



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

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16652/2021

1. Laxmilal Salvi S/o Shri Rupaji, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Barbadi Ravan, Tehsil Salumber, District Udaipur.
2. Nathulal Meghwal S/o Shri Kalulal Meghwal, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village Utharda, Tehsil Salumber, District Udaipur.

----Petitioners

Versus

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

----Respondents



For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Bharat Shrimali
For Respondent(s) : ----

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE AKIL KURESHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR VYAS**

Order

03/01/2022

The petitioner has challenged one of the conditions contained in the notification dated 05.09.2021, which pertains to holding of the competitive examination for direct recruitment to the cadre of District Judge, 2020. Under the notification in question, the High Court has invited applications from eligible candidates for direct recruitment to the post of District Judge. Paragraph 6 of this notification requires the candidates to submit online application along with certain documents. Clause (f) of paragraph 6, which is under challenge, requires the candidates to supply certified copies of those 10 judgments of which the candidate has furnished



particulars while submitting online application form. According to the petitioner, this requirement is not part of the recruitment rules, and therefore, cannot be inserted through the recruitment notification.

However, we notice that the recruitment and terms of selection for direct recruitment to the post of District Judge are governed by the Rajasthan Judicial Service Rules, 2010. Part-2 of these rules pertains to direct recruitment. Rule 33 lays down eligibility criteria for direct recruitment and essentially requires that the candidate must have attained the age of 35 years and must not have crossed the age of 45 years on the first day of January following the last date fixed for the receipt of the application and should have put in atleast seven years as an Advocate. Rule 36(1) of the said rules pertains to submission of application. Sub-rule (1) of Rule 36 reads as under:

"36. Submission of application.- (1) *While submitting application, candidate shall furnish particulars of 10 judgments of the preceding seven years. He shall produce the certified copies of such judgments before the Main Examination, as prescribed by the Recruiting Authority. The Candidate is required to provide particulars of final orders/judgments personally argued by him, not being interlocutory orders, bail orders, orders based on compromise or orders of withdrawal of case."*

Sub-rule (1) of Rule 36 thus requires a candidate while submitting the application to furnish particulars of 10 judgments of preceding seven years. He also has to produce certified copies of such judgments before conducting the main examination. He has to provide particulars of final orders and judgments personally argued by him which should not relate to interlocutory orders, bail orders or orders based on compromise or withdrawal of cases.



Clause (f) of paragraph 6 of the main notification thus traces its root to Sub-rule (1) of Rule 36 of the said rules and is thus in consonance with the statutory recruitment rules. Rule 36(1) is not under challenge. The condition, therefore, cannot be set aside.

The petition fails and is dismissed.

(RAMESHWAR VYAS),J

(AKIL KURESHI),CJ



सत्यमेव जयते