HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 607/2026
CNR: RJHC010218002026 | URN: SAW / 1124U / 2026

Shiv Lal Raidas S/o Shree Ramdev Raidas, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Ward No.18, Pratapgarh, Rajasthan.

----Appellant

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Technical Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Department Of Skills, Planning And Entrepreneurship, Directorate Of Technical Education, Jodhpur.
3. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Durgapura, Jaipur Through Its Chairman.
4. The Officer In Charge (Recruitment Cell), Technical Education Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 606/2026
CNR: RJHC010218072026 | URN: SAW / 1123U / 2026

Vinod Kumar Darji S/o Shree Suresh Kumar Darji, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Kanpur, Patiya, Nayaganv, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

----Appellant

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Technical Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Department Of Skills, Planning And Entrepreneurship, Directorate Technical Education, Jodhpur.
3. Rajasthan Staff Selection Board, Durgapura, Jaipur Through Its Chairman.
4. The Officer In Charge, Recruitment Cell Technical Education, Jodhpur, Rajasthan

----Respondents

For Appellants	:	Mr. M.A. Siddiqui with Mr. Naved Khan Sindhi
For Respondents	:	Mr. Manish Patel Mr. Harsh Rajpurohit Ms. Dishita Parmar for Mr. I.R. Choudhary, AAG

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEET PUROHIT

Order

06/08/2026

1. Both the learned counsel are *ad idem* that the issue raised in the present appeals stands finally adjudicated by this Court in ***D.B. Special (Appeal) Writ no.692/2026 [Mohd. Naved Silawat Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.]*** decided on 16th July 2026, wherein, this Court, following the law as laid down in the case of ***Sakshi Arha Vs. The Rajasthan High Court & Ors. [2025 INSC 463]*** and ***Rajasthan Public Service Commission Vs. Lavanshu Sankhla & Ors. [2026 INSC 444]***, held as under:

> *"6. In view of the above, the view taken by the learned Single judge does not warrant any interference. As regards the submission of the petitioner-appellant for granting relaxation is concerned, we are afraid that such directions cannot be given by this Court as it would amount to giving benefit to the petitioner-appellant alone, leaving others who did not apply. The petitioner-appellant has full knowledge that he was ineligible as per the advertisement and still he has applied and participated in the selection process which would not give him any benefit. No equity can be said to be granted in favour of the petitioner-appellant.*
>
> *7. Merely because someone has been given illegal benefit, illegality cannot be allowed to be perpetuated and the principle of negative equality applies. On that count, appeal stands dismissed.*
>
> *8. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of."*

2. In view of the above, as the same question of law is raised in the present appeals, the same are also dismissed *mutatis mutandis*.

3. All pending applications stand disposed of.

(SANJEET PUROHIT),J (SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA),ACJ

34,35/Jayesh Soni