Saini, Aged About 29 Years, Vpo Ganeri, District Sikar
2. Vinod Kumar Sharma S/o Sukhdev Sharma B/c Brahmin, Aged About 35 Years, Vpo Chhapra, Tehsil Ladnu, District Nagour
3. Anil Kumar Jangid, S/o Ram Sawroop B/c Jangid, Aged About 32 Years, Vpo Syalodra, Tehsil Neem Ka Thana, District Sikar
4. Anita Surekha D/o Om Prakash Surekha W/o Govind Kumar B/c Surekha, Aged About 31 Years, 558, Kh, Behind Balaji Mandir, Ward No. 9, Salasar, District Churu
5. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur
6. Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 232/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer Through Its Secretary,

----Appellant

Versus

1. Sanju Kumari D/o Shri Bhanwara Ram, Aged About 26 Years, C/o Shri Om Prakash Dhaka, New Housing Board, Jhunjhunu
2. State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. Secretraiat, Jaipur
3. Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 233/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary,

Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Kamal Kant, S/o Jhandi Ram Jangir, Aged About 34 Years, Kissan Colony, Ward No. 5, Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
2. Dev Karan Bhuriya S/o Anoop Chand, Aged About 32 Years, Village Kisari, Post Bahadurwash, Via Mandawa, District Jhunjhunu
3. Ambuj Kumar S/o Nathu Lal Sharma, Aged About 36 Years, Ward No 1, Near Lal Pani Ki Tanki, Gandhi Nagar, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 234/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ghoogra Ghati, Ajmer (Raj.)

----Appellant

Versus

1. Bhairu Lal Jat, S/o Shri Jagdeesh Jat,by Cast Jat, Aged About 40 Years, Village Post Chougai, Tehsil Peeplu, District Tonk (Raj.)
2. State Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 235/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

1. Hemant Kumar Khatik S/o Dayal Lal Khatik, Aged About 39 Years, 50, Sukhdevi Nagar, Bedla, Udaipur, Rajasthan
2. Suresh Lohar, S/o Ratan Lal Lohar, Aged About 28 Years, C/o Narayan Singh Chouhan, 67 B, Chhoti Brahmpuri, Udaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 236/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Mukesh Kumar Choudhary, S/o Ratan Lal Choudhary, Aged About 31 Years, Village Post Rajwas, Tehsil Newai, District Tonk (Raj.)

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 237/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Sikha Kushwah, D/o Ramesh Singh Kushwah, Aged About 30 Years, 42, Nandpuri, Ramnagar 2Nd, Kanta Chora, Jhotwara, Jaipur (Raj.)

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 238/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Vinita Gupta, S/o Late Shri Chandranath Kothari, W/o Ashok Gupta, Aged About 43 Years, New Civil Lines, Near Mahila Thana, House No 382, Bharatpur (Raj.)

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 239/2016

Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Appellant

Versus

Bhawani Singh, S/o Udai Raj Singh, Aged About 37 Years, Udai Bhawan, Neembraj Detha Marg, Near Forest Department, Office, Sardarpura, Barmer (Raj.)

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 348/2016

The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan

----Appellant

Versus

1. Anil Kumar Sain S/o Shri Radhey Shyam Sain, Aged About 30 Years, Near Power House Circle, Arain, District Ajmer (Raj.)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer, Rajasthan

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 349/2016

State Of Rajasthan through the Principal Secretary Education, Govt. of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Lokesh Kumar Jat S/o Chaju Lal Jat, aged about 32 years R/o Plot No. 52 Shivaji Nagar, Near Pratap Nagar, Sector-7, Sanganer, Jaipur.

2. Sitaram Jat S/o Shri Ram Kishan Jat, aged about 30 years, Resident of Village & Post Dosara, Tehsil Phagi, District Jaipur.

3. Kamlesh Meena S/o Shri Kailash Chand Meena aged about 27 Years, R/o Village & Post Jamuaram Gargh, Jaipur.

4. Dinesh Kumar Meena S/o Hari Narayan Meena, aged about 28 years, Resident of Village & Post Hans Mahal, Via Banskho, Tehsil Bassi, Jaipur

----Respondent

5. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Jaipur Road, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

…..Performa/ Respondent.

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 758/2016

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan,

Secretariat, Jaipur

2. The Director, Secondary Education, Saras Sankul, Jaipur

----Appellants

Versus

1. Juber Ahemd S/o Shri Abdul Hafeez, Apar Colony Mohalla Sadar, Malpura, District Tonk (Rajasthan)

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 759/2016

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

2. The Director, Secondary Education, Saras Sankul, Jaipur

----Appellants

Versus

1. Huma Naaz W/o Mohammad Yusuf Aijazi, Aged About 39 Years, Guljar Bagh, Fakir Villa, Tonk (Rajasthan)

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 760/2016

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

2. The Director, Secondary Education, Saras Sankul, Jaipur

----Appellants

Versus

1. Abdul Qadir S/o Mohammad Umar Khan, Aged About 27 Years, Inside Kutcheri Darwaja, Kali Paltan, Tonk (Rajasthan)

2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 761/2016

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Saras Sankul, Jaipur

----Appellants

Versus

1. Faheemuddin S/o Shri Masiuddin, Aged About 33 Years, Gali Sher Ali Khan, Bada Kuwa, Tonk (Rajasthan)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 185/2017

State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Om Prakash Sharma S/o Shri Ram Vilas Sharma, Aged About 40 Years, Village Post Bhojasar Bada, Via Patoda Bada, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Sikar (Raj.)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 186/2017

State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mudassir Mubeen S/o Abdul Mubeen, By Caste- Muslim, Aged About 33 Years, Vajirpur, Gangapur City, District-Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 769491)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Chairman, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 187/2017

State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Danish Akhtar S/o Ansar Ahmed, By Caste Muslim, Aged About 34 Years, Badi Udai, Tehsil - Gangapur City, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan, Roll No. 794719
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Chairman, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 188/2017

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Ramesh Kumar Verma S/o Shri Ganpat Ram Verma, Aged About 33 Years, Ward No. 28, Bhanwar Colony, Behind Krishi Upaj Mandi, Basant Vihar, Sikar 332001 (Raj.)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 189/2017

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan , Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Elementary Education, Shiksha Sankul, J.l.n., Marg, Jaipur.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Subhash Chandra Sharma S/o Shri Murari Lal Sharma, Aged About 41 Years, 66, Archana Nagar, Murlipura, Path No.7, Vijay Bari, Sikar Road, Jaipur-302038.
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Secretary,

Jaipur Road, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 190/2017

State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mohammad Akram S/o Mansur Ahmed, By Caste-Muslim, Aged About 29 Years, Vajirpur, Tehsil Gangapur City, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 513861)
2. Vaseem Ahmed S/o Vakeel Ahmed, By Caste Muslim, Aged About 29 Years, Badi Udai, Tehsil Gangapur City, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 517821)
3. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Chairman, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 191/2017

State Of Rajasthan through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Secretariat. Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mohammed Asjed S/o Akhlaque Ahmed, aged about 32 years, by Caste- Muslim, R/o Vajirpur, Tehsil- Gangapur City, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 515777)

2. Mazssimn Khan S/o Nisar Ahmed, aged about 28 years, by Caste- Muslim, R/o Badi Udai Kalan, Tehsil Gangapur City, District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 513083)

----Respondent

3. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, through its Chairmen, Ajmer.

…..Proforma Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 192/2017

The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner

----Appellant

Versus

1. Anupam Saxena D/o Shri Ramesh Shankar Saxena, Aged About 36 Years, Plot No. 143-B, Santosh Sagar Colony, Gali No. 2, Brahmpuri Road, Jaipur

2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Hathibhata Road, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 193/2017

State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mohammad Abuzar Khan S/o Abdul Salam Khan, By Caste Muslim, Aged About 27 Years, Udai Kalan, Tehsil-Gangapur City, District-Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan.

2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Chairman, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 195/2017

State of Rajasthan through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.

…..Appellant- Respondents

Versus

1. Sharif Khan S/o Allanoor Khan, aged about 33 years, by Caste- Muslim, R/o- Village Gogor, Post Salu Tehsil & District-Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan, Roll No. 611294.

2. Sadiq Khan S/o Laeeq Ahmed, aged-28 years, by Caste-Muslim, R/o Village- Post Bahted Tehsil- Malarana Dunger District- Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan, Roll No. 609694.

….Respondent/Writ Petitioner

3. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, through its Chairmen, Ajmer.

...Proforma Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 199/2017

State Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Vishnu Kataria S/o Shri Srawan Kumar Kataria, Aged About 30 Years, Near Chamariya College, Fatehpur Shekhawati, Distt. Sikar (Raj.).
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission,ajmer, Through Secretary.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 201/2017

1. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Director, Secondary Education Department, Bikaner, Rajasthan

----Appellants

Versus

1. Nand Kishor S/o Kedar Lal, By Caste Mali, Aged About 30 Years, Tanki Pada Dashra, Maidan Anta, District Baran (Rajasthan)
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Secretary Of Rpsc.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 216/2017

Rajasthan State Through The Chief Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Appellant

Versus

2. Kalimullah Khan Juned Son Of Azizullah Khan, Caste-Mohammedan, Aged About 30 Years, Hafiz Manzil, Nala Pahadiya, Tonk, Rajasthan.
3. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Chairmen, Rpsc Building, Ajmer.
4. Board Of Secondary Education Rajasthan, Ajmer Through Director, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 218/2017

State Of Rajasthan (Education Department) Through Principal Secretary, School Education, Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Mool Chand Saini Son Of Shri Gokul Chand Saini, Aged About 29 Years, Village Dokan, Dhani Kundla, Tehsil Neem Ka Than, District Sikar.
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission,ajmer, Through Its Secretary.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 330/2017

State Of Rajasthan (Education Department) Through Principal Secretary, School Education, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Vishal Bhardwaj Son Of Shri Shyam Sundar Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, Plot No. 227, Ganesh Nagar, Opposite Balaji College, Bainad Road, Jaipur.
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 374/2017

1. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner

----Appellants

Versus

1. Anil Kumar Dhakad S/o Damodar Lal Dhakad, Aged About 25 Years, V Bajherakalan, Tehsil Weir, District Bharatpur (Raj.)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 544/2017

1. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Ramkishore Meena S/o Shri Panchu Ram Meena, Aged About 31 Years, Ratan Pura, Post Chaturbhujpura, Tehsil Niwai, District Tonk, Rajasthan- 328008.
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 545/2017

The State Of Rajasthan, Through Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Muniraj Meena S/o Shri Sukhjee Ram Meena, B/c Meena (St), Aged About 26 Years, Vpo Ranila, Tehsil Bamanwas, District Sawaimadhopur (Roll No. 611900)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 546/2017

1. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Ajay Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Anandi Lal Sharma, Aged About 28 Years, Village Post Garoo, Tehsil Kathumar, District Alwar- 321635 (Raj.).

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

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 547/2017

1. The State Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Neetu Khatri D/o Shri Kailash Chandra Modi, W/o Shri Kamal Khatri, B/c Khatri (General), Aged About 41 Years, 2E-327, Jai Narayan Vyas Colony, Bikaner.
2. The Secretary, Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 548/2017

The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Irfan Ansari S/o Abdul Majid, Aged About 25 Years, Care Of Sabir Ansari (Vikas Property) Sripura Bus Stand, Kota, Rajasthan.
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Secretary.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 551/2017

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner, Rajasthan

----Appellants

Versus

1. Murari Lal Sharma S/o Shri Ram Kishore Sharma, Aged About 39 Years, Village Laxmipura, Post- Aliyari Via Malpura, Tehsil Todarai Singh, District Tonk, Rajasthan
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer Through Its Secretary

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 554/2017

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Directorate, Bikaner.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Nishant Anjum Daudi D/o Abdul Shamin Daudi, Aged About 28 Years, Old Saray Old City, Dholpur, Rajasthan - 3028001.
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 559/2017

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary (Secondary Education), Department Of Education, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Praveen Kumar Kumawat Son Of Sh. Hari Kishan, By Caste Kumawat (Obc), Aged About 31 Years, Sri Madhopur, Dist. Sikar (Raj.)
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Ajmer.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 564/2017

The State Of Rajasthan Through Secretary, Department Of

Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rahul Kumar Mahrawal S/o Mr. Swaroop Mahrawal, Aged About 26 Years, 219, New Colony, Andhi, Tehsil Jamwaramgarh, Jaipur, Raj.
2. The Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Ajmer. Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary.

----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 565/2017

State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Education Department, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Appellant

Versus

1. Samira Bano D/o Gulam Nabi Khan, By Caste - Muslim, Aged About 34 Years, Village - Post Dhanori Tehsil Malsisar, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan, Roll No. 456835.
2. Rajasthan Public Service Commission, Through Chairman, Ajmer.

----Respondents

For Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Rajendra Prasad, AAG with Mr. Amit Kuri Mr. A.K. Sharma, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Ajay Choudhary Mr. R.N. Mathur, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Prateek Mathur & Mr. Shovit Jhajharia Mr. Gaurav Sharma & Mr. Abhisheek Pareek Mr. Sultan Singh Kuri on behalf of Mr. Subhash Sharma Mr. Ankur Srivastava Mr. Iliyas Khan
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Anoop Dhand, Mr. Vigyan Shah with Mr. Kamlesh Sharma & Mr. R.R. Choudhary Mr. Saransh Saini Mr. Samit Bishnoi Mr. Anshuman Saxena Mr. P.C. Sharma Mr. Giriraj Rajoria for Mr. R.P. Saini Mr. Rohit Saini for Mr. S.K. Singodiya

---

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G R MOOLCHANDANI

JUDGMENT

14/05/2018

1. Challenge in the above-captioned appeals is to a judgment dated 22.09.2015 disposing of a batch of writ petitions. The writ petitions have been disposed of issuing a direction to RPSC to prepare the select list strictly in conformity with the answer key provided by the first committee of experts. Noting that the revised merit list may repeat the names of those who had been appointed pursuant to the merit list prepared, it has been directed that for purposes of seniority their names would be arranged in the order of merit. Realising further that some candidates who were in the earlier merit list may be knocked out, it has been held that they would not be ousted from service if nothing adverse exists against them but they would be placed at the bottom of the revised list. Said direction is founded on the judgment of the Supreme Court reported as (2013) 4 SCC 690, *Rajesh Kumar & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar & Ors.*

2. Relevant facts to be noted are that RPSC issued an advertisement on 02.08.2013 inviting applications from eligible candidates to fill up vacant notified posts of School Lecturers in different disciplines. The paper of General Knowledge was common to all. Other papers being 17 in number were as per the discipline opted for by the applicants.

3. Thus, in all 18 question papers were set, out of which one was in General Knowledge and the remaining 17 under different disciplines such as Chemistry, Hindi, Geography, English, History, Physics etc.

4. Model answer key was uploaded on different dates between 21.10.2014 to 10.11.2014. First committee was constituted. Based on its report revised key was uploaded. The objectors persisted with their objection even to the report submitted by the experts and thus RPSC constituted a second committee of experts who considered the objections to the report of the first experts committee and based thereon RPSC uploaded the further revised answer key on various dates between 04.03.2015 to 27.03.2015 and based on the said revised (second) key prepared the select list and proceeded to issue letters offering appointment to the candidates. At that stage writ petitions came to be filed laying a challenge to the revised key, as notified pursuant to the recommendations of the second experts committee.

5. After hearing arguments of learned counsel for the parties the learned Single Judge has picked on four questions with respect to the reports of the second experts committee and has brought out the patent error in the answer key held to be correct by the second experts committee. The learned Single Judge has thereafter posed the question: How long would the process of appointing experts committees continue?

6. Though not expressly recorded by way of opinion in the impugned decision, the signature tune appears to be that humans not being 100% perfect it cannot be accepted that any work generated by human agency would be 100% accurate. Public interest demands that public posts should be filled up at the earliest and thus the direction issued is to prepare the select list as per the answer key opined to be correct by the first experts committee.

7. Such an attempt by a Division Bench of this Court in a batch of writ-appeals in the Division Bench judgment dated 08.03.2017 giving birth to Civil Appeal arising out of SLP(Civil) Nos.14306-14310/2017, *Richal & Ors. Vs. Rajasthan Public Service Commission & Ors.* has been opined by the Supreme Court not to be the correct approach in law. In the decision dated 03.05.2018 the Supreme Court reiterated the law declared by the Supreme Court in the decision reported as (1983) 4 SCC 309, *Kanpur University Vs. Samir Gupta,* which has been consistently followed by the Supreme Court in the decisions reported as (2005) 13 SCC 744, *Manish Ujwal Vs. Maharishi Dayanand University & Ors.,* (2005) 13 SCC 749, *Guru Nanak Dev University Vs. Saumil Garg & Ors.*, (2013) 4 SCC 690, *Rajesh Kumar & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar & Ors.* and held that the principle of law to be followed would be that the Court would start with a presumption that the model answer key is correct unless on the face of it it would be shown to be wrong. The inferential process of reasoning or by the process of rationalization to determine whether the model key is right or not has not to be followed. That is to say, the wrong must be so apparent that no reasonable body of man well versed in the particular subject would regarded to be correct and that while carrying out the exercise text books which are commonly read by students have to be kept in mind.

8. It is with this understanding of law that we have, with the help of learned counsel for the parties, ventured into the process of analyzing the correctness of the model key, the key as changed by the first committee of experts and the key as corrected by the second committee of experts. Pertaining to 18 papers the questions involved are 144. We have, for purposes of

our judgment picked on the issue concerning General Knowledge and the paper of Geography and as we proceeded to analyze the same it dawned that it would be futile to carry out the same exercise pertaining to 16 other papers. The reason would be forthcoming as we proceed to note what emerged as a result of the analysis of the paper of General Knowledge and Geography.

9. Pertaining to the paper of General Knowledge, nine questions became the subject matter of the final dispute, though at the first instance we find objections being raised to as many as 63 out of 75 questions framed. Now, at the outset a figure of 63 objections to 75 questions is alarming by itself. Be that as it may, the report of the committee of experts which gave birth to the second model answer key (first being the original model answer key notified) upheld four objections pertaining to question Nos.43, 48, 50 and 59. The second committee upheld the objections to seven questions being question Nos.11, 43, 49, 63, 64, 70 and 75. Meaning thereby, of the four questions answer key whereof was recommended to be changed by the first committee the second committee accepted the correctness only qua two questions and added five more.

10. Thus, in this manner the number of questions which came to be the subject matter of debate between the parties becomes 2+7= 9.

11. The nine questions would be as under:-

Questions of which Result Changed
11.Which of the following acted as President of Indian National Congress thrice during its first twenty years? (1) Surendra Nath Banerjee (2) DababhaiNavroji (3) Gopal Krishna Gokhle (4) Motilal Nehru

Questions of which Result Changed

43. Who won the ICC 20-20 Women's Cricket World Cup, held in March-April, 2014 in Bangladesh?

(1) England

(2)Australia

(3) West Indies

(4) Sri Lanka

48. Which one of the following human diseases, is controlled by heredity?

(1) Gonorrhoea

(2) Leprosy

(3) Leukaemia

(4) Leucorrhoea

50. Consider the following statements:

1. A thermal power plant using coal as source of heat, emits more carbon dioxide than one using natural gas.

2. Use of brown coal in a thermal power plant in place of black coal reduces carbon dioxide emissions.

3. A thermal power plant using coal has a thermal conversion efficiency of about 75 percent.

Which of the above statements is/are correct?

(1) 1 Only

(2) 2 Only

(3) 1 and 2

(4) 2 and 3

59. MahiKanchan, MahiDhawal and Megha are varieties (in Rajasthan) of-

(1) Maize

(2) Gram

(3) Wheat

(4) Rice

63. The theme of Yashpal Committee Report (1993) is :

(1) I.C.T. in teacher education

(2) Learning without burden

(3) Learning through broadcasting

(4) None of the above

64. The concept of School Complex was first executed in :

(1) Uttar Pradesh

(2) Madhya Pradesh

(3) Bihar

(4) Rajasthan

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

Questions of which Result Changed
70. In 1986 (International Year of Peace) The United Nations elected the Bharat Scouts and Guides as honorary : (1) Humanity Messengers (2) Peace Messengers (3) Charity Messengers (4) Helping Messengers
75. Right to Education Act (2009) specifies the minimum percentage of members from the parents or guardians of the admitted children for the school management committee are : (1) 20% (2) 75% (3) 60% (4) 50%

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

12. To question No.11 the model key gave option No.2 to be the correct option. The first experts committee held that the option was correct. The third committee opined that all options were incorrect for the reason Dadabhai Navroji was elected as the President of the Indian National Congress for the third time in the year 1906. It was the 21st year of the Congress and not the 20th. The question as noted was who acted as the President of the Indian National Congress thrice during its first twenty years. In other words option No.2 to the question treated as the correct answer by RPSC and first experts committee is demonstrably wrong and needs no process of argument to reach the conclusion. The report of the second committee correctly opines that the question has to be deleted for the reason all options were wrong.

13. Pertaining to the second question being No.43, the question concerns who won the ICC 20-20 Women's Cricket World Cup held in March-April, 2014 in Bangladesh. Indeed, it was the Australia. The model answer key listed option No.2 as correct. The first experts committee opined that the correct answer was option

No.4. The committee overlooked the fact that the question related to women and this was corrected by the second experts committee which brought back the answer as per the original revised key as the correct answer. Meaning thereby, the original key as published gave the correct answer. The first committee report was wrong. The second experts committee report is correct.

14. Question at S.No.3 being question No.48 gave option No.3 to be the correct option as per the model key. The first expert committee opined that option Nos.3 and 4 were both correct and thus suggested that the question be deleted. The second experts committee also recommended the question to be deleted but on a different reason.

15. As noted, the question was which of the following human diseases is controlled by the heredity. The model key gave the correct answer to be the Leukaemia and is supported by a text: HARRISON'S- Principles of Internal Medicine 18th Edition, at page 905.. As per the first experts committee even Leucorrhoea was controlled by heredity and thus, option Nos.3 and 4 were correct and therefore the question needed to be deleted. The second committee of experts opined all answers to be wrong giving the reason that Leukaemia is caused by chromosomal mismatch but is not inherited necessarily in the next generation.

16. Now, Leucorrhoea has many causes, one of them being estrogen imbalance. It is a vaginal discharge which could be caused even by an infection. It certainly has no concern with chromosome or genes and thus is not heredity.

17. The second experts committee recommends that Leukaemia is caused by chromosomal mismatch but merely on the

reasoning that it necessarily may not be inherited has opined the question to be deleted.

18. Now, the question is simple. The question is which of the following diseases is controlled by heredity i.e. related to the human genome or human chromosome. Indeed, the model answer is correct.

19. Fourth question being No.50 concerning thermal power plants and the three statements are followed by the question whether the statement-1 only, or 2 only, or 1 and 2, or 2 and 3 are correct.

20. The model answer key gave option No.1 i.e. first statement to be the correct answer. The two committees have unanimously held that option No.3 is the correct answer for the reason statement-1 and statement-2 are correct. Statement No.3 is incorrect because efficiency of thermal power plants ranges between 45% to 86%. The first and the second statement are indeed correct. Meaning thereby, for this question the answer provided in the model key is wrong and the answer provided by the first and the second experts committee is correct.

21. The fifth question being no.59 relates to three hybrid varieties grown in Rajasthan and the options are Maize, Gram, Wheat or Rice. The answer as per the model key is Maize. The first experts committee has opined that Megha was not a variety of Maize but was a variety of potatoes and rice. It has therefore directed the question to be deleted. The second experts committee has concurred with the model answer key. Indeed, material placed before us from the official website show that all three varieties mentioned in the question relate to Maize. Thus, the position would be that qua this question the answer in the

model key and the one by the second experts committee would be correct and the answer as per the first experts committee would be wrong.

22. The sixth question being No.63 concerns the theme of Yashpal Committee report, 1993. Option No.2 i.e. learning without burden has been unanimously opined by the original paper-setter and the first experts committee to be the correct answer. The second experts committee has held that the question was out of the syllabus.

23. The syllabus has been shown to us. Pertaining to educational management, educational scenario in Rajasthan and Right to Education Act, 2009 which guides the prospective candidates with the subject matter on which their knowledge would be tested, reads as under:-

> *"Concept and functions of educational management, Educational management in Rajaasthan, School as a unit of decentralized planning, Educational management information System (EMIS), Institutional planning, School mapping, Block Resource Centre (BRC), School Management Committee(SMC), District Information System for Education(DISE), Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan(SSA), Rashtriya Madhyanik Shiksha Abhiyan(RMSA).*
>
> *Organisation of educational set up at primary and secondary in Rajasthan, Functions of RIE, SIERT, BSER, IASE, CTE, DIET, Rajasthan Educational Intiative, Balika Shiksha Foundation, Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidalaya, Rajasthan text book board, Bharat Scouts and Guides. Rasthriya Military school, Sainik school, Public school, Model school, E-Mitra, E-Governance, Rajshiksha, Edusat, Gyandarshan, Gyanvani.*
>
> *Provisions of Right to Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009."*

24. Indeed, as opined by the learned Single Judge, Yashpal Committee report related to the concept of educational management information system, institutional planning, school mapping etc. and thus we concur with the view taken by the learned Single Judge that the second option is the correct option and hold that without any process of reasoning the opinion of the second experts committee of the question being out of syllabus, is wrong. Pertaining to this question the position therefore would be that the answer provided in the model key concurred by the first experts committee would be correct and the answer treated as correct by the second experts committee would be wrong.

25. The seventh question being No.64 is as to which State first executed the concept of school complex. The model answer key provides the fourth option to be correct. It was accepted by the first experts committee. The second experts committee holds that the question was out of syllabus and thus needs to be deleted.

26. We have noted the relevant part of the syllabus hereinabove and we find that it embraces the concept of functions of school management and educational management in Rajasthan as a unit of decentralized planning, school mapping, educational management information system and thus it cannot be said that the question was outside the syllabus. Pertaining to this question, the position therefore would be that the answer provided in the model key and the first experts committee would be correct. The opinion of the second experts committee would be wrong.

27. The eighth question being No.70 relates to in the year 1986 and posits United Nations selected the Bharat Scouts and Guides as honorary in relation to which of the four options

provided. The model answer key concurred by the first experts committee is option No.2. The second experts committee has recommended deletion of the question on the reasoning that it is out of syllabus, overlooking the fact that the syllabus specifically includes Bharat Scouts and Guides as one of the topic. Thus, qua this question the model answer key and the key provided by the first expert committee would be correct and that by the second experts committee would be wrong.

28. The ninth question being No.75 tests the knowledge of the candidates pertaining to the Right to Education Act, 2009 and the question is which percentage is specified as minimum percentage of members from the parents or guardians of the children admitted in school to be represented in the school management committee. The answer provided in the model key is option No.2 which has been concurred by the first experts committee. The second experts committee has recommended deletion of the question on the reasoning that the school management committee includes parents of the children studying in the school while in the E.C. the percentage is 75%. Indeed, as reasoned by the learned Single Judge, under the Right to Education Act, 2009 the figure is 75% and thus, qua this question we find that the option as per the model key and by the first experts committee is correct and that by the second experts committee is wrong.

29. We put the data afore-noted in a tabular form. The option which would be wrong or correct has been noted by us in the table under the head 'Model Key, First Expert and Second Expert' which reads as under:-

Sr. No.	***Question***	***Model Key***	***1st Expert***	***2nd Expert***
1	11	Wrong	Wrong	Correct
2.	43	Correct	Wrong	Correct
3.	48	Correct	Wrong	Wrong
4.	50	Wrong	Correct	Correct
5.	59	Correct	Wrong	Correct
6.	63	Correct	Correct	Wrong
7.	64	Correct	Correct	Wrong
8.	70	Correct	Correct	Wrong
9.	75	Correct	Correct	Wrong

30. We might not be very good at statistics but the data throws out a very interesting picture. Of the nine questions the model key is having seven correct answers with only two wrong answers. Report of the first experts committee has five correct answers and four wrong answers. The report of the second experts committee has four correct answers and five wrong answers.

31. Pertaining to the Geography paper, 13 questions became the subject matter of the final dispute, though at the first instance we find objections being raised to as many as 89 out of 150 questions framed. The figure of 89 objections pertaining to 150 questions is once again alarming by itself. Be that as it may, the report of the committee of experts which gave birth to the second model answer key (first being the original model answer key notified) upheld the objections pertaining to question Nos.34, 63, 122, 124 and 140 i.e. five questions. The second committee of experts upheld the objections to 8 questions, being Nos.36, 66, 70, 72, 97, 103, 104 and 109. Meaning thereby, there was no commonality to the objections to the various questions inter se

the two committees and in this manner the questions which came to be the subject matter of debate between learned counsel for the parties became 5+8= 13. The 13 questions would be as under:-

Question of which result changed
34. Which pair of the states of India reflects the lowest and the highest sex-ratio respectively in 2011? (1) Haryana and Kerala (2) Jammu Kashmir and Kerala (3) Jharkhand and Maharashtra (4) Haryana and Madhya
36. Which region is more vulnerable to landside in India? (1) Lesser Himalaya (2) Shivalik (3) Greater Himalaya (4) Eastern and Western Ghats
63. Which one of the following is not an organic ocean deposit? (1) Peteropod Ooze (2) Globigerna Ooze (3) Red Clay (4) Diatom Ooze
66. Foundation of Human Geography was written by (1) G. Taylor (2) La-Blache (3) M. Sorre (4) Jean Brunhes
70. The factor causing migration from Myanmar to Bangladesh is (1) Religious (2) Overpopulation (3) Political (4) Economic
72. Which is not an economic cause of the migration of population? (1) Unemployment (2) Heavy pressure on the land resources (3) Economic poverty (4) Overpopulation

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

Question of which result changed
97. In Rajasthan, which National Highway is a part of both, east-west corridor and Golden Quadrant project? (1) NH 8 (2) NH 14 (3) NH 76 (4) NH 79
103. The total number of Agro-climate regions in Rajasthan is : (1) 5 (2) 7 (3) 10 (4) 13
104. Which is not an anthropogenic reason of desertification in Rajasthan (1) Population Pressure (2) Change in landuse pattern (3) Overgrazing (4) Technological development
109. Which of the following four districts of Rajasthan are having highest forest area in Rajasthan? (1) Udaipur, Alwar, Banswala, Pratapgarh (2) Udaipur, Baran, Karauli, Chhitorgarh (3) Chittorgarh, Bundi, Sirohi, Pratapgarh (4) Sirohi, Kota, Bundi, Alwar
122. Which bond is related to the theory of connectionism? (1) Situations and Responses (2) Stimulus and Responses (3) Responses and Reaction (4) Stimulus and Reaction
124. The committed teacher realizes that the amount and quality of learning is determined to a considerable extent by : (a) Classroom discipline (b) Content analysis (c) Pupils interaction (d) Reinforcement which among the following is the best choice? (1) (b) and (c) (2) (a) and (d) (3) Only (a) (4) Only (c)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

Question of which result changed
140. All formal and non formal communication include which of the following characteristic : (1) Structured (2) Unstructured (3) Discrimination (4) Similarity

32. To question No.34, the model key gave option No.2 to be the correct answer. The first committee opined the same to be incorrect and gave opinion that the correct answer was option No.1, which learned counsel concede is the correct answer.. The second committee gave reason for option No.1 to be the correct on account of the reason that no material was placed before it by any objector concerning correctness of option No.1 and on said reasoning had upheld option No.1 to be the correct option.

33. Pertaining to question No.36, the model answer key gave option No.1 to be the correct option. The first committee of experts, with reference to text books held option No.1 to be the correct option. The second committee recommended deletion of the question reasoning that more than one option was correct. But the committee did not indicate which is the one more correct option. With reference to the text books on the subject, learned counsel concede that option No.1 treated as the correct answer in the model answer key and by the first committee would be the correct answer.

34. Pertaining to question No.63, the model key gave option No.1 as the correct answer. The first committee opined option No.3 to be the correct answer which was upheld by the second committee of experts on the reason that no objections were placed before it qua the report of the first experts committee. The question is: Which one of the following is not an

organic ocean deposit? The material placed i.e. the text books show that red clay is the correct answer. In other words, the model answer key was wrong and the opinion of the two expert committees is correct.

35. To question No.66 the model key lists option No.3 to be the right answer. This has been upheld by the first experts committee. The second experts committee has recommended deletion of the question on the reason that no book by the title concerned has been authored by any of the four authors listed. Indeed, the answer given by the second experts committee is correct for the reason M.Sorre authored the book *"Les Fondements Biologiques de la geograhie humaine"*. The position qua this question therefore would be that the answer provided in the model key and by the first experts committee is wrong and that by the second experts committee is correct.

36. Pertaining to question No.70, the model answer key gave option No.1 to be the correct option and the first committee agreed. The second committee recommended deletion of the question giving reason that the four options given were not in relation to the number of persons who had migrated and therefore the question was required to be deleted.

37. Now, the question does not pertain to the number of persons migrating. The question pertains to the factor causing migration from Myanmar to Bangladesh. As is known to all muslims migrated from Myanmar to Bangladesh and thus, the first option would be the correct option and therefore the model answer key and the opinion of the first committee is correct and that of the second committee is incorrect.

38. Pertaining to question No.97, the requirement would be of the four stretches of the National Highway being part of both East-West Corridor and Golden Quadrant. The model key lists NH-76 as the correct option and so does the first committee. The second committee has recommended deletion of the question opining that option No.1, option No.2 and option No.3 were correct. The data published by the NHAI shows that the correct answer is NH-76 and NH-14 and thus, the question would need to be deleted for the reason the correct options provided in the model key and by the first experts committee is wrong. Though the conclusion by the second committee is correct but it is on a wrong reasoning.

39. Pertaining to question No.103, the model answer key and the first committee concurred that option No.3 was the correct option. The second committee has recommend deletion on the reasoning that the question relates to agro-climate regions without clarifying which is the subject of the question

40. All learned counsel concede that the question is clear. It seeks information from the candidates as to what is the total number of agro-climate regions in Rajasthan and indeed, the material published by the Department of Agriculture, Government of India shows that Rajasthan has 10 agro-climate regions. Meaning thereby, the model answer key and the opinion of the first experts committee is correct and that of the second committee is wrong.

41. The next question No.104 is framed in the negative. The question is: Which is not an anthropogenic reason of desertification in Rajasthan? The model answer key lists option No.4 as the correct answer. The first committee accepted the

same. The second committee recommend deletion opining that all four options are the result of something done by human beings.

42. Now, anthropogenic means related to humans. The question has a connection between desertification and related to human. Surely, technological developments would only relate to human activities but would not have any concern with desertification and therefore learned counsel concede that option No.4 opined to be the correct option to the negatively framed question in the model answer key, upheld by the first committee of experts is correct and the opinion of the second committee is wrong.

43. Question No.109 is: Which of the following four districts of Rajasthan are having highest area in Rajasthan? The model key lists option No.2 to be the correct option which has been upheld by the first experts committee. The second experts committee has recommended deletion thereof for the reason the model answer key upheld by the first committee of experts did not read the word *"forest"* before the word *"area"* in the question and went by geographical area overlooking that the question pertained to the forest area and indeed, report shows that in different years forest areas in the districts in Rajasthan have varied and thus, unless the year in question was specified the question would be vague. Meaning thereby, the model answer key and the opinion of the first committee is wrong and that of the second committee is correct.

44. Pertaining to the next three questions when arguments advanced we wondered as to what would be the connection with the three questions in Geography but learned counsel conceded

that the questions would be related to Geography and thus, we proceed to analyse the same.

45. Question No.122 has been shown in the model key with option No.1 to be the correct answer. The first committed has referred to text books but opined that option No.2 is the correct answer. The second committee upheld the view taken by the first committee. Apart from the texts, common sense tells us that the bond relatable to theory of connectionism would be stimulus and responses and thus, the model key answer is wrong and that opined to be the correct by the first and the second committee of experts i.e. option No.2 is the correct answer.

46. The next question No.124, as per the model answer key has option No.4 to be the correct answer. The first and the second committee had opined option No.1 to be the correct answer. Indeed, learned counsel for the parties concede that pupils interaction alone does not result in committed teacher realising that the amount and quality of learning is determined to what considerable extent. Common sense tells us that content analysis and pupils interaction i.e. option No.1 is the correct answer. Meaning thereby, the model key is wrong and the opinions of the first and second committee are correct.

47. On question No.140, the model answer key lists option No.4 to be the correct answer. The first committee has opined the question to be ambiguous and thus be deleted. The second committee has concurred. Indeed, learned counsel agreed that the question has a syntax error and thus, the model key answer is wrong and that by the first and second committee to delete the question on account of it being ambiguous is correct. Meaning

thereby, the model answer key is wrong. Indeed, question needs to be deleted.

48. To put the data afore-noted in tabular form, the option which would be wrong or correct has been noted by us in the table under the head "'Model Key, First Expert and Second Expert' which reads as under:-

Sr. No.	***Question***	***Model Key***	***1st Expert***	***2nd Expert***
1	34	Wrong	Correct	Correct
2.	36	Correct	Correct	Wrong
3.	63	Wrong	Correct	Correct
4.	66	Wrong	Wrong	Correct
5.	70	Correct	Correct	Wrong
6.	72	Wrong	Wrong	Correct
7.	97	Wrong	Wrong	Correct
8.	103	Correct	Correct	Wrong
9.	104	Correct	Correct	Wrong
10.	109	Wrong	Wrong	Correct
11.	122	Wrong	Correct	Correct
12.	124	Wrong	Correct	Correct
13.	140	Wrong	Correct	Correct

49. As it was concerning General Knowledge, the data pertaining to Geography also throws out a very interesting picture. Of the 13 questions, the model key gives only 4 correct options as the correct answers, 9 being wrong. The first and the second committee opined 9 to be the correct answers and 4 wrong answers but not unanimous on the said 9 and 4. As noted above, pertaining to question No.36 the first committee is correct and the second committee is wrong. Pertaining to question No.66, the first

committee is wrong and the second committee is correct. Pertaining to question No.70, the first committee is correct and the second committee is wrong. Pertaining to question Nos.72 and 97, the first committee is wrong and the second committee is correct. Similarly pertaining to question Nos.103 and 104, the first committee is correct and the second committee is wrong. Pertaining to question No.109, the first committee is wrong and the second committee is correct.

50. Now the learned Single Judge has held that since humans can never be perfect, there is no reason to go by the report of the second experts committee.

51. Pertaining to the analysis of the two sets of questions papers hereinabove, the position which emerges is that the matter needs a proper re-look. Indeed, in the latest decision pronounced in *Richal's* case*(supra)*, the Supreme Court held the law to be that only demonstrably wrong answers need to be corrected and as we have noted hereinabove, demonstrably wrong answers are many in the model answer key and even the key provided by the first committee of experts and the second committee.

52. We have not carried out this exercise pertaining to all 18 question papers for the reason we find that pertaining to other 16 papers the similar variations in the opinions exist for as many upto 15 questions with the least being 2 in number in different papers.

53. We follow the path walked upon by the Supreme Court in *Richal's* case*(supra)* by directing a third committee to be constituted and since experts being nominated by the RPSC seem not to be upto the requisite standard, we direct the Vice Chancellor, University of Rajasthan at Jaipur to nominate three

Professors in each discipline to constitute the committee pertaining to each discipline and if three Professors in each discipline are not available, then to the extent of non-availability Associate Professors to be nominated. The questions which have become the subject matter of debate and have been indicated in Schedule-1 to the affidavit deposed on 11.05.2018 by the Assistant Secretary, RPSC, would be re-looked into by the said committee of experts constituted. The Secretary, R.P.S.C. would be the nodal officer to co-ordinate and ensure compliance.

54. The report would be produced in Court on the next date of hearing in D.B. Civil Special Appeal(W) No.1092/2015, which learned counsel state should be retained for final directions to be issued treating other writ-appeals to be disposed of.

55. Ordered accordingly.

56. Save and except D.B. Civil Special Appeal(W) No.1092/2015, all other writ-appeals are treated to have been disposed of observing that the final directions which would be in rem would follow once the report of the committee is placed before us.

57. D.B. Civil Special Appeal(W) No.1092/2015 be listed for directions on 23.07.2018.

(G R MOOLCHANDANI),J (PRADEEP NANDRAJOG),CJ

KKC/12-168