HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 18360/2026
CNR: RJHC010766922026 | URN: CW / 31721U / 2026

Naresh Kumar Meena S/o Chandu Lal, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Wano, District Udaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Elementary Education, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Rajasthan State Election Commission, Through Chief Election Commissioner, Jaipur.
3. The District Election Officer, District Udaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Director Elementary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Bikaner.
5. The Electoral Registration Officer (Sdm), Udaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Abhimanyu Singh Deora on VC
For Respondent(s) : ---

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YOGENDRA KUMAR PUROHIT

Order

10/08/2026

1. The present writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 21.07.2026 (Annex.2) whereby the petitioner has been appointed as ‘Booth Level Officers’ (BLOs) of election booths of Rajkiya Prathmik Vidhalaya, Jharno ki Sarai, Udaipur whereas the petitioner is elector/voter of Assembly Constituency No.151, Kherwara, Udaipur. He further submits that as per the instructions of the Election Commissioner of India issued vide order dated 09.06.2025, a ‘Booth Level Officer’ (BLO)

should be a voter in the polling station where, he is deputed as 'Block Level Officer' (BLO).

2. In this regard, certain guidelines have been issued by the Election Commission of India which reads as follows:

> "1.1 ERO to appoint a BLO for each part of an electoral roll, under Section 13B(2) of the Representation of the People Act, 1950, amongst any Group C and above regular serving employees of state/local government enrolled as elector in that part.
> 1.2 In the absence of regular state/local government employees, ERO may appoint BLO amongst Anganwadi workers, Contract Teachers, or central government employees. However, in such cases, CEO shall obtain a non-availability certificate (Annexure-I) singed by ERO and countersigned by DEO.
> 1.3 In the absence of any employee of categories mentioned above enrolled as an elector in that part of electoral roll, ERO with the prior approval of CEO, may appoint BLO amongst such categories of employee working in the area covered by that part of electoral roll."

3. A reading of the above clause makes out that the employees who are falling under Group-C category are required to be appointed as Booth Level Officer in the booth in which such employee is registered as an elector. If the officers of Group – C are not available in the booth then they have to resort to any other Anganwadi workers, contract teachers or Central Government employees who are registered as voters in that particular booth. If the above two category employees are not found registered as elector in the booth, then any other person from any other areas can be appointed in that booth, even though they are not registered as voters in that booth.

4. The petitioner's claim is that there are employees who are registered voters in the respective booth for which the petitioner was appointed. In spite of availability of such employees, the petitioner was appointed in the said booth and the appointment

order does not indicate that the categories of employees as detailed in Clause 1.1 and 1.2 were not available so that the petitioner could be appointed to the said booth though he is not a registered voter in that booth.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's case may be reconsidered in case any of the employees referred in Clause 1.1 and 1.2 of the amended Guidelines dated 05.06.2025 are available, they shall be appointed as BLO instead of the petitioner who is not a registered elector in the said booth.

6. The request made by the petitioner appears to be in tune with the guidelines issued by the Election Commission of India. On a clear reading of the impugned order of appointment it can be seen that there is no indication in the appointment order that the appointment of the petitioner as a Booth Level Officer where he was not a registered voter was resorted to on account of non-availability of employees categorized in Clause 1.1 and 1.2 in the amended guidelines dated 05.06.2025. Therefore, this Court is inclined to dispose of this writ petition.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to make a representation indicating the names of the employees who are available in the booth for which the petitioner was appointed as BLO within one week. If any such representation is made, the respondent authority shall reconsider the order of appointing the petitioner as BLO and pass appropriate orders within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.

8. Till such representation is disposed off, no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner for not joining in consequence

of the appointment order. However, the respondents are given liberty to continue the order if the authorities found that the officer of category 1 and 2 are not available, they can resort to clause 1.3 of the guidelines.

9. All pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(YOGENDRA KUMAR PUROHIT),J

79/Sombeer Singh