



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**



S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6785/2011

CNR: RJHC020339742011 | URN: CW / 11170U / 2011

1. Sandeep Yadav son of Shri Sualal Yadav, aged about 26 years, resident of Ward No. 1, behind Sagri School, Village and Post Pavta, Tehsil Kotputli, District Jaipur.
2. Ratan Lal Bunkar son of Shri Chhotu Ram, aged about 32 years, resident of Village and Post Jawanpura, Tehsil Viratnagar, District Jaipur.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan, through the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Government of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Collector (LR), Collectorate, Jaipur.
3. The Competent Authority (Saksham Adhikari), Land Acquisition and Additional District Collector, Kotputli, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Praveen Sharma
For Respondent(s) : Mr. Yatharth Asopa for
Mr. Vikas Soni

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP TANEJA

Order

16/10/2026

1. The petitioners are aggrieved by the action of respondent No.3 whereby they have been disallowed from discharging their duties with effect from 09.05.2011.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that respondent No.3 issued an advertisement dated 09.09.2010, inviting applications for appointment to various posts, including the post of Class IV employees, on a contractual basis for work relating to land acquisition and the development of National Highway No.8 under the scheme for construction of a six-lane road on the Gurgaon-Jaipur route.



2.1 Pursuant to the aforesaid advertisement, the petitioners submitted their applications for the post of Class IV employees and, upon being selected, they were appointed vide appointment letters dated 04.01.2011. Thereafter, they started discharging their duties in connection with the aforesaid project in accordance with the terms and conditions stipulated in their respective appointment letters.

2.2 Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that, on 09.05.2011, respondent No.3, without assigning any reason, orally restrained the petitioners from discharging their duties. It is contended that the petitioners' services were thus brought to an end without issuance of any reasoned order and without affording them an opportunity of hearing. He, therefore, prays to allow the present writ petition.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that the petitioners were engaged purely on a contractual basis, as expressly stipulated in the application forms as well as in their respective appointment letters. It is further submitted that the terms governing their engagement specifically reserved the respondents' right to terminate the contractual services without assigning any reason. Learned counsel also submits that, at the time of joining their duties, the petitioners had furnished bonds/affidavits acknowledging and accepting the aforesaid condition of their contractual engagement. Learned counsel places reliance upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Rajasthan State Roadways Transport Corporation Vs. Paramjeet Singh**, reported in **2019 (6) SCC 250**.



4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is revealed that the only case of the petitioners is that their services were terminated without following the principles of natural justice.

5. It is not in dispute that the petitioners were appointed on a purely temporary and contractual basis, subject to the condition that their services could be terminated, or their contracts could be brought to an end, without assigning any reason. Their engagement was governed by the terms and conditions stipulated in their respective appointment letters, which expressly reserved the employer's right to terminate their contracts without assigning any reason.

6. Hence, in view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Paramjeet Singh** (supra), and having regard to the nature of their engagement, the terms and conditions of their appointment and the duties to be performed by them, the petitioners cannot claim any right to continue in service.

7. In view of the above discussion, this Court does not find any error in the action of the respondents warranting interference in the exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court. Accordingly, the present writ petition, being devoid of merit, is dismissed.

8. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SANDEEP TANEJA),J

15/TN