HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7184/2026
CNR: RJHC010314752026 | URN: CW / 13131U / 2026

1. Anil Paliwal S/o Shri Sukhlal Paliwal, Aged About 49 Years, R/o 904, Devra Ki Magri, Ganesh Nagar, University Road, Girwa, Shastri Circle, Udaipur (Raj.).
2. Jay Prakash Singh Sardar, Aged About 35 Years, R/o 258, Yadav Colony, Amba Mata, Udaipur (Raj.).
3. Naresh Gayari S/o Shri Panna Lal, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Jai Shree Nagar, Girwa, Teetardi, Po Titardi, District Udaipur (Raj.).
4. Devendra Singh Chouhan S/o Shri Kushal Singh, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Boharwadi, Opposite State Bank Of India, Sanwar, Po Sanwar, District Udaipur (Raj.).
5. Gajendra Purohit S/o Shri Satyanarayan Purohit, Aged About 50 Years, R/o 3, Samarpit Complex, Near Jaideep Sr. Sec. School, Pulla, Udaipur (Raj.).
6. Harish Gayari S/o Shri Mohan Lal Gayari, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Jharno Ki Saray, Debari, Udaipur (Raj.).
7. Devi Singh Gurjar S/o Late Shri Laxmi Lal Gurjar, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Gayatri Nagar, Near Shiv Mandir, Udaipur Road, Mavli, Tehsil Mavli, District Udaipur (Raj.).
8. Sonu Singh Sardar S/o Shri Indr Singh Sardar, Aged About 29 Years, R/o 258, Amba Mata Road, Yadav Colony, Girwa, District Udaipur (Raj.).
9. Hemant Kumawat S/o Shri Gopal Kumawat, Aged About 31 Years, R/o 16, Nag Marg, Ward No.5, Girwa, Shastri Circle, Udaipur (Raj.).
10. Muni Ram S/o Shri Shish Phool, Aged About 32 Years, R/o 189, Shahid Bhagat Singh Nagar, Pula, Girwa, Udaipur (Raj.).
11. Rajendra Singh Masani S/o Shri Onkar Singh Masani, Aged About 53 Years, R/o 3 And 18, Prabhat Nagar, Hiran Magri, Sector-5, Savina (Rural), Udaipur (Raj.).

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Animal Husbandry, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Deputy Director, Directorate, Nagrik Suraksha, Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
3. The Director, Directorate Of Animal Husbandry, Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
4. The District Collector, Udaipur (Raj.).
5. The Deputy Director, Government Veterinary Training Institute, Udaipur (Raj.).

6. The Additional Director, Area, Animal Husbandry Department, Udaipur (Raj.).
7. The Joint Director, Animal Husbandry Department, Udaipur (Raj.).
8. The Deputy Controller, Security, Udaipur (Raj.).
9. The Deputy Director, Multipurpose Veterinary Hospital, Udaipur (Raj.).the Deputy Director
10. The Nodal Officer, Polyclinic, Udaipur (Raj.).
11. The Incharge, Veterinary Hospital, Nauwa, Tehsil Mavli, District Udaipur (Raj.).
12. The Officer-In-Charge, First Class Veterinary Hospital, Sakroda (Kurabad), Udaipur(Raj.).
13. The Nodal Officer, First Class Veterinary Hospital, Mavli, District Udaipur (Raj.).

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. O.P. Sangwa
For Respondent(s) :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MUKESH RAJPUROHIT
Order

04/08/2026

1. At the request of the learned counsel for the petitioners, the matter has been heard for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the facts in the present case is similar to the facts in ***D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11737/2024*** (***Rodu Lal & Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.***), decided on 26.08.2025.

3. The relevant paragraphs of the order dated 26.08.2025 passed in the case of ***Rodu Lal & Ors.*** (Supra) reads as follows:-

> *"41. In light of the aforesaid facts & findings and the judgments, this Court is of the opinion that Rule 3 of the Rules of 2022 has to be read harmoniously, whereby, the petitioners and similarly situated persons, who have been appointed through placement agency after issuance of public advertisement are to be covered under the ambit of Rule 3 of the Rules of 2022. Since, the above*

rule has been read harmoniously in favour of the petitioners, therefore, there is no requirement to decide question No. (b), which was framed under para 13. The harmonious reading of the Rule itself clarifies that, there ought to be no discrimination between the contractual employees appointed through placement agency as well as the contractual employees appointed directly.

42. For the aforesaid reasons, the writ petitions are allowed in the following terms: (i) The respondents shall consider the individual case of each contractual employee, appointed prior to enforcement of the Rules of 2022 strictly in accordance with Rule 3 of the Rules of 2022, meaning thereby, that if an employee has been appointed on a post created by the Administrative Department with the concurrence of the Finance Department and the appointment has been through issuance of a public advertisement further without there being any differentiation whether the public advertisement has been issued by the State Government or by the placement agency. (ii) If the case of the individual is in conformation with the Rule 3 of the Rules of 2022, as interpreted above, then the benefit of the Rules of 2022 shall be extended to such petitioners. 43. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of."

4. In light of the order cited above, the present writ petition is disposed of in the same terms as in the case of ***Rodu Lal & Ors.*** (supra). The petitioners shall be at liberty to make a representation before the concerned authorities within a period of 15 days. On such representation, the concerned authorities are directed to dispose of the same in light of the decision passed in case of ***Rodu Lal & Ors.*** (supra) within a period of two months from the date of receipt of this order.

5. All the pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(MUKESH RAJPUROHIT),J

21/Mrityunjay Singh Rathore