



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15630/2021

1. Kamal Kumar S/o Sh. Atma Ram, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village 1617H Ghanjatiyan, Tehsil Sri Karanpur, District - Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan. (Roll No. 15084)
2. Shashikant Sharma S/o Sh. Khemchand Sharma, Aged About 25 Years, R/o House No. R-425, In Front Of Circuit House, U.i.t. Colony, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan. (Roll No. 15320)

----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur, Through Its Registrar General.
2. Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.
3. Arya Institute Of Engineering And Research Centre, Through The Examiner, S.p. 40 Riico Industrial Area, Delhi Road, Kukas, Jaipur.
4. Rahul Kumar Khandelwal S/o Sh. Sunil Kumar Khandelwal, R/o V.p.o. Nangal Rajawatan, 182 Adarsh Colony, Ward No. 2, District - Dausa, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15637/2021

1. Gagandeep S/o Sh. Ashok Kumar, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Ward No. 04, Gali No. 01, Purani Abadi, District - Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 28862).
2. Vikram Singh Gurjar S/o Sh. Jagdish Kr Gurjar, Aged About 26 Years, R/o 4290 Narsingh Colony, Nahargarh Kile Ke Niche, Purani Basti, Jaipur District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 33293).
3. Ravi Gurjar S/o Sh. Durgalal Gurjar, Aged About 27 Years, R/o 4290 Nahargarh Kill Ki Nicha, Meena Para, Purani Basti, Jaipur District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 30980).
4. Pankaj Shakya S/o Sh. Rajender Kumar, Aged About 25 Years, R/o House No. D-119, Kedar Chowk Purani Abadi Ward No. 4, Sri Ganganagar, District - Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 37111).
5. Ajay Meena S/o Sh. Ramdhan Meena, Aged About 22



Years, R/o 4203, Neemri Police Station Ke Pass, Chhipo Ki Bagichi, Nahargarh Road, Jaipur District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 17603).

6. Devendra Kumar Meena S/o Sh. Harphool Meena, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Vill- Chainpura Post- Doroli, Tehsil- Kathumar, Kherli, Alwar, District- Alwar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 40446)
7. Mamta Bairwa D/o Sh. Babulal Bairwa, Aged About 28 Years, R/o 2/287, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 17126).
8. Tarun Madaan S/o Sh. Vijay Kumar, Aged About 24 Years, R/o 89 B, Harmilapi Colony, Sri Ganganagar, District - Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 23806).
9. Alok Kumar Swami S/o Sh. Vinod Kumar Swami, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Near Aamli Wale Balaji, Ward No. 21, Reengus, Sikar, District - Sikar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 24970).
10. Rahul Sharma S/o Sh. Shravan Lal Sharma, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Plot No. 15, Kalyanpuri-A, Kalyanpura, Mansarover, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 30538).
11. Satish Sharma S/o Sh. Jagdish Prasad, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Vpo Baldevgarh, Tehsil Rajgarh, District - Alwar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 24393).
12. Naveen Kumar Meena S/o Sh. Gopal Lal Meena, Aged About 26 Years, R/o P. No. 184, Gaitor Road, Brahmpuri, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 26559).
13. Surendra Singh S/o Sh. Hakim Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Vpo- Khan Penghore, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 26971).
14. Kamesh Garg S/o Sh. Ishwari Prasad Garg, Aged About 25 Years, R/o 63, Rajendra Neagr, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 27031).
15. Somendra Sharma S/o Sh. Shankar Lal Sharma, Aged About 25 Years, R/o R-51/180 Govind Nagar, West Amer Road, Jaipur, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 23982).
16. Mahesh Chand Sharma S/o Sh. Chiranji Lal Sharma, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village - Jagmalpura, Jagmalpura, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 33721).
17. Amit Kumar S/o Sh. Hanuman Sahai, Aged About 28





Years, R/o 59, Ram Dev Mandir Balai Basti Shastri Nagar, Jaipur, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 25797)

18. Hitesh Parmar S/o Sh. Narendra Kumar Parmar, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Darjiyo Ka Chowk, Khanda Falsa, Jodhpur, District - Jodhpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 17482).
19. Divya Goyal D/o Sh. Prakash Goyal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o House No. 397, Subhash Nagar, Pani Ki Tanki Ke Pass, Pal Road, Jodhpur, District - Jodhpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 24321).
20. Renu Bala D/o Sh. Brijlal, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Ward No. 19, Udaram Chowk, Near Khetarpal Mandir, Purani Abadi, Sri Ganganagar, District - Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 22958).
21. Mohammed Niem Qureshi S/o Sh. Abdul Latif Qureshi, Aged About 45 Years, R/o 27/143, Near Mehtab Ki Tal, Junawas, Bhilwara, District - Bhilwara, Rajasthan (Roll No. 15008).
22. Harshit Sharma S/o Sh. Surendra Kumar Sharma, Aged About 24 Years, R/o C-33 Jda Colony Siris Road, Bhankrota, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 25853).
23. Krishan Singh S/o Sh. Roop Singh Chouhan, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Ward No. 32, New Near Baba Ramdev Mandir, Suratgarh, District - Sriganganagar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 37246).
24. Dushyant S/o Sh. Kartar Singh, Aged About 22 Years, R/o B-142, Jawahar Nagar, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 30736).
25. Himanshu Sharma S/o Sh. Gireesh Kumar Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Adarash Nagar Sec.-1, Bayana, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 15512).
26. Sahil Kumar Yadav S/o Sh. Banwari Lal, Aged About 23 Years, R/o 32/256, Roshan Cycle Store Ke Samne, Kumher Gate, Main Market, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 15160).
27. Ravikant Katara S/o Sh. Laxmi Kant, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Mohalla Rupia Paysa Old Bayana Bus Stand, Bharatpur District Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 32592).
28. Pawan Kumar Singhal S/o Sh. Ramesh Chand Singhal, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Out Side Mathura Gate, Infront





Of Bharat Studio, Bharatpur, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 21246).

29. Poonam D/o Sh. Govind Singh Saini, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Bamda Colony, Subhash Chowk, Bayana, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 26355).
30. Khushboo Gautam S/o Sh. Surendra Babu, Aged About 27 Years, R/o 591Iyan/809, Baldev Bihar Kharika Telibagh, Lucknow, District - Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh (Roll No. 40429).
31. Yogendra Saini S/o Sh. Trilok Chand Saini, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Namak Katra Chandpole Gate, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 17260).
32. Nitin Mittal S/o Sh. Ramavatar Mittal, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Mittal Machinery Store Infront Of Panchayat Samiti Alwar Road Nagar Bharatpur, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 27325).
33. Adesh S/o Sh. Mahesh Chand, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Shyam Nagar Colony, Near Central School, Bharatpur, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 37681).
34. Umesh Kumar Verma S/o Sh. Beerendra Kumar Varma, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Shiv Nagar Infront Of Arya Agency Circular Road, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 15156).
35. Ansul Gupta S/o Sh. Om Prakash Gupta, Aged About 32 Years, R/o House No. 3/17, Housing Board Jawahar Nagar, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 29353).
36. Rahul Kumar S/o Sh. Atar Singh, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Vpo Peeli, The. Nadabai, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 15418).
37. Harendra Kumar S/o Sh. Shankar Lal Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Gopal Garh Jaghina Gate, Bharatpur, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 41016).
38. Ankit Kumar S/o Sh. Rajvir Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Vpo Mai, Mai, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 28526).
39. Pallav Sharma S/o Sh. Sanjeev Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Gayatri Public School, Gour Mohalla, Arain, Ajmer, District - Ajmer, Rajasthan (Roll No. 41945).
40. Ekta Chejara D/o Ram Lal Chejara, Aged About 34 Years,





R/o Maya Vihar, Colony Ward 22, Near Court, District - Sri Madhopur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 35571).

41. Shobhit Khanna S/o Sh. Anand Khanna, Aged About 30 Years, R/o 2128 Nagarpara Gangori Bazar, Infront Of Watar Works Department, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 57554).
42. Hem Raj Gurjar S/o Sh. Kanhaiya Lal Gurjar, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Jodhula Via Maid, Tehsil - Virat Nagar, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No. 27096).
43. Anil Sharma S/o Sh. Makhan Lal Sharma, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Ward No. 4, Sadulsahar, Sri Ganganagar District - Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 33875).
44. Mayank Bhardwaj S/o Sh. Deepak Kumar Bhardwaj, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Chitavan Ki Gali, Near Police Line, Outside Malakhera Gate, Alwar District - Alwar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 25693).
45. Piyush Sharma S/o Sh Sajjan Lal Sharma, Aged About 24 Years, R/o 5/4, New Civil Line, Housing Board, District - Banswara, Rajasthan (Roll No. 29265).
46. Shilpa Choudhary D/o Shri Mahendra Singh Moond, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Bhairupura, Post Kaswali Tehsil Laxmangarh, Sikar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 24813).
47. Sachin Kumar S/o Shri Subhakaran, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Jhatawa Khurd, Post Niradhanu, Malsisar, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan (Roll No. 25935).
48. Bhuwan Singh S/o Shri Dinesh Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Ward No. 43, Behind Bsnl Office, Sureshiya, Hanumangarh Junction, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan (Roll No. 19999).
49. Bhagat Singh S/o Shri Harphool Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Vpo Hetamsar, Via Nua, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan (Roll No. 29214).
50. Umang Gadhwal S/o Shri Jai Karan Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Isharpura, Post Hamiri Kalan, Malsisar, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan (Roll No. 22973).
51. Vikash Kumar Gurawa S/o Shri Guljhari Lal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Ward No. 5, Meghawal Mohala, Village Brijlalpura, Tehsil Chirawa, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan (Roll No. 24078).





52. Manoj Kumar S/o Shri Ramniwas, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Bhurasar Ka Bass, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan (Roll No. 26474).
53. Ashutosh Saini S/o Shri Gopal Saini, Aged About 19 Years, R/o Tilak Nagar, Devipura Road, Near Pratap Nursery, District - Sikar, Rajasthan (Roll No. 18066).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur, Through Its Registrar General.
2. Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15638/2021

1. Himanshu Sharma S/o Sh. Tulsi Ram Sharma, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Near C.h.b. Jodhpur.
2. Kuldeep Chouhan S/o Sh. Nathunath, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Near Kisan Hostel, Merta City, District Nagaur (Raj.).
3. Govind Arora S/o Sh. Kailash Arora, Aged About 20 Years, Resident Of Near C.h.b, Jodhpur.
4. Amit Borawar S/o Sh. Mahesh Borawar, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Near Uco Bank First C Road, Sardarpura, Jodhpur.
5. Dileep Prajapat S/o Sh. Ramdev Prajapat, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Near Uco Bank First C Road, Sardarpura, Jodhpur.
6. Mohammed Adnan S/o Mohammed Shadique, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Nagorigate, Jodhpur.
7. Satish Bishnoi S/o Sh. Birma Ram, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Bishnoi Mohalla, Ramdev Colony, Chandpole, Jodhpur (Raj.).
8. Rekha Rajpurohit D/o Sh. Ganpat Singh, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of 27, Rajpurohito Ka Bas, Sukarlai, Roopawas, District Pali (Raj.).
9. Shubham Vyas S/o Sh. Ashok Kumar Vyas, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Lalani Vyason Ka Chauk, District Bikaner.



10. Mukul Acharya S/o Sh. Ashok Acharya, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Outside Usta Bari, Harolai Hanuman Mandir Road, Near Moongiri Gufa, Bikaner (Raj.).
11. Kalicharan Pareek S/o Devidutt Pareek, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Near Pandey Ji Ki Taal, Indira Colony, District Bikaner (Raj.).
12. Sourabh Vyas S/o Sh. Jay Kumar Vyas, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Mundron Ka Chauk, District Bikaner (Raj.).
13. Dishant Solanki S/o Sh. Rajesh Solanki, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Inside Sheetlagate, Near Mahadev Temple, District Bikaner (Raj.).
14. Shivam Vyas S/o Sh. Shyam Sunder Vyas, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Nathaniyo Ki Saray, Ranga Ki Gali Barah Guwad Chowk, Bikaner (Raj.).
15. Ramjan Bhutta S/o Abdul Bhutta, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Mahboob Tailor Ki Gali, Te3Liwada Road, District Bikaner (Raj.).
16. Lekha Modi D/o Sh. Ishwar Dayal Modi, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of House No. 1, Vakilo Ki Gali, Chootina Well, District Bikaner (Raj.).
17. Sakshi Modi D/o Sh. Sushil Kumar Modi, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of 1/97 Mukta Prasad Nagar, District Bikaner (Raj.).
18. Ananya Mishra D/o Brijesh Mishra, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Patel Nagar, District Bikaner (Raj.).
19. Navratan Vyas S/o Sh. Vishnu Dutt Vyas, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Mohta Chowk, Udhodas Ki Perol, District Bikaner (Raj.).
20. Vijay Laxmi Modi D/o Sh Gauri Shankar Modi, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of 4 - E- 274 J.n.v. Colony, Bikaner (Raj.).
21. Komal Modi D/o Girdhari Lal Modi, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of B- 1 - 44 Sudarshan Nagar, Pawan Puri, Bikaner (Raj.).
22. Rizwana Parihar D/o Abdul Hameed Parihar, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Sonaro Ki Bagechi Ke Pichhe, Bharat Gas Agency Ke Samne, District Bikaner (Raj.).





23. Asraf S/o Anwar Ali, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Behind Rajasthan Patrika Mohalla, Purani Masjid Gali, District Bikaner (Raj.).
24. Subham Gehlot S/o Anil Kumar Gehlot, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Sati Dadi Mandir, Bpo Palana, Bikaner (Raj.).
25. Mahesh Suthar S/o Sh. Shyamlal Suthar, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Udairamsar, Bikaner (Raj.).
26. Krishan Chandra Chura S/o Purushotam Das Chura, Aged About 19 Years, Resident Of Jassusar Gate Bikaner (Raj.).
27. Vijendra Singh Bhati S/o Bharu Singh Bhati, Aged About 30 Years, Resident A - 28 Vallabh Garden, Near Shiv Shakti Marble, Bikaner (Raj.).
28. Aditya Tiwari S/o Sh. Satya Narayan Tiwari, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of 13/125 Mukta Prasad Nagar, Bikaner (Raj.).
29. Manish Kumar Sharma S/o Ramakant Sharma, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Mukund Nagar, Jaipur (Raj.).
30. Abhishek Swami S/o Ramkishan Swami, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Nathusar Bas, Bikaner (Raj.).
31. Sahil Chouhan S/o Mohd. Hussain, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Pabubari, Bikaner (Raj.).
32. Mritunjaya Sain S/o Rajesh Kumar Sain, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Qi. 120, 121, Ott. Mukta Prasad Nagar, Bikaner (Raj.).
33. Brijmohan Rajpurohit S/o Sh. Goverdhan Lal Rajpurohit, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Sadafateh, Jhanwron Ka Chowk, Bikaner (Raj.).
34. Ravina Shrimali D/o Sh. Giriraj Shrimali, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Mohalla Chungiran Brahmpuri Chowk, Bikaner (Raj.).
35. Sachin Soni S/o Sh. Shrawan Soni, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of B - 4 - 259, Sudarrshan Nagar, Bikaner (Raj.).
36. Azaz Ahamad S/o Liaquat Ali, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Mohalla Chungarar, Bikaner (Raj.).
37. Vinod Sain S/o Chandan Ram Sain, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of C- 411G Rajendra Prasad Colony, Jaisalmer,





(Raj.).

38. Seema Jangir D/o Tarachand Jangir, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Private Bus Stand, Tehsil Deedwana District Nagaur (Raj.).
39. Amit Garuwa S/o Sh. Rameshwar Lal, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Vill. Rajeru Tehsil Sridungargarh, Rajeru, Bikaner (Raj.).

----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan High Court Jodhpur, Through The Registrar General.
2. Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15640/2021


1. Satyendra Kumar Gaur S/o Late Sh. Ganga Lahri Gaur, Aged About 36 Years, P.no. 13-A, Kishan Vihar, Goner Road, Jaipur 302031 (Rajasthan). Roll No. 29787
2. Manuraj Singh S/o Shivraj Singh, Aged About 27 Years, P.no. 151-A, Shriram Nagar-A, Khirni Phatak Road, Jhotwara, Jaipur (Raj.). Roll No. 22302
3. Tarun Kumar Sharma S/o Badri Prasad Sharma, Aged About 25 Years, Behind Of Panchayat Samiti, Shiv Colony, Bandikui-303313 (Dausa) Roll No. 22811
4. Kiran Rajput S/o Ramesh Singh Rajput, Aged About 34 Years, 11, Shrimal Colony, Lal Halway Ke Pass, Hida Ki Mori, Jaipur, Tripoliya Bazar Roll No. 38364
5. Priyanka Meena D/o Suresh Meena, Aged About 24 Years, Banzaro Ka Mohalla, Vpo Kachroda Puhulera, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll N. 15046
6. Megha Singhal D/o Hari Mohan Singhal, Aged About 26 Years, Behind New Mandi, Agarwal Colony, Hindaun City, Karauli, Rajasthan, Roll No. 36218
7. Harish Sahu S/o Banwari Lal Sahu, Aged About 21 Years, Annpurna Dungri Bamor Road, Tonk, Rajasthan Roll No. 18767
8. Ramjas Gurjar S/o Prahlad Gurjar, Aged About 19 Years, Vill Post Soran, Teh. Dist. Tonk, Rajasthan Roll No. 35660





9. Divya Sain D/o Bhgwan Sahay Sain, Aged About 27 Years, Near Jain Mandir, Aadarsh Nagar Depot Tonk, Rajasthan Roll No. 22336
10. Upasana Sharma D/o Surgyani Sharma C/o Surgyani Sharma, Aged About 24 Years, Tiba Toll Tax, Behind Hotel Raj Fort, Tonk Road 16 Km, Sanganer, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 27999
11. Santosh Meena D/o Banwari Lal Meena, Aged About 26 Years, 4 C 19, Rajkiy Malti Stori, Gandhi Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 25362
12. Rajat Singh S/o Indra Bhushan Gupta, Aged About 25 Years, Rajeev Colony, Near T V Tower, Deeg, Bharatpur, Rajasthan Roll No. 22213
13. Shiv Kumar Meena S/o Shankar Lal Meena, Aged About 19 Years, Vpo Mathasula, Teh. Jamwaramgarh, Dist. Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 18226
14. Ajay Kumar Beniwal S/o Chiranji Lal Bairwa, Aged About 24 Years, Near Community Centre, Vpo Watika, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 20502
15. Dinesh Kumar Verma S/o Mahesh Kumar, Aged About 22 Years, Vill Dhadha, Post Sudarpura, Teh. Kotputli, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 34534
16. Praveen Sharma S/o Suresh Sharma, Aged About 23 Years, Tehsil Parbatsar, Kinsariya, Nagaur, Rajasthan Roll No. 15294
17. Neha Gaur D/o Ghanshyam Gaur, Aged About 23 Years, 814-A, Banshi Bhawan, Tikki Walon Ka Rasta, Kishanpole Bazar, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll N. 29619
18. Juhi D/o Rajbeer Singh, Aged About 31 Years, Ward No. 11, Street No. 2, Near Sukhwant Palace, Purani Abadi, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan Roll N. 27065
19. Rahul Badoliya S/o Chhoga Lal Badoliya, Aged About 19 Years, 6, Maa Tripura Nagar, Tejajai Ka Bada, Sanganer, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 27945
20. Nisha Agarwal D/o Satish Chand Agarwal, Aged About 25 Years, 14C, Shrimal Colony, Hida Ki Mori, Surajpole Bazar, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 31478
21. Dev Karan Sahu S/o Dalip Chand Sahu, Aged About 31 Years, Village Raipura, Post Ratusar, Tehsil Sardarshahar,





District Churu, Rajasthan Roll No. 27501

22. Sumitra Devi D/o Bhaira Ram, Aged About 27 Years, 23, Dablibas Molavi 1 Dbi 1, Pilibangan, Dabli Rathan, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan Roll No. 30494
23. Savita Rajbhar D/o Nandji Prasad, Aged About 32 Years, P. No. 106, Royal Tatvam, Iskcon Road, Dholai, Mansarovar, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll N. 19658
24. Kashish Kharra D/o Hari Narayan Kharra, Aged About 23 Years, C-17, Shriji Nagar, Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 31412
25. Purushottam Thathera S/o Roop Narayan Thathera, Aged About 21 Years, Parmanand Colony, Ladnu Road, Didwana, Nagaur, Rajasthan Roll No. 24348
26. Khushee Ram Meena S/o Deep Ram Meena, Aged About 21 Years, Vill Dovnagar, Post Sukar, The Bamanwas, Sawi Madhopur, Rajasthan Roll No. 26742
27. Ramanand Sharma S/o Jagdish Prasad Sharma, Aged About 34 Years, 180, Hariyana Mohalla, Vpo Natoj, Kathumar, Alwar, Rajasthan Roll No. 15191
28. Ashishi Kumar Bansal S/o Omprakash Bansal, Aged About 31 Years, 101, Bhola Patti, Mahu Khas, The Hindaun City, Dist Karauli, Rajasthan 322254 Roll No. 15170
29. Deepak Sharma S/o Jagdish Prasad Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, Vpo Natoj, Tehsil Kathumar, Natoj, Dist-Alwar, 321606, Rajasthan Roll No. 25404
30. Akash Khandelwal S/o Damodar Prasad Khandelwal, Aged About 25 Years, 3700, Babu Katiba, Surajpole Bazar, Jaipur Rajasthan, Jaipur, Jatpur - 302003, Rajasthan Roll No. 22346
31. Ashok Pathak S/o Sushil Kumar Pathak, Aged About 29 Years, D/668, Rpa, Shastri Nagar, Jaipur 302016, Rajasthan Roll No. 15271
32. Pranay Sharma S/o Umesh Sharma, Aged About 26 Years, 60-A, Jai Bhawani Colony, Khatipura, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 24940
33. Mahesh Sharma S/o Ishwar Lal Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, 24, Jaitpuri Colony, 80 Feet Road, Mahesh Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 31928





34. Ajay Khurana S/o Ashok Kumar Khurana, Aged About 29 Years, House No. 1, Street No. 7, Setia Colony, Near Gururam Dass Gurudwara, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan Roll N. 29790
35. Laxmi Lawa D/o Ghetan Lawa, Aged About 22 Years, Beside H - 307, H-Block, Siddharth Nagar, Getor Jagatpura, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 18253
36. Khushi Bansal D/o Santosh Kumar Bansal, Aged About 21 Years, 13/423, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 32620
37. Mangal Prajapati S/o Rajendra Prajapati, Aged About 24 Years, Ward No. 30, Subhash Nagar Bhind, Bhind - 477001 (Mp) Roll No. 15372
38. Shashi Kant Meena S/o Kehari Mal Meena, Aged About 28 Years, P.no. 56, Shyam Nagar, Roopbass, Alwar 301001 Rajasthan Roll No. 17923
39. Devesh Kumar S/o Jagmohan Sain, Aged About 25 Years, Behind Ashok Takies, Khatik Padi Mohalla, Alwar 301001 Rajasthan Roll No. 25262
40. Rajaram Meena S/o Mukesh Kumar Meena, Aged About 23 Years, Outside Delhi Gate, Dugar Wala Kaun, Meena Padi, Alwar 301001 Rajasthan Roll No. 31050
41. Nitish S/o Rajendra Singh, Aged About 26 Years, H.no. 635, Ward 18, Gali No. 1, Near Kisan Bhawan, Shiv Colony, Jind, Haryana Roll No. 17218
42. Ravindra Kumar Swami S/o Kanha Ram Swami, Aged About 23 Years, House No. 11-C-2, Shakti Nagar, Suratgarh, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan Roll No. 42451
43. Abhishek Sharma S/o Rajesh Kumar Sharma, Aged About 27 Years, A-4, Balaji Nagar, Goverdhan Vilas, Sector-14, R.h.b., Udaipur, Rajasthan Roll No. 16953
44. Lalit Kumar Verma S/o Malchand Verma, Aged About 27 Years, Power House Ke Samne, Kishangarh, Renwal, Jaipur 303603 Roll No. 32163
45. Anil Kumar S/o Anand Prakash, Aged About 32 Years, H-109, Indira Nagar, Jhalana Dungari Phase -2 302004 Roll No. 15110
46. Israr Khan S/o Mohammed Ushman Khan, Aged About 27 Years, 49 Madina Nagar, Jhotwara, Jaipur 302012 Roll No.





32292

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur, Through Its Registrar General, Principal Seat At Jodhpur.
2. Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15641/2021

1. Hemant Parihar S/o Sh. Chanda Ram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Tapariya Bera, Opp. Chand Poll, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 15348).
2. Paras Rakhecha S/o Sh. Vijay Raj, Aged About 29 Years, R/o 48-C, Shri Ram Marg, Near Ayushi Tower, Pal Road Masuriya, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 25595).
3. Hemant Kumar Sharma S/o Sh. Kamal Kishore, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Ward No.21, Near Idea Tower, Taranagar, District- Churu (Raj.). (Roll No. 15467).
4. Ashish Kumawat S/o Sh. Sharwan Kumar Kumawat, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Ward No. 03, Vpo- Pachar, The Dantaramgarh, Pachar, District- Sikar (Raj.). (Roll No. 35470).
5. Rahul Sankhla S/o Sh. Rakesh Sankhla, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Sharda Colony, Balad Road, Beawar, District- Ajmer (Raj.). (Roll No. 15270).
6. Ashok Kumar Choudhary S/o Sh. Babu Lal Choudhary, Aged About 23 Years, R/o A-43, Patel Nagar, Sinwar Mode, Post- Sinwar, Jhotwara, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 26955).
7. Gaurav Chaturvedi S/o Sh. Omprakash Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Gandhi Nagar, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 15577).
8. Ramji Lal Sharma S/o Sh. Prabhu Narayan Sharma, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Vpo Titariya, Tehsil- Chaksu, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 35868).
9. Mahendra Jakhar S/o Sh. Shivraj Jakhar, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Mana Bera, Ajmer Road, Raghunathpura, Post- Peeh The Parbatsar, District- Nagaur (Raj.). (Roll No. 28303).






10. Chandra Wali D/o Sh. Gagan Bhojwani, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Near Hindu Pada Sanatan Dharma Temple, District- Alwar (Raj.). (Roll No. 17602).
11. Arpit Kumawat S/o Sh. Nanu Ram Kumawat, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Vki Area, Laxminarayanpura, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 16194).
12. Dilip Chouhan S/o Sh. Prakash, Aged About 25 Years, R/o J-231, Behind Power House, Pratap Nagar, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 17623).
13. Jitesh Songara S/o Sh. Prakash Songara, Aged About 25 Years, R/o K-140, Indra Colony, Behind Police Chowki Pratap Nagar, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 15088).
14. Saloni Ojha D/o Sh. Bhanu Ojha, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Ganesh Colony, Fatehpur, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 40948).
15. Aakansha Pandey D/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar Pandey, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Krishna Puram Colony, Ward No. 10, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 40299).
16. Hina Soni D/o Sh. Rakesh Soni, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Near Radha Raman Temple, Old Shivpuri, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 32524).
17. Juli Soni D/o Sh. Kailash Soni, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Krishan Puram Colony, Fatehpur Road, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 43499).
18. Gagan Sharma S/o Sh. Omprakash Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Near Kothi No. 26, Fatehpur, Tongra Road, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 39245).
19. Zuber Khan S/o Sh. Shafiq Khan, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Aklera Old Bus Stand, Tehsil- Aklera, District- Jhalawar (Raj.). (Roll No. 30083).
20. Mohd. Aaqib Khan S/o Sh. Abdul Qayum Khan, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Near Old Kotwali, Street Of Banduk Walan, Mangalpura, District- Jhalawar (Raj.). (Roll No. 15272).
21. Sunil Natwadia S/o Sh. Ranjeet Ram, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Tan Ki Dhani, Mandabhupawas, Kalwar, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 31191).
22. Shivam Bajpai S/o Sh. Ajai Bajpai, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Ward No. 31, Subhash Nagar Bhind, District- Bhind



(Raj.). (Roll No. 15401).


23. Rahul Pareva S/o Sh. Ramji Lal Parewa, Aged About 21 Years, R/o 203-204, Sindhu Nagar, Bhumiya Ji Temple, Murlipura, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 15429).
24. Jyoti Sharma D/o Sh. Bhawani Shankar Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Plot No. 4, Shankar Vihar Vistar-B, Murlipura Scheme, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 17481).
25. Sonali Sharma D/o Sh. Late Hariom Sharma, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Opp. Siddeshwar Mela Ground, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 30065).
26. Sourabh Chaturvedi S/o Sh. Om Prakash Sharma, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Gandhi Nagar, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 15578).
27. Hemant Lakhara S/o Sh. Satya Narayan, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Kumariya Kua, Jatiyon Ki Gali, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 15399).
28. Kiran Jangid D/o Sh. Pramendra Jangid, Aged About 24 Years, A-114, Shyam Nagar, Jhotwara, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 26778).
29. Pawan Kumar Kumawat S/o Sh. Gopal Lal Kumawat, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Basri Khurd, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 31190).
30. Deepesh Jain S/o Sh. Prem Narayan Jain, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Kharai, Post- Kharai, Tehsil- Kolaras, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 37950).
31. Shubham Sharma S/o Sh. Radheshyam, Aged About 20 Years, R/o 8/104, Chopasani Housing Board, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 17594).
32. Prema Ram S/o Sh. Kishna Ram, Aged About 21 Years, R/o 136, Gorchiyo Ki Dhani, G/p- Parasala, Tehsil- Bapini, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 25805).
33. Pradeep Kumawat S/o Sh. Prahalad Kumawat, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Lalpura, Tehsil- Amber, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 37123).
34. Vishal Hatwal S/o Sh. Gajanand Hatwal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Harijan Basti, Tehsil- Chomu, Kaladera, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 33012).





35. Meenu Devanda D/o Sh. Mohan Lal Devanda, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Ward No. 11, Dabri Rampura, Dabri, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 38403).
36. Kavita Vaishnav D/o Late Sh. Shyam Sunder Vaishnav, Aged About 25 Years, R/o House No. 61, Vishnu Laxmi Nagar, Behind Rto Office, Bjs Colony, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 15451).
37. Dharmendra Sankhla D/o Sh. Jitendra Sankhla, Aged About 25 Years, R/o 105, Nehru Nagar, Opp. B R Birla School, Jhanwar Road, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 25590).
38. Navdeep Ratnu S/o Sh. Chaindan Ratnu, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Karni Colony, Near Karni Mandir, District- Nagaur (Raj.). (Roll No. 21804).
39. Lovely Longwani D/o Sh. Kamlesh Longwani, Aged About 33 Years, R/o 17E/277, Chopasani Housing Board, District- Jodhpur (Raj.). (Roll No. 35948).
40. Kuldeep Singh Parihar S/o Sh. Deepak, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Navgrah Colony, Opp. Sector 2, Gol Pahadiya Lashkar, Gwalior (M.p.). (Roll No. 18576).
41. Shashwat Yadav S/o Sh. Sanjay Yadav, Aged About 21 Years, R/o State Bank Colony, Shivaji Ward, District- Sagar (M.p.). (Roll No. 17456).
42. Lakshman Kurmi S/o Sh. Kanhaiyalal, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village- Amet, Post- Rajoua, District- Sagar (M.p.). (Roll No. 26540).
43. Rohit Kumar Chourasia S/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar Chourasia, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Opp. Shiv Vihar Colony, Tili Ward, District- Sagar (M.p.). (Roll No. 20076).
44. Amit S/o Sh. Ved Prakash, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Near Shiv Mandir, Ward No. 10, H. No. 1275, Bhuna, District- Fatehabad (Haryana). (Roll No. 15856).
45. Rahul Gole S/o Sh. Parimal Gole, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Ganesh Pura, Near Footi Puliya Morena (M.p.). (Roll No. 33244).
46. Kuldeep Sharma S/o Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Indra Colony, Behind Vishnu Mandir, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 15035).
47. Banti Rathore S/o Sh. Ghan Shyam Rathore, Aged About





26 Years, R/o Village And Post- Kunwarpur, Tehsil And District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 16031).

48. Rinkita Rawat D/o Sh. Raghuveer Singh, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village- Bagoda, Post- Kharai Jalim, Tehsil Bairad, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 17319).

49. Saurabh Lakshkar S/o Sh. Murari Lal, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village And Post- Amol Patha, Tehsil- Karera, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 19948).

50. Aman Gupta S/o Sh. Mahesh Prasad Gupta, Aged About 21 Years, R/o City Centre Colony Karera, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 17379).

51. Poonam Sharma D/o Sh. Komal Prasad Sharma, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Near Maniyar Beej Godam, District- Shivpuri (M.p.). (Roll No. 38313).

52. Anita Saraiya D/o Sh. Bhure Lal Saraiya, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Mukam Post Jasalpur, District- Hoshangabad (M.p.). (Roll No. 30882).

53. Nitin Kumar Istwal S/o Sh. Rameshwar Prasad, Aged About 24 Years, R/o House No. 102, Chandra Vihar Kargi Grant, P.o.- Banjarawala, District- Dehradun (Uttarakhand). (Roll No. 33326).

54. Sonal Shriwas S/o Sh. Santosh Kumar Shriwas, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Sardar Patel Ward No. 15, Lalipur Mandla (M.p.). (Roll No. 37329).

55. Siddharth Bhatnagar S/o Sh. Ramprakash Bhatnagar, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Near Shivgir Mandir Marg, Datia (M.p.). (Roll No. 15109).

56. Girraj S/o Sh. Bhoole Ram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Hassanpur Sohna, Nuh (Haryana). (Roll No. 17736).

57. Pramod Rajput S/o Sh. B.s. Rajput, Aged About 27 Years, R/o House No. 164, Sector 11-A, Avas Vikas Colony, Sikandra, District Agra (U.p.). (Roll No. 28513).

58. Ravindra Kumar Verma S/o Sh. Dhanraj Verma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village- Malwani, 3 Barani, Nohar, District- Hanumangarh (Raj.). (Roll No. 28150).

59. Pintu Ram Meena S/o Sh. Jai Ram Meena, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village And Post- Balahera, Tehsil Baswa, District Dausa (Raj.). (Roll No. 15468).





60. Akanksha D/o Sh. Ramji Lal, Aged About 19 Years, R/o Ward No.11, Prajapat Colony, Jhunjhunu (Raj.). (Roll No. 27164).
61. Nupur Khandelwal D/o Sh. Kaushal Khandelwal, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Khedliganj Bus Railway Station Road, Atru Baran (Raj.). (Roll No. 39930).
62. Gourav S/o Sh. Raghuveer, Aged About 22 Years, R/o W No. 2, Village Adarsh Nagar, P.o. Mainawali, District- Hanumangarh (Raj.). (Roll No. 15714).
63. Harish S/o Sh. Devi Lal, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village And Post- Pakka Bhadwan, District- Hanumangarh (Raj.). (Roll No. 28319).
64. Sunil Prajapat S/o Sh. Babulal Prajapat, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Vivekanand Nagar, Sonawa Ki Dungar, Ward No. 35 New, District- Alwar (Raj.). (Roll No. 33686).
65. Kuldeep Yadav S/o Sh. Jaswant Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village- Mundiya Khera, Post- Rajwara, Tehsil- Mundawar, District- Alwar (Raj.). (Roll No. 26246).
66. Arti Soni D/o Sh. Mohan Lal Soni, Aged About 24 Years, R/o 1 Ja 4 Kala Kuan, Housing Board, District (Alwar). (Roll No. 27792).
67. Nandini Nama D/o Sh. Shivcharan Nama, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Plot No. 46, Printers Nagar, 1st Sitabari, Sanganer, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 36794).
68. Harshal Nagar D/o Sh. Rajesh Nagar, Aged About 22 Years, R/o House No. 3026, Bagru Walo Ka Rasta, Purani Basti, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 27708).
69. Pooja Swami D/o Sh. Prem Kumar Swami, Aged About 28 Years, R/o 74, Vinoba Basti, District- Sriganganagar (Raj.). (Roll No. 27522).
70. Amit Kumar Soni S/o Sh. Bhawani Shankar Soni, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Ward No. 22, Behind Cinema Hall, Nohar, District- Hanumangarh (Raj.). (Roll No. 38478).
71. Lokesh Kumar Yadav S/o Sh. Brij Lal Yadav, Aged About 27 Years, R/o 29, Nayagaon Machari, Post- Para, Tehsil Reni, District Alwar (Raj.). (Roll No. 15213).
72. Ponting Khandel S/o Sh. Dharam Chand Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village- Khorpuri, Post- Baroda Meo, Tehsil- Laxmangarh, District- Hanumangarh (Raj.). (Roll



No. 29800).

73. Narendra Kumar Mehra S/o Sh. Daya Ram Mehra, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Rajiv Colony, New Matunda Road, Near Gas Godam, District- Bundi (Raj.). (Roll No. 34066).
74. Shyam Sunder S/o Sh. Mohan Lal, Aged About 29 Years, R/o New Basti, Sogaria Main Road, Opp. Gaurav Traders Kota Junction, District- Kota (Raj.). (Roll No. 24649).
75. Piyush Sen S/o Sh. Jaiprakash Sen, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Indra Market, Baran (Raj.). (Roll No. 33594).
76. Kuldeep Sain S/o Sh. Ram Dayal Sain, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village And Post- Sop, Nadoti, District- Karauli (Raj.). (Roll No. 25448).
77. Sojal Gupta S/o Sh. Rajendra Gupta, Aged About 25 Years, R/o N-26, Gandhi Nagar, District- Gwalior (M.p.). (Roll No. 29058).
78. Riya Rathore D/o Sh. Mahendra Singh Rathore, Aged About 20 Years, R/o 346, Panchwati, Near Poltry Farm, Senth, District- Chittorgarh (Raj.). (Roll No. 27193).
79. Chandraveer Singh S/o Sh. Durga Lal Parihar, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Near Rswc-1, Panchwati Senth, District- Chittorgarh (Raj.). (Roll No. 25690).
80. Narayan Lal Sharma S/o Sh. Dinesh Chandra Sharma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o 27, R.a. Colony, Chamti Khera Road, District- Chittorgarh (Raj.). (Roll No. 23364).
81. Suman Ghausalya D/o Ramawtar Ghausalya, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Dhani Ghosalya Wali, Village And Post- Patwari Ka Bass, District- Sikar (Raj.). (Roll No. 40826).
82. Kusum Bhati D/o Khemchand Bhati, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Bhati Farm House, Chundiya Road, Merta City, District- Nagaur (Raj.). (Roll No. 28475).
83. Ragini Awasthi D/o Sh. Prayag Narayan Awasthi, Aged About 19 Years, R/o L-381, Keshavpuram, Awas Vikas-1, Kanpur Nagar (U.p.). (Roll No. 25228).
84. Damodar Prasad S/o Sh. Shankar Lal Kumawat, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Ward No. 7, Chejaro Ka Mohalla, Danta, District- Sikar (Raj.). (Roll No. 30550).
85. Om Prakash Meena S/o Sh. Jodha Ram Meena, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village- Hardi, Post- Kunthada Khurd,





Tehsil- Bassi, District- Jaipur (Raj.). (Roll No. 38856).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan High Court Principal Seat Jodhpur, Through Its Registrar General, Jodhpur (Raj.).
2. Rajasthan High Court Principal Seat Jodhpur, Through Its Registrar (Examination), Jodhpur (Raj.).

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16239/2021

1. Divesh Kumar S/o Sompal Singh, Aged About 38 Years, Ward Number 8, Mohala Holika Mandir, Thakur Dwara, Muradabad, Uttar Pradesh.
2. Anees Ahmad S/o Raees Ahmad, Aged About 21 Years, Ghosipura, Patti Kalan, Post Rahmatganj, Suar, Rampur, Uttar Pradesh.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur, Through The Registrar General.
2. Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16534/2021

Rahul Jatoliya S/o Shri Hari Lal Jatoliya, Aged About 21 Years, R/o 227, Maharana Pratap Nagar, District Pali.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. High Court Of Judicature For Rajasthan At Jodhpur, Through Its Registrar General.
2. The Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.
3. Arya College Of Engineering And I.t., (Arya-I Old Campus), Sp-42, Riico Industrial Kukas, Delhi Road, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2422/2022

Tejpal S/o Shri Gheesu Singh Shekhawat, Aged About 29 Years,



Resident Of Village Shyampura Via Phaglwa, Tehsil - Dodh, Dist.
- Sikar At Present Resident Of 65, Prithvipura, Rasala Road,
Jodhpur,. (Roll No. 15189).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur, Through The Registrar General.
2. Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3958/2022

Narendra Mehra S/o Ramavtar Mehra, Aged About 22 Years, Plot
No.55 Mehra Bhavan Sushil Public School Opposite Sushilpura
Ajmer Road Sodala Jaipur Rajasthan 302006

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur, Through The Registrar General, Rajasthan High Court Jodhpur.
2. The Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.
3. Arya Institute Of Engineering And Research Centre, Through The Examiner, Sp-40, Riico Industrial Area, Near Hotel Le, Meridien, Delhi Road, Kukas, Jaipur Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3964/2022

1. Meenu Verma D/o Hanuman Sahai Verma, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village - Gila Ki Nangal, Post - Naila, Via-Kanota, Tehsil Bassi, Jaipur, Gila Ki Nangal, Jaipur Rajasthan 303012.
2. Mamta Vyas D/o Kanhaiya Lal Vyas, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Corner 60 A Bhagwati Nagar 2Nd Kartarpura, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302015.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The Rajasthan High Court, Through The Registrar General, Rajasthan High Court Jodhpur.
2. The Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.



3. Arya College Of Engineering, Riico Industrial Area, Kukas, Delhi, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3978/2022

Phool Meena D/o Chouthmal, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Plot No. 09, Mahadev Nagar, Meeno Ki Dhani, Charan Nadi, 2Nd Murlipura, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur, Through The Registrar General, Rajasthan High Court Premises, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. The Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Rajasthan High Court Premises, Jodhpur.
3. Arya College Of Engineering I.t., Through Examiner, (Arya - I Old Campus) Sp-42, Riico Industrial Area, Kukas, Delhi Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3998/2022

1. Bhupesh Khandelwal S/o Rameshwar Khandelwal, Aged About 31 Years, 57-A, Ram Vihar Vistar, Goner-Lunaywas Road, Agra Road, Jaipur (Roll No.31668)
2. Shubham Kumar Sharma S/o Chiranji Lal Sharma, Aged About 25 Years, H.no.2898, Bhindo Ka Rasta, First Crossing Indira Bajar, Jaipur (Roll No.16667)
3. Sumant Dubey S/o Virendra Dubey, Aged About 25 Years, S D 157, Shanti Nagar, Hatwara Road, Jaipur (Roll No.15074)
4. Aditya Vashistha S/o Radhey Shyam Sharma, Aged About 26 Years, 35, Pratap Nagar Old Ramgarh Mode, Amer Road, Jaipur (Roll No.31148)
5. Khushwant Singh Kumawat S/o Yogesh Chandra Kumawat, Aged About 30 Years, 30, Jagdish Colony, Mahesh Nagar, Jaipur (Roll No.18690)
6. Hansa Prajapati D/o Rajendra Kumar, Aged About 34 Years, P.no.37B, Laxmi Nagar-I, Chhopolo Ki Dhani, Dhani Kumawatan, Sanganer, Jaipur (Roll No.15698)



7. Vimal Gupta S/o Devendra Gupta, Aged About 24 Years, P.no.7, Ganesh Vihar First, Behind Jda Block-B, Naradpura, Jaipur (Roll No.16833)
8. Prakash Chand S/o Surgyan, Aged About 26 Years, Ward No.18, Kacholiya Road, Gora Ki Dhani, Behind Vinayak School, Chomu, Jaipur (Roll No.28383)
9. Anjali Aseeja D/o Sohan Lal Aseeja, Aged About 27 Years, 33/180, Sector 3, Pratap Nagar, Sanganer, Jaipur (Roll No.38445)
10. Ankur Gupta S/o Vishnu Gupta, Aged About 26 Years, Near Vajirpur Gate, Opposite Jain Mandir, Bada Bajar, Karauli (Roll No.26219)
11. Ramesh Thakur S/o Ram Naresh Thakur, Aged About 27 Years, Village Rahimpur Rudauli, Post Bikrampur Bandey, Samstipur, Bihar (Roll No.32814)
12. Ravindra Kumar S/o Jagdish Prasad, Aged About 35 Years, Near Laxmi Place, Subhash Chowk, Bayana, Bharatpur (Roll No.40407)
13. Preeti, D/o Chaturbhuj Prasad Agrawal, R/o Subhash Nagar, Behind Sony Beauty Parlour, Bharatpur (Roll No.17320)
14. Pavan Kumar, S/o Anandi Lal, R/o Pathan Para, In Front Of Forest Office, Bayana, Bharatpur (Roll No.35138)
15. Arshad Aman Khan, S/o Amjad Khan, R/o Pathan Pada, Bayana, Bharatpur (Roll No.23885)
16. Om Prakash Meena, S/o Jodharam Meena R/o Hardi Post Kuthara Khurd, Hardi, Kanota, Jaipur, Rajasthan (Roll No.38856)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. High Court Of Judicature Of Raj., At Jodhpur, Through Its Registrar General.
2. The Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur.
3. Arya College Of Engineering And I.t. (Arya-I Old Campus), Sp-42, Riico Industrial Area, Kukas, Delhi Road, Jaipur

-----Respondents



For Petitioner(s) : Mr. B.S. Sandhu with
Mr. S.K. Shreemali,
Mr. Dishant Kiroriwal
Mr. Chirag Kalani.
Mr. Muktesh Maheshwari with
Mr. Yuvraj Singh Mertia.
Mr. Suniel Purohit.
Mr. Vivek Shrimali.
Mr. Manish Rajpurohit for
Mr. Rakesh Arora.
Mr. Ankit Prakash Singh with
Mr. Harshit Yadav.
Mr. Pradeep Mathur.
Mr. Narendra Singh Hada.
Mr. Ramrakh Sharma (through VC)

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Manoj Bhandari, Sr. Adv. assisted
by Mr. Aniket Tater and
Ms. Sapna Vaishnav.
Mr. A.K. Sharma, Sr. Adv. assisted by
Mr. Vishnu Kant Sharma (through VC)

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA PRAKASH SONI

Judgment

Reportable

Reserved on 15/02/2024

Pronounced on 04/03/2024

Per Dr. Pushpendra Singh Bhati, J:

1. Since all the instant petitions involve a common controversy though with marginal variation in the contextual facts, therefore, for the purposes of the present analogous adjudication, the facts and the prayer clauses are being taken from the above-numbered D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15641/2021, while treating the same as a lead case; thus, the rival submissions of the parties and the observations of the Court, in the present judgment, would also be based, particularly, on the factual matrix of the lead case.

1.1 The prayer clauses read as under:-



"It is therefore, humbly prayed on behalf of the petitioners that this writ petition may kindly be allowed and

a) The impugned Notice dated 28.10.2021 (Annex.8) issued by the Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur declaring the revised result of Shorthand Test and Computer Test for Stenographer Examination may kindly be declared illegal and accordingly be set aside;

b) The Impugned Notice dated 30.10.2021 (Annex.9) issued by the Registrar (Examination), Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur rescheduling the interview rounds for the newly selected candidates in the revised result of Shorthand Test and Computer Test for Stenographer Examination may kindly be declared illegal, without jurisdiction and accordingly be set aside;

c) The Respondents may kindly be directed to uphold the previous final result of recruitment to the posts of Stenographers Examination 2020 published on 31.07.2021 (Annex.6);

d) The Petitioners be given joining upon the posts of Stenographer Grade-III (Hindi & English) and Stenographer as per the final result of Stenographers Examination 2020 published on 31.07.2021;

e) Any other appropriate writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court considers just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case, may kindly be passed in favour of the petitioners;"

2. Brief facts of the case, as placed before this Court by learned counsel of the petitioners, are that the respondents issued a detailed advertisement dated 18.01.2020 inviting applications from the eligible candidates for direct recruitment on the post of Stenographer Grade-III (Hindi/English) under the establishment of



the District Courts, Legal Services Authorities and Permanent Lok Adalats in the State.

2.1. The petitioners submitted the application form and participated in the recruitment process (Shorthand test and Computer test) which was held between 03.04.2021 to 08.04.2021; thereafter, the respondents declared the results on 30.06.2021, whereby the petitioners were declared provisionally qualified for the interview.

2.2. Subsequently, the respondents issued a notice dated 06.07.2021 wherein it was notified that the interview for the provisionally qualified candidates would be held between 28.07.2021 and 30.07.2021 in two slots and the candidates would be required to bring the requisite documents in original, as stipulated in the list appended to the said notice. Thereafter, the respondents declared the final results on 31.07.2021 and since the candidates selected were less in numbers, therefore, the earlier decided margin of error i.e. 5% was enhanced to 15%, meaning thereby, such errors were stipulated to be deducted from the total number of words.

2.3. Being aggrieved of the aforesaid results, certain candidates filed a representation before the respondents and also filed Writ petition before this Hon'ble Court i.e.D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11003/2021 & Other connected matters. A Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 25.10.2021 disposed of the said petition without going into the merits of the case, as the respondents were going to revise the results of the examination in question. Subsequently, the respondents vide the impugned order



28.10.2021 cancelled the provisional results dated 30.06.2021 and the final results dated 31.07.2021 on the ground that while preparing the result on earlier occasion, the software agency did not give effect of mistakes committed by the candidates and the results were published based on the marks obtained by the candidates with no deduction of the errors, and the marks were awarded only on the basis of correct words typed and some other discrepancies were also noticed. In furtherance, the respondents issued the revised result and cut off marks; 46 candidates, who were selected in the previous results, were once again declared as selected in the revised results as well, whereas around 350 candidates, who were declared selected in previous results had not been selected in the revised result. Thereafter, the respondents vide impugned notice dated 30.10.2021 issued a schedule for the interview of the selected candidates (except the aforesaid 46 candidates) selected in the revised result.

2.4. The petitioners in WP No.15641/2021, lead case, filed an affidavit, wherein it was mentioned that during pendency of the writ petition, the respondents issued the final results of the recruitment in question on 15.12.2021, which as per the petitioners, contained anomalies as, amongst others, there was neither any fixed method nor formula used before declaration of the said results and nowhere it has been clarified that as to how calculations were made and how the cut off list was prepared, and thus, apart from the above impugned orders/notices, the petitioners are assailing the said revised final results dated 15.12.2021 as well.



3. Thus, being aggrieved of the aforesaid, the present petitions have been preferred claiming, in sum and substance, the afore-quoted reliefs.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the respondents had previously published the results of the shorthand and computer tests with selection of 422 candidates, but later came up with the technical errors in the software at the time of evaluation of answer-sheets of the candidates, and on that ground the respondents revised the results, whereby the candidates who were selected earlier had not been declared selected, and therefore, issuance of the revised results is illegal and against the principles of natural justice.

4.1. Learned counsel further submitted that the respondents revised the results on the ground that errors were not counted, at the time of evaluation of answer sheets of the candidates, but if the errors were not counted, then in what way the respondents arrived at the conclusion of expanding the scope of errors from 5% to 15%. It was also submitted that if the errors was not counted previously i.e. before publication of the earlier results, then in the revised results the merit must have gone down and not on the higher side, as is discernible from a bare perusal of both the results.

4.2. Learned counsel also submitted that after the revised results, almost 85% candidates, including the petitioners, who were previously declared selected, are not being selected as per the revised results, and in that case, the respondents are duty to bound to at least subject the answer sheet of the candidates to





inspection and make the same open to public domain, so as to show that a fair and transparent method has been adopted in finalizing the recruitment process in question, which is clearly absent in the present case.

4.3. Learned counsel further submitted that for the selection of Stenographer (Hindi), a speed of 70 words per minute had been stipulated, and for Stenographer (English), a speed of 80 words per minute was stipulated, in Shorthand Speed category, contrary to what had been given in the previous results, wherein there were numerous fluctuations with regard to the shorthand speed. It was also submitted there is neither a fixed method nor a formula which was used before publishing the whole results.

4.4. Learned counsel also submitted that as per the respondents, the results were revised due to technical error, and in that case, the respondents, before revising the results, ought to have checked the whole data and records, and only thereafter, in case anomalies or erroneous evaluation is detected, the respondents may be able to justify their impugned action, but the respondents have proceeded to revise the results in a hurried manner and within a short span of time, which itself creates a doubt upon the method adopted by the respondents in conducting and finalizing the recruitment process in question.

4.5 In support of such submissions, learned counsel relied upon the following judgments:-

(a) *Sachin Kumar and Ors. Vs Delhi Subordinate Service Selection Board & Ors. (2021) 4 SCC 631;*



(b) *Tej Prakash Pathak & Ors. Vs Rajasthan High Court & Ors.*
(Civil Appeal No 2634/2013 decided on 20.03.2013) by the
Hon'ble Apex Court;

(c) *Krishna Rai (Dead) Through LRs & Ors. Vs Banaras Hindu
University Through Registrar & Ors* (Civil Appeal No. 4578-
4580/2022, decided on 16.06.2022) by the Hon'ble Apex Court;

(d) *Ramjit Singh Kardam & Ors. Vs Sanjeev Kumar & Ors.* AIR
2020 SC 2060;

(e) *Raj Kumar & Ors. Vs Shakti Raj & Ors.* (1997) 9 SCC 527;

(f) *Asha Kaul & Ors. Vs State of Jammu and Kashmir & Ors*
(1993) 2 SCC 573.

5. On the other hand, Mr.Manoj Bhandari, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr.Aniket Tater & Ms.Sapna Vaishnav; Mr.A.K. Sharma, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr.Vishnu Kant Sharma, appearing on the behalf of the respondents, while opposing the aforesaid submissions made on behalf of the petitioners, submitted that the respondents have already issued appointment orders for both Stenographer (English) and Stenographer (Hindi), and the petitioners while filing the instant petitions have not impleaded the persons, selected in pursuance of the revised results, as party in this case, and therefore, the present petitions are not maintainable on that sole ground.

5.1. Learned Senior Counsel also submitted that on 03.12.2021 the information regarding additional requirement of the stenographers was received from District Judges and Member Secretary, RSLSA, and therefore, additional 60 candidates were called for interview on 14.12.2021 and the revised final results of



482 candidates were declared on 15.12.2021, who were called for interview. Subsequent to the interview on 11.11.2021, 12.11.2021 and 14.12.2021, the appointment orders were issued vide order dated 15.12.2021, and thus, it is apparent on the face of the record that the entire selection process is completed in a fair, transparent and impartial manner, and therefore, the petitioners have no right to challenge the selection process at all.

5.2. Learned Senior Counsel further submitted that during the earlier process of the examination in question, the software agency did not adopt the actual correct words in the marking system and the results were published based on the marks obtained by the candidates without proper deduction of the errors, and the marks were awarded only on the basis of correct words typed and some other discrepancies were also noticed; the actual marks can only be ascertained by applying the formula i.e. "Actual Correct Words=Total Dictated Words-Actual Committed Mistakes."

5.2.1. Learned Senior Counsel also submitted that the previous result was based on the marks calculated on the basis of correct words typed, whereas in the revised result marks were calculated on the basis of actual correct words, which were ascertained by deducting the actual committed mistakes from total dictated words, and then the cut off marks went up. Therefore, as per learned Senior Counsel, after appropriately applying the aforesaid formula, the respondents revised the results, by undertaking the impugned action.



5.3. Learned Senior Counsel further submitted that the policy decision regarding increasing the margin of mistake from 5% to 15% was taken even before the first result was declared and the same was made applicable to the entire selection process in question. It was further submitted that the respondents found some technical issues in the evaluation and result software, while preparing the previous result dated 30.06.2021, and at that time, the aforesaid formula was not appropriately applied.

5.4. Learned Senior Counsel also submitted that the total dictated words in the examination in question were 420, however, in the Shift-1 on 03.04.2021, in Arya Institute of Engineering and Technology (Center Code 1001); dictation of passage started after 48 words and total 372 (420-48) words were dictated. In the previous result dated 30.06.2021, the speed was calculated by reckoning the maximum prescribed time as 5.19 minutes which was technically not correct, and in the revised results, the speed was calculated by reckoning the maximum prescribed time as 5.314285714 minutes and 15 % margin of mistakes regarding the 372 words was 55.80, minutes, which is technically correct.

5.5. Learned Senior Counsel further submitted that in the above backdrop, no right was created in favour of the petitioners because no appointment was given and no document verification was undertaken by the Appointing Authority in pursuance of the previous result. It was also submitted that as per Clause 13 Sub Clause 4 (Method of Evaluation) of the advertisement in question, the omission of words or figures etc. were stipulated to be counted as mistakes. The said clause is reproduced as hereunder:-





"(4) मूल्यांकन की विधि (**Method of Evaluation**):

(1) The mistakes shall be counted as full or partial mistakes, as the case may be :-

(a) The following should be counted as full mistakes:-

- (1) Omission of words of figure.
- (2) Substitution of wrong word or figure.
- (3) Misspelling.
- (4) Two partial mistakes will be equal to one full mistake.

(b) The following should be counted as partial mistakes:-

- (1) Error Omission in punctuation.
- (2) Wrong use of capital or small letters.
- (3) Wrong indentation of paragraph.

(2) The margin of 5% mistakes may be allowed. If the mistakes/omissions are more than 5% of the dictated passage, the excess number of mistakes over 5% shall be deducted from the total number or words dictated and the speed will be calculated."

5.6. Learned Senior Counsel further submitted that the aforesaid formula is uniformly applicable in the previous recruitment as well as present recruitment, and shall be continued to be applicable in future recruitment also, and therefore, there is no illegality and no arbitrariness in the impugned actions of the respondents in declaring the revised results in question.

5.7. In support of such submissions, learned counsel relied upon the following judgments:-

- (a) *Ashok Kumar and Ors. Vs State of Bihar & Ors.* (2017) 4 SCC 357;
- (b) *Secy. (Health), Deptt. Of Health and F.W. & Ors. Vs Anita Puri & Ors.* (1996) 6 SCC 282;
- (c) *Prabodh Verma & Ors. Vs State of UP & Ors.* (1984) 4 SCC 251;





6. In their rejoinder arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners preferred the instant petitions before publication of the final revised results and the Hon'ble Court has ordered that the such final results will be subject to the outcome of the writ petitions, and therefore, the respondents' action is not justified on this count alone.

6.1. It was further submitted that when the mistakes were considered in revised results, then the cut off marks must have decreased and not enhanced. It was also submitted that the formula of ascertaining the correct words was neither mentioned in the advertisement in question nor the same was mentioned in the amended/revised results.

6.2. It was also submitted that as per Rule 10 of the Rajasthan District Courts Ministerial Establishment Rules, 1986, the candidates must qualify for minimum speed of stenography, only then he or she can be declared eligible for the further process of examination. Therefore, as per learned counsel, the action of the respondents not only lead to giving undue benefit to the less meritorious candidates, but also resulted into issuance of the wrong results.

6.3. It was further submitted that the respondents in reply itself stated that in Arya Institute of Engineering and Technology (Center Code 1002), dictation of passage was started after 97 words (total words to be dictated were 420) and that till the end, in total, the dictation was continued only upto 108 words, which clearly confused the candidates and the respondents created irregularity during the examination in question.



7. Heard learned counsel for the parties as well as perused the record of the case alongwith the judgments cited at the Bar.

8. This Court observes that the respondents issued a detailed advertisement dated 18.01.2020 inviting applications from the eligible candidates for direct recruitment on the post of Stenographer Grade-III (Hindi/English) under the establishment of the District Courts, Legal Services Authorities and Permanent Lok Adalats in the State. The petitioners submitted the application form and participated in the recruitment process (Shorthand test and Computer test) which was held between 03.04.2021 and 08.04.2021; thereafter, the respondents declared the results on 30.06.2021, whereby the petitioners were declared provisionally qualified for the interview.

8.1. Subsequently, the respondents issued notice for interview of the provisionally qualified candidates in the two slots and thereafter, the respondents declared results vide notice dated 30.06.2021 and final results on 31.07.2021.

8.2. Aggrieved of the aforesaid results, certain candidates filed the aforesaid Writ petition before the Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court, whereupon, the Hon'ble Court vide order dated 25.10.2021 disposed of the petition without going into the merits of the case, as mentioned above. Subsequently, the respondents vide impugned order dated 28.10.2021 cancelled the previous results.

9. Thereafter, the respondents vide impugned notice dated 30.10.2021, issued schedule of the interview for the candidates declared selected in the revised results, and thereafter, owing to





the additional requirement of the stenographers, additional 60 candidates were called for the interview on 14.12.2021 and revised final results were declared vide the impugned order dated 15.12.2021 and the appointment orders were accordingly issued.

10. This Court observes that previously, the respondents declared the results, but thereafter it was found that the proper prescribed formula of evaluation of the answer sheet of the candidates could not be applied due to some technical errors in the evaluation software. The said formula is reproduced as hereunder:-

$$\text{Speed} = \text{Actual correct words typed} + \text{Permissible 5\% mistakes or actual committed mistakes (whichever is less)}$$

Duration of dictation (6 minutes)

$$\text{Marks} = \text{Actual Correct Words typed} \times \text{Max. Marks (100)}$$

Total dictated words

$$\text{Actual Correct Words} = \text{Total dictated words} - \text{actual committed mistakes}$$

10.1. This Court further observes that the policy decision regarding the enhancement of margin of mistakes from 5% to 15% was taken before the first result and it was applicable to all candidates uniformly, and therefore, there is no illegality in the said decision which is taken by the respondents.

11. This Court also observes that the total dictated words were 420 and the formula was Actual Correct Words=Total Dictated





Words-Actual Committed Mistakes. This Court further observes that due to errors in the software, the marks were awarded in previous process, only on the basis of the correct words typed instead of the actual correct words.

11.1. For better understanding, the results of some candidates as reproduced in the reply of the respondents reads as under:-

PREVIOUS RESULT

As per results 30.06.2021 & 31.07.2021					
Roll No.	Correct Words typed	Actual committed mistake	Speed	Marks	Remarks
25595	389	34.5	70.583	92.619	Selected
35868	371	50	70.167	88.333	Selected
39245	361	61	70.333	85.952	Selected
27522	357	65	70	85	Selected
38478	364	65	71.167	86.667	Selected
37319	403	17.5	70.083	95.952	Ranked 1 st
33371	406	11	69.5	96.667	Failed
17868	404	11.5	69.25	96.19	Failed
38516	403	13	69.3	95.952	Failed

REVISED RESULT

As per results dated 28.10.2021 & 15.12.2021						
Roll No.	Correct Words typed	Actual committed mistake	Actual correct words	Speed	Marks	Remarks
25595	389	34.5	385.5	70	91.786	Not Selected
35868	371	50	370	70	88.095	Not Selected
39245	361	61	359	70	85.476	Not Selected
27522	357	65	355	69.667	84.524	Failed
38478	364	65	355	69.667	84.524	Failed
37319	403	17.5	402.5	70	95.833	Ranked 36 th
33371	406	11	409	70	97.381	Ranked 1 st
17868	404	11.5	408.5	70	97.262	Ranked 2 nd



38516	403	13	407	70	96.905	Ranked 3 rd
-------	-----	----	-----	----	--------	------------------------

11.2. For more better understanding, this Court takes one example from the aforesaid table, which is Roll No. 25595; the total of 420 words were dictated to the candidate and the actual correct words typed were 385.5 and the actual mistake committed were 34.5 ($385.5+34.5=420$ words) as per the formula which is applied by the respondents in the revised results; and in second column of the aforesaid, is the previous result, Correct Words Typed were 389 ($389+34.5= 423.5$), which clearly shows that in the previous results, the formula was not correctly applied and the same was reflected in the aforesaid table as well as aforesid example.

12. This Court also observes that in some of the institutions/examination centres, in some shifts of the examination in question, dictation of words was started later on, and that complete dictation of 420 words was also not given. This Court also noticed that though certain candidates were given lesser time for transcribing the dictation, but at the same time, the words dictated to them were also lesser in the same proportion, thus, maintaining uniformity as regards all the candidates in the examination in question.

13. This Court further observes that the aforementioned formula for evaluation of the answer sheet of the candidates is in vogue even before the present recruitment and also in the subsequent recruitment processes of the stenographer. However, in the previous results, in this recruitment the formula could not be



applied due to technical reasons, and when the respondents found such errors, they revised results, after proper application of the formula, which is justified in law.

14. This Court also observes that in the previous process, the respondents did not issue any appointment order and no verification of documents of the candidates was undertaken, and therefore, the joining on the post in question does not arise at all. Thereafter, the respondents revised the results vide impugned orders and issued the appointment orders to the selected candidates in the year 2021 and all the selected candidates upon their joining, are working at the respective place for last more than two years and the said candidates are not even party in the present petitions.

15. This Court further observes that no right has been created in favour of the petitioners, because the previous result itself does not stand due to non-application of the computation formula in an appropriate manner, which is critical to the evaluation of the answer sheet of the candidates.

16. This Court also observes that for the purpose of public employment, it is necessary to select the meritorious candidates and it is very important to apply the proper formula and select the candidates who secured the higher marks, and therefore, in absence of application of the prescribed formula, due to technical error in the evaluation software, the action taken by the respondents in declaring revised results is justified, and the same also protected the rights of the meritorious candidates as provided under Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India.






17. This Court further observes that the respondents rectified the mistakes by way of the revised results which is the sole option available to them, because for the purpose of recruitment in question, the requirement of candidates cannot come in the way of detecting the technical errors and taking follow up action i.e. revision of results, which has been duly done by the respondents in the present case by properly applying the prescribed formulation for evaluation of the answer sheet of the candidates. The said exercise of the respondents does not suffer from any illegality or arbitrariness.

18. This Court further observes that the aforementioned formula in not a new one, which was made applicable for the first time by the respondents, as it was made applicable in the recruitment processes in the past as well and has been made applicable in the subsequent recruitment processes also. Thus, on that count also, the impugned action of the respondents is justified in law.

19. This Court also observes that the prescribed formula so applied was not mentioned in the advertisement but it is not a case of changing the rules of the game, because in the selection process in question the prescribed formula was in vogue even before issuance of the advertisement in question, and the same has remained applicable for the subsequent selection processes as well. Therefore, the entire selection process is faultless, without any illegality and the formula has been applied uniformly for all the candidates, irrespective of whether the same has been mentioned in the advertisement or not. Moreover, the aforesaid prescribed formula is part of the method of evaluation, and not



the method of recruitment, and method of recruitment has been duly mentioned in the advertisement. This Court further observes that the respondents revised the results to ensure the transparency, and for the said purpose, amongst others, the prescribed and uniform formula for evaluation has been applied.

20. The judgments cited on the behalf of the petitioners do not rendered any assistance to their case.


21. Thus, in light of the above observations and looking into the factual matrix of the present case, this Court does not find it a fit case so as to grant any relief to the petitioners in the present petitions.

22. Consequently, the present petitions are dismissed. All pending applications stand disposed of.

Per Rajendra Prakash Soni, J.

1. I have had the advantage of reading the judgment prepared by my learned brother Dr. Justice Pushpendra Singh Bhati and I am in complete and respectful agreement with him. However, having regard to the importance of the issue involved, I deem it appropriate to pen down few of my own views to supplement the reasoning, in addition to the opinion of my brother Judge.

2. The task of preparing result was given to an outsourced technical agency which was well within jurisdiction of respondent recruiting authority. A computer program, based on the "method of evaluation" to prepare the results was created by the agency itself. The agency was expected to prepare computer programme



by correctly applying the "method of evaluation", as determined by the recruiting authority.

3. When representations were received by the respondent after declaration of the first result dated 31.07.2021, raising issue of technical deficiencies in computerized evaluation programme and writ petitions were also filed, in such a situation, it was necessary and expedient for the respondents to examine the way the computerized evaluation was worked-out and it processed the evaluation of shorthand answer sheets. It was justified on the part of the respondents to do so, as the respondents could not have turned a blind eye to the objections raised.

4. Upon examining the computerized evaluation programme, it was found that due to inadvertence, "the mistakes" were deducted from the total words typed by the candidate, instead of from "total words dictated". The agency did not account for mistakes properly. Due to this, the "evaluation method" could not be applied correctly as notified in recruitment advertisement. In the light of various representations received, competent authority revisited the assessment made by the agency and decided to rectify technical errors.

5. In my view, the respondent typically had the right to rectify errors found in results which was found to have been committed by a third party i.e. the agency. Ensuring the accuracy of result was crucial for correctness, fairness and integrity in the recruitment process. The purpose of rectifying the mistakes was to ensure that candidates receive the merit they rightfully earned and that their achievements are accurately reflected. Rectifying



the mistakes demonstrates respondents' commitment to transparency and accountability as respondents were accountable for the accuracy of candidates' assessment. It shows that the respondent took the concern seriously and was willing to take appropriate actions to address them. This was also essential for upholding the credibility, fairness and trustworthiness of recruitment process.

6. In such a situation, the revision of result had become inevitable and same has been done redressing the grievances of the persons concerned. The results were declared finally after correcting the errors to ensure an error free result. Neither the method of evaluation was changed nor the norms of selections were altered in the midst of the selection process.

7. Therefore, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that revision of result could not have been applied for the current recruitment or it was a case changing the rules of the race once the race had commenced, does not hold water.

8. Now question arises whether a wrongly selected person has the right to get an appointment? When the evaluation method upon which the selection of candidates was to be based, could not be applied correctly due to technical reasons, then the selection based on an incorrect evaluation could not be materialised, nor could the individuals selected in error have any legal rights.

9. The main question for consideration is whether a legitimate expectation has arisen due to the revision of the result by the respondent, whether it is a matter of change of evaluation method and if so, what remedy can be granted to the petitioners for



breach of such expectation. In my view, if a candidate has been wrongly selected for a position and the selection was made in violation of prescribed norms, the wrongly selected person has no legal right to the appointment. Such selection process does not confirm any right to any candidate for getting an appointment.

10. I am clearly of the view that beneficiaries of a wrong selection process lack the legal right to challenge a subsequent correct selection process as they do not acquire any prescriptive right to be appointed on a particular post and therefore, revision of the result by the respondents would not confer the petitioners any right to challenge the selection process. In such a situation, if a new result has been declared after correcting the technical errors in the evaluation process then no irregularity or illegality can be challenged.

11. The scheme, syllabus, and method of evaluation of the examination were clearly outlined in the advertisement dated 18.01.2020. Having knowledge of these details, the petitioner participated in the examination, therefore, after failing in the examination, the petitioners have no right to challenge the method of evaluation.

12. The salient features of the scheme of examination and method of evaluation was as follows:-

A. *The short-hand test was of 6 minutes duration, during which the speed of dictation in English language was 80 words per minute, resulting in a total of 480 words dictation to be given by the examiner. Candidates were expected to type this dictation within 50 minutes.*

B. *A total of 6 types of mistakes were enumerated as follows:-*



- (i) Omission of words or figures
- (ii) Substitution of wrong words or figures
- (iii) Misspelling
- (iv) Error or omission in punctuation
- (v) Wrong use of capital or small letters
- (vi) Wrong indention of paragraphs

C. Margin of 5% mistakes were allowed which was later increased to 15%

D. Mistakes were to be deducted from the total number of the words dictated.

13. It is true that no distinct formula for the evaluation of the short-hand test was mentioned in the advertisement. However, the method of evaluation was clear in the description of the evaluation method itself. The fact of deducing mistakes from the total "words dictated" was made clear in the advertisement itself.

14. In such a situation, after deducting the "total number of mistakes committed" from the "total words dictated", the words remaining constitute the "total correctly typed words" by the candidate. The shorthand paper was of 100 marks. In this case, dividing the total number of "correctly typed words" by the total number of "words dictated" and multiply it by 100, gives the candidates "marks obtained", and this could have been the only way to calculate the marks of short-hand test.

15. The correctness of subtracting "mistakes committed" from the "words dictated" has been disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

16. For better appreciation, this can be understood through two illustrations.

17. First, in English, if a candidate types all the 480 words within the prescribed period of 50 minutes and makes "zero" mistakes, then his total number of "correctly typed words" will be 480, and in this case, he will be said to have scored 100% marks.





18. Second, if a candidate types 460 out of 480 words in the prescribed 50-minutes duration for typing and he also commits "zero" mistakes, then the total number of "correctly typed words" will be 460. In this scenario, it cannot be said that he has scored 100%, because "Omission" is also a mistake and he has committed 20 "omission" mistakes. In this situation, he will be said to have earned 95.83% marks although all the words he typed were correct. This is why "total words dictated" was made the basis of performance evaluation.

19. In the light of the aforesaid, it cannot be said that the subsequently correctly implemented evaluation method came as a surprise to the petitioners.

20. The next and very important plank of the argument on behalf of the petitioners is that after giving effect of mistakes committed by the candidates, the cut off in the revised result increased, which should ideally have decreased from the earlier cut-off, owing to the negative marking that was earlier omitted due to the error of agency.

21. I am not impressed by the submissions of learned counsels for the petitioners. This is an argument which at first blush looks attractive but on closer scrutiny it is not as sound as it is attractive. It cannot be accepted for the simple reason that if we first deduct the mistakes by the number of a smaller digit (that is total words typed by the candidate) and secondly, by the number of a larger digit (that is total words dictated), the numerical result obtained from the latter process will definitely be higher than the





earlier result. In this process, the marks obtained by a candidate will increase and shall not decrease.

22. This can be understood with an example. If a given candidate types 460 words out of the total dictated 480 words in English and makes 10 mistakes of typing, then the difference in marks obtained in the first and second result will be as follows:

Particulars	I st evaluation	II nd evaluation
Total words dictated	480	480
Total words typed by the candidate	460	460
Total mistakes committed (20 mistakes of omissions plus 10 mistakes of typing)	30	30
Total number of correctly typed words (Note- In the first result, since 30 mistakes were subtracted from the "total typed words", the total number of "correctly typed words" was 430. Whereas, in the second result, since 30 mistakes have been subtracted from the "total words dictated", the total number of "correctly typed words" was 450)	430	450
Marks obtained (According to the formula for calculating percentage i.e. correctly typed words X 100 ÷ Total words dictated)	89.58 %	93.75 %

23. Due to the reasons mentioned above, increase in the cut-off marks from 89.58 % to 93.75 % was natural in the above example. Therefore, I do not find any merit in the said argument as well.

24. The decision to increase the margin of mistakes from 5% to 15% was equally applied in declaring both the results and was made effective in the context of each candidate. In this contest, the contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners is completely baseless. This was done to increase the probability of



having fill-in all the posts and avoiding possibility of posts remaining vacant so that the recruitment process could be avoided again and again.

25. It is also pertinent to mention that the recommendations made for appointment by virtue of notice dated 31.07.2021 was provisional and subject to other conditions as per the advertisement and rules, such as the verification of original documents was to be made and appointing authority was also required to comply with the procedure of Rule 23(1) of the Rajasthan District Courts Ministerial Establishment Rules. Only after fulfilling these conditions, appointment orders could have been issued in favour of the selected candidates.

26. Having regard to the aforesaid discussion, I am of the considered view that petitioners have filed these petitions on imaginary grounds based on conjectures and surmises. The rules of the game have not been changed after commencement of the game. Results have been revised on account of perfectly justifiable and valid reasons. It is not a case of cancellation of result in violation of legitimate expectations of petitioners and has thereby led to the violation of fundamental rights under article 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

(RAJENDRA PRAKASH SONI),J (DR. PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J
Skant/Payal