



2026 INSC 179

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ OF 2026
(Arising out of S.L.P. (C) NOS.13102-13109 OF 2020)

THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN & ORS. ... APPELLANTS

VERSUS

NAMONARAYAN SHARMA & ORS. ... RESPONDENTS

J U D G M E N T

J.K. MAHESHWARI, J.

1. Leave granted.
2. Applications for impleadment/intervention are allowed.
3. These Civil Appeals pertain to the recruitment, selection and appointment of the Grade III Teachers (level I and level II) in various places across 33 districts in the State of Rajasthan. The advertisement was issued on 24.02.2012 notifying 39544 posts, out of which, 10690 posts were for level I (Class 1 to 5) and 28935 posts for level II (Class 6 to 8). Indisputably, the recruitment was conducted district wise through the Panchayati Raj Department. The examination was held on 02.06.2012 and results were declared on 27.08.2012 and the orders of appointment were issued.
4. The batch of unsuccessful candidates challenged the process of selection before the High Court, *inter-alia*

contending that flawed answer keys were given, which led to erroneous result of the examination. In the pleadings, illustration and examples of the questions and their answers were given, which has been discussed by the High Court. However, after analysing the contentions, the High Court in the case of **Ramdhan Kumawat vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr.**, (S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.10622 of 2014) vide judgment dated 18.11.2014, issued the following directions :

"9. In that view of the matter, the Court deems it proper to give the following directions :

(i) The respondent No.1-State Government in Panchayati Raj Department shall appoint an Expert committee for preparing the model answer keys to the question papers of all subjects in respect of the examination held on 2/6/2012 for the posts of Teacher Gr.II (Level I & II) at different Districts. The said Expert Committee shall comprise of the experts who are either Readers or Senior Professors in Rajasthan University or a very learned and reputed persons in the concerned subject. They shall be appointed by the respondent No.1 at the earliest and latest by 28/11/2014.

(ii) The said Expert Committee shall prepare the model answer keys, taking recourse to the standard text books prescribed for being taught in the schools and standard reference books used for colleges, published by the Education Boards or the State Government, or shall take recourse to other government publications or materials, which are officially put on the government website or used for the information of public at large, or to the publications of the books written by the authors recognized by the Government as the authority on a particular subject. The Expert Committee shall

disclose the source of information relied upon by them for each of the answer keys, while submitting their reports to the respondent No.1.

(iii) The Expert Committee shall prepare the model answer keys on or before 15/12/2014 and shall cause them to be put on the website of the Government in Panchayati Raj Department on the same date, inviting objections from the candidates who had appeared in the examination in question.

(iv) The candidates shall submit their objections before the concerned Expert Committee on or before 18/12/2014. The Expert Committee, after taking into consideration the objections, if any submitted by the candidates, shall prepare final model answer keys for each of the question papers of the concerned subjects and submit the same to the respondent No.1 in the sealed cover not later than 22/12/2014.

(v) The respondent No.1 shall prepare the merit list afresh of the selected candidates for being appointed in the respective zila Parishads on the basis of the said model answer keys prepared by the experts committee as early as possible and put on the Government website latest by 31/12/2014.

(vi) Since the fresh merit list would disturb the merit list prepared earlier by the respondents, entailing possible termination of the candidates already appointed and working on their respective posts at different Zila Parishads, it is directed that such of those candidates as may be ultimately found to be entitled to the issuance of appointment letters on the basis of their merits as per the revised merit lists, shall pick up their appointments according to their inter-se position in the respective merit list, however they would not be entitled to any back wages or any other benefits whatsoever.

(vii) Such of the candidates, who are already appointed and who also figure in the revised merit

VERDICTUM.IN

list, shall continue on their respective posts, and their appointments shall relate back to the date of their respective appointments with continuity of service for the purposes of seniority.

(viii) Such of the candidates who are already appointed but who do not figure in the revised merit list may not be ousted from the service, if there is nothing adverse against them on record and if there are sufficient vacant posts in the respective Zila Parishads for the concerned subject and as far as possible they shall be accommodated against such vacancies by placing them at the bottom of the revised merit list of the selected candidates.

(ix) It is further directed that the Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department shall see to it that the time limit set by the Court is strictly adhered to the all concerned, failing which strict view shall be taken in the matter."

5. It is not out of place to say that the judgment of **Ramdhan Kumawat** (supra) has not been questioned by the State Government before any forum, i.e., either in writ appeal before the High Court or in the Civil Appeals before this Court. Even issuance of specific directions in Para 9(v), (vi), (vii), (viii) and (ix), the State Government discontinued some of the teachers who were appointed in furtherance to the first merit list published on 27.8.2012. Being aggrieved by the orders of termination and discontinuation, number of teachers who were already appointed, approached the High Court in the case of **Hemendra**

Kumar Jangid vs. State of Rajasthan¹ and batch. On filing such writ petitions, **Hemendra Kumar Jangid (supra)** was dismissed on 19.12.2013 by the learned Single Judge. Other writ petitions also met with similar fate. The said case to be challenged before the Division Bench in the case of **Manju Chaudhary vs. State of Rajasthan** and batch reported in 2014 SCC OnLine Raj 5883.

6. The High Court in the said case reaffirmed the view taken in the case of **Ramdhan Kumawat** and directed as under:-

"16. We do not find any error of law and agree with the reasoning given by learned Single Judge in Ramdhan Kumawat vs. The State of Rajasthan & Anr. (supra), pursuant to which the results have to be revised after fresh evaluation of answers. The revision of select list is thus not complete and the process is still open. In the circumstances, in order to allay any apprehension and to protect the interest of the appellants-petitioners, who were appointed, and are under constant threat on the revision of lists under directions of the Court, without fault attributed to them, we find it appropriate to quash the order dated 30.08.2013 passed by the Secretary and Commissioner, Gramin Vikas and Panchayati Raj Department (Panchayati Raj Primary Education), Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur, to the extent that it directs termination of services of those persons, who were ousted from selections on the declaration of the first revised results. We direct that at this stage, they will not be ousted from service. The termination orders passed, if any, consequent to the orders dated 30.8.2013, are set aside. The directions given by learned Single Judge in Ramdhan Kumawat V/s The

¹ 2013 SCC OnLine Raj 3962

State of Rajasthan & Anr. (supra), namely, that the Expert Committee will issue model answer keys afresh and that the results will be revised in accordance with such keys, will be given effect to leaving the question of its correctness open. The State Government will be at liberty to pass fresh orders, after revising the results and adjusting equities protecting the interest of the appellants-petitioners, to the extent that they will not be ousted from the selected list and will be placed as far as possible at the bottom of the revised select list.

17. With the aforesaid directions, all the Special Appeals are partly allowed, with liberty to the appellants-petitioners to file a fresh writ petition, if any fresh cause of action arises to them.

18. A copy of this judgment will be placed in all the connected files."

7. The said judgment was assailed by filing Special Leave petition (Civil) No. 22663 of 2016 (CC No. 13878 of 2016) which was dismissed on the ground of delay on 01.08.2016.

8. In consequence of the judgment of **Ramdhan Kumawat** and **Manju Chaudhary (supra)**, the teachers appointed in furtherance to the first selection list dated 27.08.2012 and the revised selection list dated 02.09.2013 were continued. In the meantime, some of the persons who were above in merit than the persons continued in furtherance to the first selection list approached the High Court by filing writ petition No. 750 of 2017 and batch. The said batch of writ

petitions was decided commonly in the case of **Mukesh Kumar Tailor vs. State of Rajasthan** vide judgment dated 09.02.2017 reported in 2017 SCC OnLine Raj 4145. In the said judgment, the Court referred to the judgment of **Manju Chaudhary** and also the stand of the State Government, and issued certain directions. The aforesaid is necessary and vital to the issue as involved, therefore, reproduced for ready reference as under:

"As a result, all those candidates whose names appeared in the revised list were granted appointment and those who had already stood selected, continued to remain in service in spite of the fact that their names no more figured in the revised list. The outfall is that there were many candidates whose names were not in merit in the first list but as per the revised result got more marks than those who were allowed to continue in service by the order of the High Court even though, they now had less marks than the petitioners. The Special Leave Petition against the judgment and order dated 08.12.2014 was also dismissed. Thus, as on date, all those candidates who had got less marks than the petitioners are continuing to be retained in service and the same has resulted in filing of number of writ petitions by candidates who now have more marks as per the revised result. Thus, the grievance of the petitioners is that in pursuance to the same selection, the candidates less meritorious to the petitioners are continuing in service, whereas, as per the revised result, the petitioners have got more marks than those who are retained in service by the order of the Court. In short, those who had got less marks than the petitioners are still continuing in service.

The matter having been settled up till Hon'ble Supreme Court, the candidates who were appointed in pursuance to the first list shall have to be permitted to continue. The respondent-State taking into account the grievance of the petitioners have tried to workout the possibility to adjust as many as candidates as possible from amongst those who have got more marks than the last candidate selected to the extent of the vacancies still available out of the advertised vacancies.

Learned Additional Advocate General has filed the reply in some of the petitions and has placed on record the order dated 08.02.2017 showing that the Department is trying to ascertain the factual position of the vacancies in each of the Zila Parishads and also taking into account the bifurcation of the vacancies as per the reservations. It is stated that the detail of the vacancies for some of the Zila Parishads have been received and from some of the Zila Parishads, it is likely to be received in few days time and after the whole process is completed, they shall offer the appointment after verification of their documents to the most meritorious candidates from amongst those who have got more marks than the last candidate still working with the department in pursuance to the selection of the advertisement dated 24.04.2012.

In view of the fair stand taken by the respondent State and appreciating the exercise being undertaken by them to meet the situation in hand, all the abovementioned writ petitions are disposed of as under :

a. The respondent-State shall workout the vacancies in each of the Zila Parishads as expeditiously as possible. Thereafter, the list shall be prepared of the candidates who have got more marks than the last candidate still working with the department in pursuance to the directions

of this Court passed in Manju Choudhary's case (supra).

b. Thereafter, the candidates as per the ration 1:2 of the vacancies available shall be called for the verification of the documents and the appointments shall be given to such like eligible candidates as per their merit equivalent to the vacancies available with the department.

c. This Court is aware that some of the candidates are bound to be left out even though they have got more marks than the last candidate but taking into account the limited number of vacancies, the said candidates shall have to try their luck in the next recruitment process afresh.

d. The said process be completed as expeditiously as possible preferably within 06 months from today.

The writ petitions are disposed of accordingly."

9. After perusal of the aforesaid, it reveals that the said judgment was based on the concession of the State to accommodate those who are above than the last candidate appointed in furtherance to the first selection list and between the cut-off date of the revised selection list. In furtherance, the Government itself has taken a decision vide Minutes of the Meeting dated 04.09.2017 through the Government of Rajasthan Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Primary Education Department. In the said decision, the Government decided to deviate from the circular dated 19.07.2001 of Personnel Department. The said decision was

taken in furtherance to the directions as issued by the High court, based on the concession made by the State Government. However, the Government decided to grant relaxation for waiting list and observed that they shall proceed in accordance with the main list in the light of the decision in ***Mukesh Kumar Tailor (supra)***. It has further been decided that the issue of reservation may not have any relevance in the facts. For clarity, the decision as taken by the Government in the said Minutes of Meeting is reproduced as under :-

“After overall discussion following decisions have been taken:-

1. According to the information received from various District Councils, a total of 6235 Teachers who have been already appointed and working have been ousted from Seniority in view of amended result of Third Grade Teacher Recruitment, 2012. In compliance to the judgment passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.10622/2014 Ramdhan Kumawat vs. State, 3008 Teachers have been adjusted against category-wise available vacant posts in various Districts in accordance with the advertised posts. After deducting 3008 teachers who have been adjusted category wise out of above 6235 teachers, now it is not possible to adjust remaining 3227 teachers due to lack of category-wise vacant posts. The Hon'ble Minister has informed in the meeting that at present there are around 50,000/- posts of third grade teachers lying vacant. The Personnel Department before adjustment against aforesaid posts has directed to present information in prescribed format regarding District Council-wise cadre strength. Therefore, Primary Education Department be written to present information in prescribed format.

2. After adjustment of teachers already appointed and working who have been ousted from seniority in view of amended result of Third Grade Teacher Recruitment, 2012 published in November, 2016 in compliance to judgment passed in the case of Ramdhan Kumawat, the candidate obtaining marks higher than above candidates have presented S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 750/2017, "Mukesh Kumar Tailor & Ors. vs. State", in which Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan has laid down this arrangement that first of all adjustments be made against vacant posts in compliance to the judgment passed in the case of Ramdhan Kumawat. Thereafter, candidates obtaining higher marks be selected in the order of seniority against remaining vacant posts.

In compliance to the judgment passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.750/2017, "Mukesh Kumar Tailor Vs. State", the Representative of personnel Department has made statement regarding relaxation in provisions as laid down in Circular Dt. 19.7.2001 of Personnel Department that provisions have been made in circular Dt. 19.07.2001 of Personnel Department not to fulfill such vacant posts from waiting list. The vacant posts of Third Grade Teacher Recruitment Year, 2012 is not to be filled up from waiting list, rather to be filled up only from the main list i.e. to the extent of advertised posts, therefore, provisions of above Circular are not binding. Therefore, in compliance to the judgment passed in the case of Mukesh Kumar Tailor, it was decided that assent of Personnel Department be received in filling up posts.

3. According to the information received from various District Councils, District Councils shall adjust 3008 teachers out of 6235 teachers being ousted from Seniority who have already been appointed and working in view of amended result published in November, 2016. In compliance to the judgment passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.10622/2014 Ramdhan Kumawat vs. State, directions

be issued to the District Councils for adjustments of these teachers against category-wise available vacant posts in District Councils for adjustments of these teachers against category-wise available vacant posts in District Councils. Thereafter, proceedings for regularization, payment of arrears along with other remuneration to these teachers be carried out by Primary Education Department."

10. In the judgment of the **Mukesh Kumar Tailor (supra)**, the direction was to the State to workout the vacancies in each of the Zila Parishad and thereafter calling the candidate in the ratio of 1:2 of the vacancies as available and on verification of the document, the appointment be made. In view of the word used "the vacancies and the merit equivalent to the vacancies available", however, the issue arose what would mean by the "vacancies". The said clarification can be found in the judgment of **Rajesh Choudhary vs. State of Rajasthan** (D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1178 of 2017) though related to different departments wherein vide judgment dated 03.11.2017, the Court in paragraph 11 observed as thus:-

"11) As regards the issue raised by the appellants that people lower in merit than them in the revised merit list have been retained in service and thereby a vested right in the appellants who are higher in merit in the second select list, has been violated is concerned, in view of the decision in Umesh Singhal's case which is based on decision of the Supreme Court, the argument is rejected. Thus, of the 1478 notified vacancies such number have been occupied by candidates as per the merit position in the first

select list notified on 21/07/2012 is concerned, the same cannot be upset, such vacancies for said year which remain unfilled as of today, be it because of letters offering appointment not issued to all selected candidates when the merit list was prepared or on account of some of the candidates not accepting letter offering appointment or some having joined resigned thereafter would require to be filled up in view of the various directions issued in judicial verdicts and as noted hereinabove."

11. As such, it was clear that what would mean by the vacancies available on which the persons who fall within the merit and the last candidate appointed in furtherance to the first selection list and between the candidates appointed last in the revised merit list. Those candidates again approached the High court by filing petition S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2329 of 2017 (**Babulal Sharma vs. State of Rajasthan**) and batch which was disposed of on 20.02.2017 relying upon the judgment of the Principal Seat at Jodhpur in the case of **Mukesh Kumar Tailor** (supra) and directed as under:

"The operative part of the order dated 9-2-2017 passed by the Coordinate Bench Main Seat at Jodhpur being relevant for the present purpose as under :-

"In view of the fair stand taken by the respondent State and appreciating the exercise being undertaken by them to meet the situation in hand, all the abovementioned writ petitions are disposed of as under :

a. The respondent-State shall workout the vacancies in each of the Zila Parishads as expeditiously as possible. Thereafter, the list shall be prepared of the candidates who have got more marks than the last candidate still working with the department in pursuance to the directions of this Court passed in Manju Choudhary's case (supra).

b. Thereafter, the candidates as per the ration 1:2 of the vacancies available shall be called for the verification of the documents and the appointments shall be given to such like eligible candidates as per their merit equivalent to the vacancies available with the department.

c. This Court is aware that some of the candidates are bound to be left out even though they have got more marks than the last candidate but taking into account the limited number of vacancies, the said candidates shall have to try their luck in the next recruitment process afresh.

d. The said process be completed as expeditiously as possible preferably within 06 months from today."

The coordinate Bench at Jaipur while disposing of CWP-2194/2017 vide order dt.17-2-2017 has also made it clear that it shall be applicable in rem to all the candidates who are similarly situated and there is no need to file fresh writ petitions by the candidates who have not so far approached this Court for independently ventilating their grievance since what is being observed by the Coordinate Bench Main Seat at Jodhpur while disposing of batch of writ petitioner (CWP-750/2017) vide order dt.9-2-2017 covers their grievances as well.

In the light of the order passed by the Coordinate Bench Seat at Jodhpur in CWP-750/2017 & other connected orders dt.9-2-2017 & also the order passed by the Coordinate Bench at Jaipur in CWP-2194/2017 dt.17.2.2017, the present batch of

petitioner in light thereof stand disposed of and the present writ petitioners are also entitled mutatis mutandis entitled to the same relief as extended by the Coordinate Bench Main Seat at Jodhpur in the order dt.9-2.2017. Copy of the order be separately placed in each file."

12. Even after the order passed by the High Court, the appointments are not made on the pretext of the interpretation of the words "vacancies available". However, taking a clue from the same, Special Appeal Writ No. 908 of 2017, **Namonarayan Sharma & Ors. vs. State of Rajasthan** was filed which was decided vide impugned order dated 08.01.2020 issuing direction to apply the judgment of **Mukesh Kumar Tailor** (supra) in true sense and spirit.

13. Being dissatisfied by such direction, the State Government filed the present Civil Appeals. During hearing of these appeals, in the proceedings dated 28.10.2025, this Court passed the order and directed as under:

1) After perusal of order dated 09.02.2017 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan in a batch of writ petitions consisting of the case of Mukesh Kumar Tailor v. State of Rajasthan and Ors., certain directions were issued. Those directions have not been disputed by the learned Additional Solicitor General appearing on behalf of the petitioner. As per the said directions, some exercise has to be done by the State Government after working out the vacancies in each of the Zila Parishads and to take recourse as ordered.

2) *Learned senior counsel for the respondents submitted that vacancies are available even in the year 2025. He has the vacancy position available with him received under RTI of some districts. He is at liberty to file the same along with affidavit indicating that how many vacancies are still available in all Zila Parishads, if possible.*

3) *On filing such an affidavit within two weeks, learned Additional Solicitor General representing the State shall also seek instructions and file affidavit in counter and to explain how many vacancies are available.*

4) *In view of the above, we postpone the hearing. List on 02nd December, 2025."*

14. In furtherance to the said order, the respondents by filing IA No.307058 of 2025 submitted that total number of vacant posts in 2012 are 2253. It is urged that the respondents are 49 in total and the other impleaders/intervenors are about 645 who are placed in the list above the last appointed candidate in the first selection list dated 27.08.2012 and below the last candidate of the revised selection list dated 02.09.2013. It is contended that the ratio of **Mukesh Kumar Tailor** (supra), if applied, in furtherance to the direction, they deserve appointment and the High Court vide impugned judgment has rightly interpreted all the previous judgments and also the position of vacancies as referred therein. Looking to the available vacancies, the number of persons are less. It is

submitted that they be directed to be appointed and be extended similar benefits as allowed in terms of the judgment of **Mukesh Kumar Tailor (supra)** and also the Resolution of the Government dated 04.09.2017.

15. Per contra, Shri K.M. Nataraj, learned Additional Solicitor General representing the State has strenuously urged that the person who is above than the cut-off of the revised selection list may be directed to be appointed out of the revised selection list. It is urged that if a candidate who could not secure the marks above than the cut-off of the revised selection list may not be permitted for appointment merely because of the directions issued in the case of **Ramdhan Kumawat (supra)** and **Manju Chaudhary (supra)** which are having application only with respect to those candidates whose appointment were made in furtherance to the previous selection list and to protect those appointments, those directions were issued.

16. After hearing learned counsel for the parties at length and on perusal of the stand as taken by the State Government in the case of **Mukesh Kumar Tailor (supra)** and batch (supra), it is clear from the averments referred in the order dated 09.02.2017 that the judgment was based on the concession of the State Government , which has not been either recalled or

assailed before any higher forum. On the contrary, the Government has taken a decision on 04.09.2017 to implement the said order. In such circumstances the respondents and the impleaders/interveners, if they are similarly placed, cannot be denied the benefit as allowed by the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench of the High Court by the order impugned.

17. The respondents have also filed the counter affidavit after the order dated 28.10.2025 passed in the proceedings of this case. On perusal of the same, it is clear that in the State of Rajasthan, at various Zila Panchayat levels, approximately 7,500 vacancies are available for which an advertisement has been issued and the examinations had been held on 17.01.2026. In the circumstances, the availability of the vacancies is not in dispute. Therefore, the respondents as well as the impleaders/interveners, if they fall between the candidate who is last appointed in furtherance to the first selection list and below to the last candidate of the revised selection list dated 02.09.2013 found, deserves appointment similar to the other persons who have been appointed in the case of **Mukesh Kumar Tailor (supra)** and batch and alike extending similar benefit to them.

18. Also, at this juncture, it is not out of place to mention

that after passing of the impugned judgment by the High Court, the State Government vide Minutes of Meeting dated 13.01.2020 has decided that to put a quietus to litigation in furtherance to the recruitment of the advertisement dated 24.02.2012, the cases which are decided or pending before the High Court may be taken up and no further cases of the applicants be extended benefit at par. In view of the foregoing, we are inclined to dismiss the present appeals and reaffirm the directions as issued by the High Court in the case of ***Mukesh Kumar Tailor (supra)*** vide the order under challenge. Since the matter is pending from 2020, therefore, to carry out those directions and for clarity, these appeals stand disposed of in the following terms:

- (i) A fresh list be prepared of the candidates who are respondents/intervenors/impleaders before this Court from the list of candidates last appointed in furtherance to the first selection list dated 27.08.2012 and who fall below the cut-off of the revised selection list dated 02.09.2013, within a period of two months from the date of communication of this order.
- (ii) After preparation of such list on verification of antecedents and other documents, the appointments be

made within two months.

- (iii) We make it clear that the respondents or the impleaders/intervenors would be treated at par to the other similarly situated persons, but the benefit of salary be extended from the date of their joining. We also clarify that on such appointment, they would be entitled to all consequential benefits notionally.
- (iv) Since the appointment has to be made at District level on the vacancies so available, as such, in case the vacancy in any subject is not available in that District, the appointment of such candidate be offered for the nearby district by the authorities taking recourse as permissible.
- (v) After perusal of the judgments of **Ramdhan Kumawat (supra)**, **Manju Chaudhary (supra)**, **Rajesh Choudhary (supra)** and **Mukesh Kumar Tailor (supra)**, one more clarity is required regarding maintaining the *inter-se* seniority of the Teachers. Otherwise, it will give rise to another round of litigation. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the *inter-se* seniority would be maintained in terms of the merit of the revised seniority list and the people who would be placed according to their merit in bottom thereto

including the respondents, wherever the candidate find place their *inter se* seniority be maintained accordingly by the State. We make it clear that this order of *inter se* seniority has been passed by this Court with an intent to curtail the anticipated litigation. However, the State Government is at liberty to afford an opportunity, if necessary, while determining such *inter se* seniority.

19. This decision is in the peculiar facts relying the concessions of the State Government in the case of ***Mukesh Kumar Tailor (supra)***, therefore, it would be confined to the respondents and the impleaders/intervenors who have approached this Court on or before this order. No further avenue would remain open to any of the candidate.

20. Accordingly, the Civil Appeals are disposed of. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

....., J.
[J.K. MAHESHWARI]

....., J.
[ATUL S. CHANDURKAR]

New Delhi;
January 28, 2026.

ITEM NO.15

COURT NO.3

SECTION XV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 13102-13109/2020

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 08-01-2020 in DBSAW No. 908/2017 08-01-2020 in DBSAW No. 792/2017 08-01-2020 in DBSAW No. 794/2017 08-01-2020 in DBSAW No. 801/2017 08-01-2020 in DBSAW No. 815/2017 08-01-2020 in DBSAW No. 816/2017 08-01-2020 in DBSAW No. 826/2017 29-01-2020 in DBWMA No. 11/2020 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jaipur]

THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

NAMONARAYAN SHARMA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

[FOR FINAL DISPOSAL]

IA No. 54509/2021 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IA No. 9886/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT IA No. 3982/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT IA No. 103826/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 106090/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 47368/2022 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 22815/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 112570/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 3981/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 45010/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 48121/2022 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 45007/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 27507/2024 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 63288/2025 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 222342/2023 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 33181/2025 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 46061/2022 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 165257/2022 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 208325/2023 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 298148/2024 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 101991/2021 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 30635/2022 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 208652/2024 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 52466/2021 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 1636/2022 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 70057/2022 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 208409/2024 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 9885/2021 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 69082/2022 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 61194/2024 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA No. 57855/2024 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION

IA No. 152901/2021 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION
IA No. 189591/2022 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION
IA No. 50155/2024 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION
IA No. 97082/2025 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION
IA No. 54050/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 111147/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 144096/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 47708/2022 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 179270/2022 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 129979/2020 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 40558/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 54012/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 143740/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 174578/2022 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 115372/2020 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 27826/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 106087/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 143708/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 115370/2020 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 53576/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 142164/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 100637/2022 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 176729/2023 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 115369/2020 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 98796/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 137468/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 133340/2023 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 115367/2020 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 46446/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 92676/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 123319/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 1294/2022 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 114296/2020 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 46443/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 55967/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 122382/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 161881/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 52235/2022 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 55582/2023 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 97249/2025 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 112875/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 112569/2020 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 3979/2021 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 106703/2023 - VACATING STAY

Date : 28-01-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.K. MAHESHWARI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ATUL S. CHANDURKAR

VERDICTUM.IN

24

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. K.M. Nataraj, ASG
Mr. S. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. P.S. Patwalia, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Puneet Jain, Adv.
Ms. Christi Jain, AOR
Mr. Akshit Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Mann Arora, Adv.
Ms. Akriti Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Harsh Jain, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Jain, Adv.
Mr. Yogit Kamat, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Jain, Adv.
Mr. Arjun Kanadi, Adv.
Mr. Om Sudhir Vidyarthi, Adv.

Mr. D.N. Goburdhun, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Charu Mathur, AOR

Mr. Yadav Narender Singh, AOR
Mr. Mayank Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Mudit Bansal, Adv.
Mr. Girraj Singh Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Abhijeet Singh, Adv.
Mr. Anirudh Singh, Adv.
Ms. Chitrangda Rastravara, Adv.
Ms. Sakshi Aggarwal, Adv.
Mr. Yuvraj Singh, Adv.
Mrs. Pearl Pundir, Adv.
Mr. Gp. Capt. Karan Singh Bhati, AOR

Mr. Ranjit Kumar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Raman Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Vikram Nagpal, Adv.
Ms. Deepsea Chakraborty, Adv.
Mr. Aman Jha, AOR

Ms. Ankita Chaudhary, AOR
Mr. Yadav Narender Singh, AOR

Mr. Balwant Singh Billowira, Adv.
Dr. Ravinder Kumar Singh, Adv.
Ms. Kaninika Majumder, Adv.
Mr. Akshay Singh, Adv.
Mr. Akash Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Anirudh Ray, Adv.
Ms. Arpita Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Shilpa Singh, AOR

VERDICTUM.IN

25

Mr. Abhay Anand Jena, AOR

Mr. Vibhuti Sushant Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Keane Sardhina, Adv.

Mr. Narender Kumar Verma, AOR

Mr. D.N. Goburdhun, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Charu Mathur, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

(GULSHAN KUMAR ARORA)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(NAND KISHOR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR