RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

D.B. Writ Contempt Petition No. 1197/2026
CNR: RJHC010829052026 | URN: WCP / 1246U / 2026

Rajasthan High Court
सत्यमेव जयते
Web Copy - Not Official

1. Deshraj S/o Shri Harish Chandra, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Kulhariyo Ki Dhani, Binjusar, District Jhunjhuu.
2. Sunil Kumar S/o Shri Brijlal, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Ward No. 2, Village- Post Hansasari, Via Dhanduri District Jhunjhunu.
3. Saroj Sharma W/o Shri Mahesh Kumar Sharma, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village-Post Lootu, District Jhunjhunu.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Medical And Health Services (Group-Iii), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, (Rajasthan).
2. Smt. Gayatri Rathore, The Principal Secretary, Medical And Health Services (Group-Iii), Jaipur (Rajasthan).
3. Shri Jogaram, The Mission Director (Nhm), Directorate Of Medical, Health And Family Welfare Services, Swasthya Bhawan, C-Scheme, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
4. Shri Rakesh Sharma, The Additional Mission Director (Nhm), Directorate Of Medical, Health And Family Welfare Services, Swasthya Bhawan, C-Scheme, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
5. Smt. Santosh Goyal, The Project Director (Nhm), Directorate Of Medical, Health And Family Welfare Services, Swasthya Bhawan, C-Scheme, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
6. Shri Rakesh Sharma, The Additional Director (Nhm), Directorate Of Medical, Health And Family Welfare Services, Swasthya Bhawan, C-Scheme, Tilak Marg, Jaipur.

----Respondents

Connected with

D.B. Writ Contempt Petition Nos.1350/2026, 1108/2026, 1118/2026, 1123/2026, 1172/2026, 1198/2026, 1352/2026, 1353/2026, 1355/2026, 1360/2026, 1440/2026, 1539/2026, 1541/2026, 1453/2026, 1454/2026, 1470/2026, 1481/2026, 1536/2026, 1173/2026, 1201/2026, 1351/2026, 1122/2026, 1124/2026, 1126/2026, 1128/2026, 1137/2026, 1193/2026, 1354/2026, 1377/2026, 1401/2026, 1444/2026, 1445/2026, 1448/2026, 1450/2026, 1452/2026, 1519/2026, 1582/2026,

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:38 AM)

1583/2026, 1584/2026, 1585/2026, 1586/2026.

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Manoj Bhandari, Sr. Adv. Assisted by Mr. Aniket Tater and Mr. Ojas Gupta Mr. Rajesh Joshi, Sr. Adv. Assisted by Ms. Kamini Joshi Mr. Ramawatar Singh Mr. Nikhil Ajmera Mr. Hanuman Singh Mr. Sharwan Choudhary Ms. Gourangi Acharya Mr. Pulkeshwar Rajpurohit Mr. Anirudh Kothari Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. N.S. Rajpurohit, AAG assisted by Ms. Kanchan Jodha Mr. Santosh Goyal (NHM, Jaipur)

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YOGENDRA KUMAR PUROHIT

Judgment

Reportable

Judgment Pronounced on: 28/11/2026

Per: Arun Monga, J.

1. Common grievance is made out in the bunch [1] of contempt petitions which are being disposed of vide this common order and judgment i.e. alleged wilful disobedience of the judgment and order dated 24.01.2019 passed by learned Single Bench read with judgment and order dated 15.09.2025 passed by Division Bench of this Court.

1.1 For the sake of brevity, the facts and recitals of the present bunch of cases are being taken from D.B. Writ Contempt Petition No. 1197/2026, titled Deshraj Vs. State of Rajasthan.

1.2 This contempt petition alleges wilful disobedience of three judicial orders. The first is the order dated 24.01.2019 passed in ***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13259/2018***, which was the petitioners' own writ

[1] As per schedule appended at the end.

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:38 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

petition. The second is the judgment dated 19.12.2018 in ***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14497/2017***, titled ***Suresh Kumar & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors.***, in terms of which their writ petition was disposed of. The third is the judgment dated 15.09.2025 of a Division Bench of this Court, which dismissed ***D.B. Special Appeal No. 414/2019*** titled ***State of Rajasthan Vs. Suresh Kumar & Ors.*** and the connected appeals of the State, including ***D.B. Special Appeal No. 1078/2019*** titled ***State of Rajasthan Vs. Deshraj & Ors***.

2. The grievance is simple. The petitioners say they have not been appointed as Nurse Grade II (GNM) under the National Rural Health Mission. They say the State has instead gone ahead with fresh recruitment under the advertisement dated 28.01.2025 and thus the respondents be punished and be made to comply with the judgments, *ibid*.

3. The respondents deny any wilful default. Their additional affidavit dated 29.09.2025 sets out the steps taken after 15.09.2025 wherein it is deposed as below :-

> *"3. That the present additional affidavit is being filed on behalf of the answering respondents to apprise this Hon'ble Court of the steps undertaken by the State in compliance with the judgement dated 15.09.2025 passed in the SAW 414/2019 State of Rajasthan vs Suresh Kumar and connected appeals, which is the impugned order in the present case.*
> *4. That in pursuance of the directions issued by this Hon'ble Court, the Department obtained the merit list of 6635 candidates dated 28.02.2009 from the Director (Non-Gazetted) Medical and Health Services, Rajasthan. Thereafter the aforesaid list was published on the official website of the department on 15.10.2025, in compliance with the directions of this Hon'ble Court.*
> *5. That thereafter, vide communication No. 0054 dated 19.11.2025, all concerned Chief Medical and Health Officers were directed to furnish information in the prescribed format regarding inclusion of the petitioners covered by the judgment dated 15.09.2025 in the aforesaid merit list of 6,635 candidates.*
> *6.That upon receipt and examination of the information furnished by the concerned Chief Medical and Health Officers, it was found that only three petitioners, namely, Shri Madan Lal Choudhary, son of Shri Ummedram Choudhary, Shri Jitendra Tailor, son of Shri Ramniwas Tailor; and Suman Choudhary, daughter of Shri Ganesh Ram, were included in the said merit list, comprising two candidates from Ajmer district and one candidate from Sikar district. That for the purpose of further examination and compliance with the aforesaid judgment, a Committee was constituted*

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:38 AM)

vide Order dated 21.04.2026. The Committee examined the relevant record and made recommendations regarding the selection and appointment of the petitioners covered by the judgment.

7. That pursuant to the recommendations of the Committee, the Director (Non-Gazetted), Medical and Health Services, Rajasthan, vide informal note No. 552 dated 15.06.2026, informed the Department that the aforesaid three candidates had already been selected in accordance with the final merit list of 6,635 candidates and appointment had been offered to them. However, as per the reports received from the concerned Chief Medical and Health Officers, the said candidates had not joined their respective posts.

8. That, accordingly, the answering respondents respectfully submit that the State has undertaken the requisite exercise in pursuance of the directions issued by this Hon'ble Court by publishing the merit list, obtaining district-wise verification reports and examining the matter through a duly constituted Committee. The stand of the State is founded upon the official record and the reports of the competent authorities. An exact and correct copy of the departmental order dated 01.07.2026 issued by the Mission Director, National Health Mission, Medical Health and Family Welfare Department, Rajasthan regarding the compliance of the Impugned order is annexed herewith and marked as Annexure- AA/I.

9. That in view of the aforesaid facts and the compliance undertaken, the State respectfully submits that no further selection or fresh appointment is presently required to be made from the aforesaid merit list in respect of the petitioners covered by the judgment dated 15.09.2025, the three candidates found in the list having already been selected and offered appointment.

10. The answering respondent always remained keen and vigilant to comply the orders of the Hon'ble Court and same are always complied by the answering respondent in its true letter and spirit."

To crystallize, the stand taken thus is that the merit list was published on time. District reports were called. A Committee examined the record. Only three petitioners were found in the merit list. Appointment was offered to all three. None of them joined.

4. The question before us is narrow. Have the respondents wilfully disobeyed the orders of this Court? For the reasons that follow, our answer is no.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

5. The dispute is nearly two decades old. Only the facts needed for this order are noted.

6. On 04.05.2007, applications were invited for 2,500 posts of Nurse Grade II (GNM) under the National Rural Health Mission. Merit lists were to be prepared district wise. Bona fide residents of the district were to get preference.

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:38 AM)

7. On 08.08.2007, a second advertisement was issued for 6,172 posts. It gave no district preference. Corrigenda dated 25.08.2007 and 21.01.2008 then changed the basis of the merit list more than once. In ***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1120/2008, Dema Ram Choudhary v. State***, this Court directed a State level merit list by order dated 20.02.2008. ***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 741/2008, Sant Lal Yadav & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors.***, was allowed on the same lines on 08.05.2008. The State's appeal failed.

8. The advertisement dated 08.08.2007 was cancelled on 29.03.2008. A notification dated 15.04.2008 followed. It sought to fill only 3,704 posts.

9. The legality of district wise merit and local preference was then referred to a Larger Bench. By judgment dated 30.11.2015, the Larger Bench held that preference on the basis of residence among equals under the Scheme was not arbitrary. It did not violate Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. The matters were sent back to the learned Single Judge.

10. In ***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6207/2009*** titled ***Rajkumar & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors.***, decided on 07.12.2016, the learned Single Judge issued detailed directions. The State was to find out all GNM posts available up to 15.04.2008. It was to distribute them among the 34 districts. It was to fill them from district wise merit lists of candidates who had applied under the advertisement dated 08.08.2007 or under the district advertisements issued after 15.04.2008.

11. The State filled only 3,704 posts. Contempt petitions followed. An interim merit list was issued on 04.05.2017 and a final list on 19.07.2017. The contempt petitions were disposed of on 04.09.2017. Liberty was given to question the number of posts in fresh proceedings.

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:38 AM)

12. That led to ***Suresh Kumar (supra)***. On 19.12.2018, the learned Single Judge quashed the decision to confine the posts to 3,704. It held that 2,500 more GNM posts were available as on 15.04.2008. The State was directed to deal with them in terms of ***Rajkumar (supra)*** within six weeks. Monetary benefits were to run only from the date of actual engagement. It was held / ordered as under by the learned Judge :-

> *"Consequently, the writ petitions filed by the petitioners are partly allowed. The action of the respondents in confining the posts of GNM for engagement under the NRHM Scheme pursuant to the directions given by this Court in the case of Raj Kumar (supra) to 3704 posts is quashed and set aside, it is held that besides 3704 posts as determined by the respondents, 2500 more posts of GNM as on 15.04.2008 were available for engagement under NRHM Scheme and in view thereof, the respondents are directed to deal with the said 2500 positions of GNM in NRHM Scheme strictly in accordance with the directions issued by this Court on 07.12.2016 in the case of Raj Kumar (supra). Those engaged on the said 2500 posts, would be treated similarly to the candidates, who were engaged on 3704 posts for all purposes, except for the monetary benefits, which would be available to them from the date of their actual engagement. The needful be done by the respondents within a period of six weeks from the date of this order. No order as to costs."*

13. On 24.01.2019, S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13259/2018 was disposed of. The learned Single Judge held that the directions in ***Suresh Kumar (supra)*** were general. They covered every candidate eligible under ***Rajkumar (supra)***. No further direction was issued. Relevant part thereof is reproduced here under :-

> *These writ petitions have been filed by the petitioners seeking a direction to the respondents essentially to follow the directions as given by this Court in Suresh Kumar & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors. SBCWP No.14497/2017, decided on 19.12.2018, for them also.*
> *This Court in the case of Suresh Kumar & Ors. (supra)*
> *directed as under :-*
>
> > *"Consequently, the writ petitions filed by the petitioners are partly allowed. The action of the respondents in confining the posts of GNM for engagement under the NRHM Scheme pursuant to the directions given by this Court in the case of Raj Kumar (supra) to 3704 posts is quashed and set aside, it is held that besides 3704 posts as determined by the respondents, 2500 more posts of GNM as on 15.04.2008 were available for engagement under NRHM Scheme and in view thereof, the respondents are directed to deal with the said 2500 positions of GNM in NRHM Scheme strictly in accordance with the directions issued by this Court on 07.12.2016 in the case of Raj Kumar (supra).*
> > *Those engaged on the said 2500 posts, would be treated similarly to the candidates, who were engaged on 3704 posts for all purposes, except for the monetary benefits, which would be available to them from the date of their actual*

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

engagement. The needful be done by the respondents within a period of six weeks from the date of this order.

No order as to costs."

A perusal of the directions issued by this Court clearly indicate that the directions have not been confined to the petitioners in the writ petitions. The action of the respondents in confining the post of GNM for engagement under the NRHM Scheme pursuant to the directions given by this Court in the case of Raj Kumar & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors. SBCWP No.6207/2006, decided on 07.12.2016 to 3704 posts has been quashed and set aside, and a further direction has been given to deal with 2500 positions of GNM under NRHM Scheme strictly in accordance with the directions issued by this Court on 07.12.2016 in the case of Raj Kumar (supra) and further directions have been given.

A apprehension has been expressed by learned counsel for the petitioners that as the petitioners were not parties in the case of Suresh Kumar & Ors, and other connected writ petitions, which were decided by this Court, despite fulfilling the eligibility as per the directions given by this Court on 07.12.2016 in the case of Raj Kumar (supra), they would be left out and therefore, the present writ petitions have been filed.

The apprehension is totally misplaced and is not borne out from the orders passed by this Court. This Court while passing the directions in the case of Suresh Kumar & Ors. (supra) has not restricted the directions to the petitioners therein. The directions are general in nature and would cover each and every candidate, who is eligible in terms of the directions issued by this Court on 07.12.2016 in the case of Raj Kumar (supra).

In view of the above discussion, no further directions are required to be issued in the present writ petitions, the same are, therefore, disposed of.

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official सत्यमेव जयते

14. The State appealed. On 23.05.2019, the Division Bench granted an interim order in the appeals. The appeals were finally dismissed on 15.09.2025. The judgment of the learned Single Judge was affirmed. But the Division Bench did not stop short there. It noted the time lag and the fresh advertisement dated 28.01.2025. It then moulded the relief. Let us first have a look at that before proceeding further.

COURT DIRECTIONS

15. Paragraphs 28 to 34 of the judgment dated 15.09.2025 hold the key. They read as under.

"28. However, in order to meet the present fact-situation and considering the time lag and also because a fresh advertisement dated 28.01.2025 has been issued, we direct the State to first publish on its website, the merit list of all the candidates qua 6172 posts as ordered in the case of Rajkumar (supra), latest by 15.10.2025 or 6635 candidates as per list dated 28.02.2009

29. Each interested candidate whose name finds mention in such merit list, shall apply before the concerned Chief Medical and Health Officer alongwith a web-copy of the order of this Court in his favour (reflecting his/her name) latest by 31.10.2025.

30. All the candidates involved in the present bunch or the candidates whose writ petitions have already been disposed of in light of the judgment

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

of Rajkumar (supra), shall be given appointment, if their names find mention in the merit list/select list so published pursuant to the order instant. Before offering them appointment, the State shall be free to verify the documents of each of the candidates, in accordance with law. Their eligibility including age shall be considered as on the date of advertisement dated 04.05.2007.

31. Needless to observe that the present order shall apply only to the writ petitioners involved in the present appeals, and other petitioners whose writ petition(s) have been disposed of in terms of the order dated 19.12.2018 passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14497/2017.

32. In case, the recruitment process initiated vide advertisement dated 28.01.2025 is not yet finalized, the respondents-writ petitioners and all the candidates who are covered by the judgment shall be offered appointment prior to those persons who have applied and selected pursuant to such advertisement (dated 28.01.2025). The candidates applying pursuant to the advertisement dated 28.01.2025 shall be engaged only against the remaining posts.

33. All other conditions shall apply according to terms of the directions issued by the learned Single Judge.

34. So far as the posts to be advertised pursuant to PIP for 2025-26 are concerned, firstly all the writ petitioners involved in present batch so also similarly situated candidates whose writ petition(s) have been disposed of in terms of the judgment dated 19.12.2018, shall be offered appointment and then only, remaining available posts shall be advertised."

SUBMISSIONS OF THE PETITIONERS

16. Learned counsels for the petitioners submit that the judgments have attained finality. The respondents were parties throughout. Knowledge is not in doubt. The directions are clear and capable of immediate compliance.

17. They submitted that the State was bound to determine all GNM posts available up to 15.04.2008, distribute them district wise and appoint the petitioners against the additional 2,500 posts. That has not been done.

18. They also argued that the Division Bench gave the petitioners priority over the candidates under the advertisement dated 28.01.2025. The State has ignored that priority. Representations and a notice for demand of justice dated 13.07.2026 went unanswered. No impossibility is shown. The silence of the respondents is deliberate, is the contention. Thus they urge that appropriate action be taken against the erring officials under Section 2(b) read with Section 12 of the Contempt of

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

Courts Act, 1971, and they be directed to comply with the judgments, *ibid*.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

19. Learned counsels for the respondents submitted that there is no disobedience, much less wilful disobedience. They refer to the additional affidavit of the Joint Director, Medical and Health Services, Zone Jodhpur.

20. They would urge that the merit list of 6,635 candidates dated 28.02.2009 was obtained from the Director (Non Gazetted), Medical and Health Services. It was published on the official website on 15.10.2025. That was the date fixed by the Division Bench. By communication No. 0054 dated 19.11.2025, all Chief Medical and Health Officers were asked to report whether the petitioners figured in that list.

21. They also pointed out that only three petitioners were found in the list. They are Shri Madan Lal Choudhary son of Shri Ummedram Choudhary, Shri Jitendra Tailor son of Shri Ramniwas Tailor and Suman Choudhary daughter of Shri Ganesh Ram. Two are from Ajmer district. One is from Sikar district. A Committee was constituted on 21.04.2026 to examine the record. By note No. 552 dated 15.06.2026, the Director informed the Department that these three candidates had already been selected and offered appointment. The Chief Medical and Health Officers reported that they did not join.

22. They would also refer to the order dated 01.07.2026 of the Mission Director, National Health Mission, placed on record as Annexure AA/I. It is submitted that no further appointment is due from the list in respect of the petitioners. In the alternative, the respondents tender an unconditional apology. Reliance was placed on ***Arun Jain v. Naresh***

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

Pal Gangwar[2]. Thus the contempt proceedings are sought to be dropped.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS (*VIS-A-VIS* SCOPE OF CONTEMPT JURISDICTION)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

23. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record and the various precedents cited before us.

24. Civil contempt under Section 2(b) of the Act of 1971 requires wilful disobedience. Disobedience alone is not enough. The law on the point is well settled, and a few decisions will do before we advert to the merits of rival contentions.

25. The first set of decisions deals with the standard of proof and the mental element. In ***Ram Kishan v. Tarun Bajaj & Ors.***,[3] the Supreme Court held that disobedience must be shown to be wilful before a contemnor is punished. The word wilful brings in a mental element. Since the proceedings are quasi criminal, the charge must be proved to a high standard and cannot rest on mere probabilities. In ***Ashok Paper Kamgar Union & Ors. v. Dharam Godha & Ors.,***[4] the Supreme Court explained that wilful means an act done voluntarily and with specific intent. It does not cover an act that is careless, inadvertent or done in good faith.

26. The second set deals with restraint and the limits of the jurisdiction. In ***Anil Ratan Sarkar & Ors. v. Hirak Ghosh & Ors.***,[5] the Supreme Court cautioned that the power of contempt is to be used sparingly. In ***Sudhir Vasudeva, Chairman & Managing Director, ONGC & Ors. v. M. George Ravishekaran & Ors.,***[6] it held that the contempt court must stay within the four corners of the order said to be

---

[2] 2026: RJ-JD:14802-DB
[3] (2014) 16 SCC 204
[4] (2003) 11 SCC 1
[5] (2002) 4 SCC 21
[6] (2014) 3 SCC 373

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT सत्यमेव जयते

disobeyed. Only directions that are explicit and plainly self evident count. The court cannot add to the order, reopen what was decided or balance equities. In ***Jhareswar Prasad Paul & Anr. v. Tarak Nath Ganguly & Ors.***,[7] it held that the contempt court cannot decide fresh issues, which belong to the court of original jurisdiction. And in ***Dinesh Kumar Gupta v. United India Insurance Co. Ltd. & Ors.,***[8] it held that where wilful disobedience is in doubt, the contempt petition must fail.

Rajasthan High Court सत्यमेव जयते Web Copy - Not Official

27. Learned counsel for the respondents also relied on Arun Jain (supra). Since the principles above are settled by the Supreme Court, we need not discuss that decision separately.

28. Also, we may as well observe that one more principle applies. When an appellate court decides an appeal, the order of the lower court merges in the appellate order. Only one operative order then remains. That is the doctrine of merger explained in ***Kunhayammed & Ors. v. State of Kerala & Anr.***[9]

29. With that mindset, four questions arise for our decision viz. :-

a. First, what exactly are the directions now in force?

b. Second, which of the petitioners meet the conditions those directions lay down?

c. Third, have the respondents complied, including with paragraphs 32 and 34 of Division Bench judgment?

d. Fourth, if there is any default, is it wilful?

We propose to take them up in that order, in the succeeding part of our order.

30. The judgment of 19.12.2018 was carried in appeal. It was affirmed on 15.09.2025. It now operates through the appellate

[7] (2002) 5 SCC 352
[8] (2010) 12 SCC 770
[9] (2000) 6 SCC 359

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

judgment. The order dated 24.01.2019 added nothing of its own. It only held that the earlier directions covered all eligible candidates.

31. The Division Bench did more than affirm. It gave fresh and specific directions in paragraphs 28 to 34. Those directions control the manner of compliance today. Compliance must therefore be judged against them and not against the directions of 2016 or 2018 read alone.

32. This is the heart of the matter. The world of 2025 was not the world of 2007. Eighteen years had passed. The State had issued many fresh advertisements for contractual and regular posts. Recruitment had moved to annual Programme Implementation Plans. A fresh advertisement for 1,940 posts of Contractual Nurse had been issued on 28.01.2025 under the plan for 2024 to 2025. Many candidates of 2007 may have crossed the age limit. All this was placed before the Division Bench.

33. The Division Bench did not accept the plea that the 2,500 posts never existed. But it did accept that the time lag called for a different method. In its own words, the directions were given to meet the present fact situation and the time lag. A fresh district wise determination of posts and fresh merit lists were no longer required. In their place came a simpler route. The State was to publish an existing merit list. Each candidate was to apply to the Chief Medical and Health Officer by 31.10.2025. Appointment was to follow only if the name of the candidate appeared in the published list. Eligibility, including age, was to be tested as on 04.05.2007.

34. Two features of paragraph 28 of Division Bench judgment deserve notice. First, it gave the State a choice. The State could publish a merit list of all the candidates for 6,172 posts or the list of 6,635 candidates as per list dated 28.02.2009. The State chose the second. That was an option the Division Bench itself allowed. Second, the figures in this long

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

history do not neatly add up. 3,704 posts and 2,500 posts make 6,204, not 6,172. This shows why the Division Bench tied relief to a list of names and not to a head count of posts. A contempt court cannot now turn the order into a mandate to fill a fixed number of posts.

35. The result is plain. The right of a petitioner to appointment is no longer open ended. The present petitioners do clear the first hurdle. Their writ petition was disposed of on 24.01.2019 in terms of ***Suresh Kumar (supra)***, so they fall within paragraph 31 of the Division Bench judgment dated 15.09.2025. But that only brings them to the door. Two further conditions must still be met. The name of the candidate must appear in the published list, and the candidate must have applied by 31.10.2025. A petitioner who does not meet both conditions has no enforceable right under the judgment.

36. There is one more change of circumstance. On 23.05.2019, the Division Bench granted an interim order in the appeals. The six week period in ***Suresh Kumar (supra)*** could not run while that order held the field. The State cannot be faulted for not acting between 2019 and 2025. Non compliance during a stay is not contempt.

37. The petitioners still ask for the exercise directed in ***Rajkumar (supra).*** They want a fresh count of posts and a fresh district wise merit. That exercise has been replaced by the Division Bench. To insist upon it now is to ask us to go behind the appellate judgment. We cannot do so.

38. Let us now see what the respondents have done. The affidavit shows the steps taken. The list of 6,635 candidates was published on 15.10.2025. That was the last date allowed. District reports were called on 19.11.2025. A Committee was formed on 21.04.2026. Its findings were conveyed on 15.06.2026. An order of compliance followed on 01.07.2026.

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

39. The sequence also makes sense. The last date for candidates to apply was 31.10.2025. Reports from the districts could be called only after that date. They were called on 19.11.2025. The State did not wait for the representation of 04.07.2026 or the notice of 13.07.2026 to begin. Its steps had started in October 2025.

40. Learned counsel for the petitioners may say the record is vague. The offer letters to the three candidates are not on record. That is true. But the affidavit is sworn by a responsible officer. It is founded on the official record of 2009 and on reports of the Chief Medical and Health Officers. The burden lies on the petitioners to prove wilful disobedience to a high standard. A gap in the record does not prove that the affidavit is false. Any doubt goes to the benefit of the alleged contemnor. That is the settled position in ***Ram Kishan (supra).***

41. Nothing placed before us shows these facts to be untrue. The petition does not deal with the publication of the list at all. It speaks only of silence. The record shows action.

42. No doubt, respondents erred in causing delay as quite some time was taken between November 2025 and June 2026. We though do not approve of it, but delay in a long administrative exercise is not, by itself, wilful defiance. The respondents worked through the record of 2009. They did so through a Committee. That is not the conduct of a party bent on flouting the Court.

43. Only three petitioners were found in the list. Each was offered appointment, and none joined. The affidavit does not say on what date the offers were made. On either view the result is the same. If the offers were made in an earlier round, these three were already given what the list entitled them to. If the offers were made after 15.09.2025, the State did what paragraph 30 required. In both cases, nothing more remains to be done for them.

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT सत्यमेव जयते

44. The other petitioners do not claim that their names appear in the published list. Nor do they say they applied to the Chief Medical and Health Officer by 31.10.2025 as paragraph 29 requires. The petition is silent on both points. Without them, paragraph 30 does not help the petitioners.

Rajasthan High Court सत्यमेव जयते Web Copy - Not Official

45. If any petitioner says his name was wrongly left out, that is a new question. It needs evidence and a decision on merits. It is not a question of compliance. Following ***Sudhir Vasudeva (supra)*** and ***Jhareswar Prasad Paul (supra)***, we cannot decide it here. Nor can we direct appointment of persons whom the Division Bench did not cover. That would be adding to the Division Bench order.

46. The priority under paragraph 32 of the Division Bench judgment is conditional. It applies only if the recruitment under the advertisement dated 28.01.2025 was not yet finalised. Before the Division Bench, the State said that process had concluded. Whereas, learned counsels for the writ petitioners said it had not. The Division Bench left the point open and framed the direction as a condition.

47. Whether the process was final on 15.09.2025 is therefore a disputed fact. A contempt court does not resolve such disputes. More importantly, paragraph 32 of Division Bench judgment gives priority only to candidates covered by the judgment. Under paragraph 30, those are candidates whose names appear in the published list. A petitioner outside the list cannot claim priority over anyone. Carrying on with the 2025 recruitment is therefore not defiance of the Division Bench.

48. The petitioners have also not shown any appointment made under the advertisement dated 28.01.2025 after 15.09.2025 to the prejudice of a candidate whose name is in the published list. Without such material, there is nothing on which a charge could be framed. The

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

statement of the State before the Division Bench, that the process had concluded, stands uncontradicted by any document placed before us.

49. Paragraph 34 of the Division Bench judgment concerns posts to be advertised under the plan for 2025 to 2026. The petition does not allege any such advertisement made in breach of that paragraph. No case is made out on it.

50. Is there a wilful disobedience, is the question that needs to be addressed? We have tested the case against the settled law. The directions in force are those of 15.09.2025. The respondents acted on them within time. They acted on official records. Where they could give appointment, they offered it. Where the petitioners were not in the list, the directions gave them no right.

51. At the highest, the petitioners have a dispute about the reach of the order and about the contents of the list. That is not wilful disobedience. In the light of ***Ram Kishan (supra)***, ***Ashok Paper Kamgar Union (supra)*** and ***Dinesh Kumar Gupta (supra)***, the charge of contempt is not proved. In any case, in the alternative, the respondents have also offered an unconditional apology. But, an apology offered as a fallback does not purge contempt, and we do not rest our decision on it. Our conclusion stands on the absence of wilful disobedience.

52. We are conscious of what the petitioners have been through. They have litigated for about nineteen years. They won more than once. Yet most of them are not in service today.

53. But a contempt court cannot turn sympathy into a direction. Time changed the facts on which their rights first rested. The Division Bench took note of that change and moulded the relief. It drew the line at the merit list. Those on the right side of it have been offered appointment. Those on the other side must live with where the line was drawn.

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

54. Litigation that runs for two decades seldom ends the way each litigant hopes. Its outcome is shaped as much by time as by law. That is a vagary of litigation. It is not a wrong that contempt can cure.

CONCLUSION

55. For the reasons above, we hold as follows.

(i) The judgment dated 15.09.2025 governs compliance. The earlier directions of 07.12.2016, 19.12.2018 and 24.01.2019 now operate only as moulded by it.

(ii) The change of circumstances recognised by the Division Bench, and the interim order operating from 23.05.2019 till 15.09.2025, explain why the earlier directions were not carried out in their original form.

(iii) The respondents have taken the steps required by paragraphs 28 to 30 of the judgment dated 15.09.2025.

(iv) No wilful disobedience of any order of this Court is made out.

56. Nothing in this order is an expression of opinion on any claim outside the four corners of the judgment dated 15.09.2025.

57. All the contempt petitions are dismissed. The contempt proceedings are dropped. Notices issued to the respondents are discharged. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(YOGENDRA KUMAR PUROHIT),J **(ARUN MONGA),J**

Crt_3 (2040)
S-A/21-62
Dhananjay Sharma

SCHEDULE-A

Sr No.	CASE NO.	TITLE	RESERVED ON	UNDER CHALLENGE
1.	1108/2026	JITENDRA KUMAR MISHRA V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONER HEREIN SEEKS INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE RESPONDENTS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 19.12.2018 AND 15.09.2025. A FURTHER DIRECTION IS SOUGHT FOR GRANT OF APPOINTMENT AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

				AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH ALL CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS.
2.	1118/2026	AMIT KUMAR V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONER HEREIN SEEKS INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE RESPONDENTS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 24.01.2019 AND 15.09.2025. A FURTHER DIRECTION IS SOUGHT FOR GRANT OF APPOINTMENT AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH ALL CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS.
3.	1122/2026	JULFIKAR MANSURI V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 414/2019 AND CONNECTED MATTERS AND A DIRECTION TO PUBLISH THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT APPOINTMENTS TO THE ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES, DESPITE SUBMISSION OF REPRESENTATIONS WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED TIME AND SERVICE OF LEGAL NOTICE DATED 18.07.2026.
4.	1123/2026	RAVI KUMAR VASHISTHA V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 07.12.2016, 19.12.2018 AND 15.09.2025, WHEREBY THE RESPONDENTS WERE DIRECTED TO PREPARE MERIT LISTS AND GRANT APPOINTMENTS TO ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES FOR THE POST OF NURSE GRADE-II (GNM).
5.	1124/2026	RISHI RAJ V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 24.01.2019 AND 15.09.2025 AND A DIRECTION TO GRANT APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS AND FILING OF A COMPLIANCE AFFIDAVIT.
6.	1126/2026	RAKESH KUMAR AGRAWAL V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 414/2019 AND CONNECTED MATTERS, WHEREBY THE RESPONDENTS WERE DIRECTED TO ISSUE APPOINTMENT ORDERS TO ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES WHO SUBMITTED THEIR DETAILS BY 31.10.2025, DESPITE THE PETITIONERS HAVING SUBMITTED THEIR REPRESENTATIONS WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED TIME.
7.	1128/2026	JAVED BEGH V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 414/2019 AND CONNECTED MATTERS, WHEREBY THE RESPONDENTS WERE DIRECTED TO ISSUE APPOINTMENT ORDERS TO ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES WHO SUBMITTED THEIR DETAILS BY 31.10.2025, DESPITE THE PETITIONERS HAVING SUBMITTED THEIR REPRESENTATIONS WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED TIME.

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

8.	1137/2026	HANUMAN PRASAD MALI V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 414/2019 AND CONNECTED MATTERS AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE APPOINTMENT ORDERS IN THEIR FAVOUR, DESPITE SUBMISSION OF REPRESENTATIONS WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED TIME AND SERVICE OF LEGAL NOTICE DATED 18.07.2026.
9.	1172/2026	ANIL KUMAR SWAMI V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 19.12.2018 AND 15.09.2025. A FURTHER DIRECTION IS SOUGHT FOR GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH ALL CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS.
10.	1173/2026	NISHAR AHAMAD V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	14.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 1301/2019 AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE APPOINTMENT ORDERS IN THEIR FAVOUR, DESPITE THEIR NAMES FIGURING IN THE MERIT/SELECT LIST AND SUBMISSION OF CLAIMS, FOLLOWING CONTEMPT NOTICE DATED 18.07.2026.
11.	1193/2026	RADHA GOPAL TIWARI V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 414/2019 AND CONNECTED MATTERS AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE APPOINTMENT ORDERS IN THEIR FAVOUR, DESPITE SUBMISSION OF REPRESENTATIONS WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED TIME AND SERVICE OF LEGAL NOTICE DATED 18.07.2026.
12.	1198/2026	TARESH KUMAR TRIPATHI V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 24.01.2019 AND 15.09.2025. A FURTHER DIRECTION IS SOUGHT FOR GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS, AND FILING OF A COMPLIANCE AFFIDAVIT.
13.	1201/2026	MANOHAR LAL SHARMA V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	14.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 414/2019 AND CONNECTED MATTERS AND A DIRECTION TO PUBLISH THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT APPOINTMENTS TO THE ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES, DESPITE SUBMISSION OF REPRESENTATIONS WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED TIME AND SERVICE OF LEGAL NOTICE DATED 18.07.2026.

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

14.	1350/2026	OM PRAKASH V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONER HEREIN SEEKS INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 AND A DIRECTION TO PREPARE THE MERIT LIST AND PROVIDE APPOINTMENT TO THE PETITIONERS. A FURTHER DIRECTION IS SOUGHT TO RESTRAIN APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025 DURING THE PENDENCY OF THE CONTEMPT PETITION.
15.	1351/2026	MAHESH KUMAR V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	14.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 19.12.2018 AND 15.09.2025 AND A DIRECTION TO GRANT APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS AND FILING OF A COMPLIANCE AFFIDAVIT.
16.	1352/2026	ALLARAKHA V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 BY PREPARATION OF THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS, ALONG WITH INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND RESTRAINT ON FURTHER APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025
17.	1353/2026	DINESH KUMAR BISHNOI V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 BY PREPARATION OF THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS, ALONG WITH APPROPRIATE ACTION AGAINST THE RESPONDENT-CONTEMNORS AND RESTRAINT ON APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025 PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE CONTEMPT PETITION.
18.	1354/2026	MOINUDDIN NEELGAR V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 BY PREPARATION OF THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS, ALONG WITH INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND RESTRAINT ON FURTHER APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025 PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE PETITION.
19.	1355/2026	RAM NARESH GURJAR V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 BY PREPARATION OF THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS, ALONG WITH INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND RESTRAINT ON APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025 PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE PETITION.
20.	1360/2026	MADAN LAL V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 BY PREPARATION OF THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS, INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND RESTRAINT ON FURTHER APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025 PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE PETITION.
21.	1377/2026	PRAKASH CHAND V/S	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

		STATE OF RAJASTHAN		JUDGMENTS DATED 19.12.2018 AND 15.09.2025 AND A DIRECTION TO GRANT APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS AND FILING OF A COMPLIANCE AFFIDAVIT.
22.	1401/2026	RAKESH KUMAR V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 19.12.2018 AND 15.09.2025 AND A DIRECTION TO GRANT APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS AND FILING OF A COMPLIANCE AFFIDAVIT.
23.	1440/2026	DURGA PRATAP SINGH CHAUHAN V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 BY PREPARATION OF THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS, ALONG WITH INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND RESTRAINT ON APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025 PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE PETITION.
24.	1444/2026	HANUMAN RAM PATEL V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 21.01.2019 AND 15.09.2025 AND A DIRECTION TO GRANT APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS AND FILING OF A COMPLIANCE AFFIDAVIT.
25.	1445/2026	NARESH KUMAR MENARIYA V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 BY PREPARATION OF THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS, ALONG WITH INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND RESTRAINT ON FURTHER APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025 PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE PETITION.
26.	1448/2026	SUBHASG CHANDER NITHARWAL V/S GYATRI RATHORE (IAS)	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 571/2019 AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE POSTING ORDERS AGAINST THE ADJUDICATED VACANT POSTS.
27.	1450/2026	MAHENDRA SINGH MAAN V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 19.12.2018 AND 15.09.2025 AND A DIRECTION TO GRANT APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS AND FILING OF A COMPLIANCE AFFIDAVIT.
28.	1452/2026	SURESH KUMAR V/S GYATRI RATHORE	15.10.2026	PETITIONER HEREIN SEEKS INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 772/2019 AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE POSTING

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

				ORDERS AGAINST THE ADJUDICATED VACANT POSTS.
29.	1453/2026	MAHAVEER PRASAD BAJYA V/S GYATRI RATHORE	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 1304/2019 AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE POSTING ORDERS AGAINST THE ADJUDICATED VACANT POSTS.
30.	1454/2026	BIHARI LAL AHIR V/S GYATRI RATHORE	08.10.2026	THE PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 414/2019 AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE POSTING ORDERS AGAINST THE ADJUDICATED VACANT POSTS.
31.	1470/2026	HEMANT SONI V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 BY PREPARATION OF THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT OF APPOINTMENTS, ALONG WITH INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND RESTRAINT ON FURTHER APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025 PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE PETITION.
32.	1481/2026	BHAGWAN SAHAY SHARMA V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENTS DATED 19.12.2018 AND 15.09.2025 AND A DIRECTION TO GRANT APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE ADDITIONAL 2,500 GNM POSTS AVAILABLE AS ON 15.04.2008, ALONG WITH CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS.
33.	1519/2026	RAVINDRA KUMAR SHANDILYA V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONER HEREIN SEEKS INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 566/2019 AND CONNECTED MATTERS AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE APPOINTMENT ORDER IN HIS FAVOUR, DESPITE SUBMISSION OF HIS CLAIM WITHIN THE STIPULATED PERIOD AND SERVICE OF CONTEMPT NOTICE DATED 18.07.2026.
34.	1536/2026	GIRDHARI RAM POTLIYA V/S SMT. GAYATRI RATHORE	08.10.2026	PETITIONER HEREIN SEEKS INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. S.A.W. NO. 772/2019 AND A DIRECTION TO GRANT APPOINTMENTS AGAINST 2,500 POSTS IN TERMS OF THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE'S ORDER.
35.	1539/2026	KAILASH CHANDRA VYAS V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	08.10.2026	PETITIONER HEREIN SEEKS COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED BY THE DIVISION BENCH IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL (WRIT) NO. 414/2019 AND INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE RESPONDENTS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE THEREOF.
36.	1541/2026	SHRI NARAYAN SINGH SHEKHAWAT V/S SMT. GAYATRI RATHORE	08.10.2026	PETITIONER HEREIN SEEKS COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. S.A.W. NO. 776/2019 AND CONNECTED MATTERS BY GRANTING APPOINTMENTS AGAINST 2,500 POSTS, ALONG WITH INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

				DISOBEDIENCE THEREOF.
37.	1582/2026	RAMJILAL V/S GYATRI RATHORE	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 674/2019 AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE POSTING ORDERS AGAINST THE ADJUDICATED VACANT POSTS.
38.	1583/2026	DHARMENDRA KUMAR V/S GYATRI RATHORE	15.10.2026	PETITIONER HEREIN SEEKS INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 1301/2019 AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE POSTING ORDERS AGAINST THE ADJUDICATED VACANT POSTS.
39.	1584/2026	NARAYAN RAM V/S THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE ORDER DATED 15.09.2025, A DIRECTION TO PREPARE THE MERIT LIST AND GRANT APPOINTMENTS, AND RESTRAINT ON APPOINTMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ADVERTISEMENT DATED 28.01.2025 PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE CONTEMPT PETITION.
40.	1585/2026	GANESH KUMAR SHARMA V/S STATE OF RAJASTHAN	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. SPECIAL APPEAL WRIT NO. 414/2019 AND CONNECTED MATTERS AND A DIRECTION TO ISSUE APPOINTMENT ORDERS IN THEIR FAVOUR, DESPITE SUBMISSION OF CLAIMS WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED PERIOD AND SERVICE OF CONTEMPT NOTICE DATED 18.07.2026.
41.	1586/2026	MUKESH KUMAR V/S THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY	15.10.2026	PETITIONERS HEREIN SEEK INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 15.09.2025 PASSED IN D.B. S.A.W. NO. 414/2019 AND A DIRECTION TO GRANT APPOINTMENTS AGAINST THE 2,500 POSTS IN TERMS OF THE LEARNED SINGLE BENCH ORDER.

(Uploaded on 28/11/2026 at 10:11:26 PM)
(Downloaded on 29/11/2026 at 12:00:39 AM)