HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT JODHPUR

(1) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 18959/2025

Sultan Singh Sahu S/o Manfool Ram, Aged About 59 Years, R/o Ward No. 1, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

...

(2) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 18960/2025

Taskeen Zaheer W/o Najmuddin, Aged About 53 Years, R/o 1709, Ratakhet, Sajjan Nagar, B-Block, Girwa, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

.....

(3) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19085/2025

Ram Niwas S/o Late Shir Bhanwar Lal, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Ladoli, Tehsil Makrana District Deedwana-Kuchamna At Present Posted At Mahatma Gandhi Government School, Bidiyad District Deedwana-Kuchaman.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Secondary Education, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner.
3. Satya Prakash Mahawar, At Present Posted As Principal, Government Senior Secondary School, Rayta District Chittorgarh.

----Respondents

.....

(4) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19094/2025

Satya Prakash S/o Shri Kundan Mal, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of 123 Rawalo Ka Bas, Post Babra, Pratapgarh Pali (Raj.), (Presently Posted Principal At Govt. Senior Secondary School, Pratapgarh Beawar (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education (Group-Ii), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Joint Director, School Education, Ajmer Division, Ajmer.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Beawar.

----Respondents

.....

(5) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19095/2025

Neena Bansal W/o Govind Bansal, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 12, Fatehnagar, Udaipur, Rajasthan - 313205

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Joint Secretary, Department Of School Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner

----Respondents

.....

(6) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19099/2025

Hukma Ram S/o Shri Gulla Ram, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Udasar, Dhorimanna, District Barmer, At Present Working As Principal, At Govt. Senior Secondary School, Gogaji Ki Jaal Goliya Jetmal, District Barmer (Raj.) -----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Director, Board Of Secondary Education For Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary, Barmer.

----Respondents

.....

(7) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19102/2025

Somalal Gameti S/o Halu Ji Gameti, Aged About 56 Years, Gameti Fala Mukam Post Talaiya Dungarpur Rajasthan 314801.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Director Secondary Education Rajasthan Bikaner.
2. District Education Officer (Secondary), District Dungarpur Rajasthan.
3. District Education Officer (Secondary), District Pratapgarh Rajasthan.
4. Principal, Government Senior Secondary School Talaiya Dungarpur

----Respondents

.....

(8) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19111/2025

Sangeetha Detha W/o Dinesh Charan, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Bera Batawa Khudala, Falna, Pali, Rajasthan.306116.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Bikaner.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

.....

(9) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19112/2025

Sheela Asopa W/o Shri Puneet Asopa, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Children Park, 7Th B Road, Sardarpura, Jodhpur Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Director, Secondary Education Rajasthan-Cum-Additional Commissioner, Samagra Shiksha, Jaipur (Raj.).

----Respondent

.....

(10) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19114/2025

Kishor Kumar S/o Chain Singh Parmar, Aged About 59 Years, R/o 8-9, Prithviraj Nagar, Near Jhalamand Jodhpur, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Jodhpur, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(11) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19126/2025

Pinky Jain W/o Shri Pradeep Kumar Jain, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of 9, Bhajan Nagar, Ajmer Road, Ward No. 2, District Beawar, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan.

3. The District Education Officer, Beawar, Rajasthan.
4. Saraswati, Working As Govt. Sr. Sec. School Butiwas Raipur, Pali, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(12) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19129/2025

Smt. Sapna Sharma W/o Late Shri Arvind Sharma, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of A-91, Subhash Nagar Shopping Center Jaipur (Ra.), (Presently Posted Principal At Govt. Senior Secondary School, Barwala, Makrana, Dist. Didwana-Kuchaman (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education (Group-Ii), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Joint Director, School Education, Ajmer Division, Ajmer.
4. The District Education Officer, (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Didwana-Kuchaman, (Raj.).
5. Pema Ram, Principal Govt. Girls Senior Secondary School (Ggups), Bhadliya District Nagaur.

----Respondents

.....

(13) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19135/2025

Poonam Chand Kumhar S/o Shri Ratan Lal, Aged About 58 Years, R/o 326, Punja Nagar, Jhadol, Udaipur, Rajasthan. ----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. Joint Director, School Education Department, Division Udaipur, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
4. District Education Officer, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
5. Chief Block Education Officer, Jhadol, District Udaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(14) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19140/2025

Santosh Parihar W/o Shri Bhagaram, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of 56-A, Meghwal Basti, Near Panchmukhi Balaji Temple, Masuria, Jodhpur (Rajasthan.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Rajasthan.)
2. The Director, Secondary Education And Ex-Officio Additional State Project Director (Senior), Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan (Smsa) Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

.....

(15) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19145/2025

Jagdish Prasad S/o Bhura Ram, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Suratpura, Molisar Bada, Churu Raj, At Present Posted At Govt. Senior Secondary School Sahjusar (215288), Churu, Raj.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education (Secondary), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur(Raj.)
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. The District Education Officer(Secondary), Churu, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(16) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19148/2025

Pradeep Kumar Kachhwah S/o Durga Ram, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of 154, Himmat Nagar, Pali, District Pali, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Elementary And Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Director Of Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

....

(17) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19149/2025

Prem Devi D/o Shri Madan Lal W/o Late Shri Om Prakash, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Pahadganj Iind, Lalsagar Road, Jodhpur (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of School Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

....

(18) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19156/2025

Harvinder Singh S/o Gurdeep Singh, Aged About 47 Years, Ward No. 08, 4 Krw, Amargarh, Ganganagar, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of School Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Joint Secretary, Education Department (Group-2), Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Director, Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(19) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19160/2025

Manoj Kumar Choudhary S/o Ghanshyam Das, Aged About 59 Years, R/o C-106, Sarswati Nagar, Basni Phase-1, Jodhpur, Ditrict Jodhpur. At Present Residence At 49, Ashapurna Colony, Bhinmal Byepass Jalore, District Jalore. At Present Working As Principal At Govt. Senior Secondary, School, Devki Block Ahore, District Jalore, Raj.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Director, Secondary Education, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(20) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19161/2025

Jitendra Kumar Satija S/o Shri Omesh Chander Satija, Aged About 59 Years, R/o Ward No. 36, 7 F 11, Jawahar Nagar, Ganganagar, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of School Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Joint Secretary, Education Department (Group-2), Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Director, Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
4. Trapti Agarwal, Working As Govt Senior Secondary School, Khaminpura 27F, Sri Ganganagar.

----Respondents

.....

(21) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19163/2025

Adram Limba S/o Shri Dulla Ram, Aged About 58 Years, R/o House Number 59, Naya Chowk, Saraswati Nagar, Ganganagar, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of School Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Joint Secretary, Education Department (Group-2), Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Director, Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(22) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19164/2025

Jai Singh S/o Shri Gulab Ram, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of V/p Rampura, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of School Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director, Secondary Education Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

.....

(23) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19165/2025

Shahzad Khan S/o Idris Khan, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Ward No. 7, Masjid Wali Gali, Vpo Kelwada, Baran, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

.....

(24) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19166/2025

Asefa Sultana W/o Late Safat Ali, Aged About 53 Years, R/o H.no. 1B1 Near Bsnl Tower, 18-E, Chopasani Housing Board, Suraj Nagar, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Joint Director (Secondary), Education Department, Jodhpur.
4. The District Education Officer, Secondary, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

.....

(25) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19181/2025

Liyaqat Husain Sheikh S/o Shri Badruddin Sheikh, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Village Post Kotra District Udaipur

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Director, Secondary Education Department Of Secondary Education, Bikaner Rajasthan

----Respondents

.....

(26) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19211/2025

Laxmi Bhagtani D/o Shri Satish Nainani, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of 171 B Harsh Nagar Ambamata, District Udaipur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur Rajasthan.
2. Director, Secondary Education Department Of Secondary Education, Bikaner Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(27) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19224/2025

Prakash Chandra Sharma S/o Shri Purushottam Lal Sharma, Aged About 59 Years, R/o House No. 59-B, Bapu Nagar, Senthi, District Chittaurgarh, At Present Working As Principal At Shahid Major Natwar Singh Shaktawat, Govt. Senior Secondary School, Chittaurgarh, District Chittaurgarh (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. Director, Board Of Secondary Education For Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. Chief District Education Officer, Chittorgarh.
4. District Education Officer, (Headquarter) Secondary, Chittaurgarh.

----Respondents

.....

(28) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19253/2025

Ambika Choudhary W/o Nahar Singh Ruhela, Aged About 50 Years, Basni, V.p.o. Beras, Laxmangarh, District Sikar (Rajasthan) ----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Secondary Education, Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan)
2. Director, Secondary Education Bikaner (Raj.)
3. Parmeshwar Lal Atariya, C/o Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner (Rajasthan)

----Respondents

(29) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19305/2025

Amjad Khan S/o Akram Khan, Aged About 51 Years, Mehro Ka Bas, Badi Pole Ke Andar, Tehsil And District Jalore.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The District Education Officer, Secondary Education, Jalore, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(30) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19352/2025

Sunita Dadrwal W/o Virendra, Aged About 59 Years, R/o Parwati Niketan, Dayanand Marg, Naya Bass Ward No. 13, Churu District Churu, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Churu, District Churu, Rajasthan.
4. Hanuman Singh, Principal, Shaheed Head Constable Pal Singh Govt. Senior Secondary School Jasrasar, Churu, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

.....

(31) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19402/2025

Vijay Krishna Vaishnav S/o Bihari Das Vaishnav, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Shri Krishna Marg Bhagakot, Banswara, District Banswara (Rajasthan).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary To The Government, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Director, Secondary Education Rajasthan Cum-Paden Additional State Project Director (Senior) Samarag Shiksha Abhiyan (Smsa), Bikaner (Raj.).

----Respondents

.....

(32) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19405/2025

Rajiv Kumar Junwa S/o Shri Shanti Lal Junwa, Aged About 59 Years, R/o Plot No. 33, Ward No. 12, Bahubali Colony, Banswara, Distt. Banswara (Rajasthan).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary To The Government, Department Of Education, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Director, Secondary Education Rajasthan Cum-Paden Additional State Project Director (Senior) Samarag Shiksha Abhiyan (Smsa), Bikaner (Raj.).

----Respondents

.....

(33) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19444/2025

Naina Ram S/o Late Deva Ram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Meghwalo Ka Bass, Sanwalta Kalla, Tehsil- Rohat, District Pali (Raj.), (Presently Posted Principal At Govt. Senior Secondary School, Bhanwari, Pali (Raj.)K.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education (Group-Ii), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Joint Director, School Education, Pali, Division, Pali.
4. The District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Pali.

----Respondents

.....

(34) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19494/2025

Omparkash S/o Shri Sarwan Ram, Aged About 58 Years, R/o 03 Ward No. 21, Purani Abadi, Sri Ganganagar District Sri Ganganagar (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Secondary Education, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner Zone Bikaner.
3. The Principal, Pujya Bapu Nambardar Magghar Singh Ji Insan Gsss, Gurusar Modia, Sri Ganganagar.

----Respondents

.....

(35) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19529/2025

Sona Ram Choudhary S/o Goma Ram Choudhary, Aged About 53 Years, Village And Post Nand Tehsil And District Barmer (Raj.) ----
Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan

3. District Education Officer (Head Quarter), Secondary Education, Barmer, Rajasthan

----Respondents

.....

(36) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19539/2025

Anju Kachhawaha W/o Shri Navneet Kachhawaha, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of G - 20, Shastrinagar, Jodhpur (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. District Education Officer, (Head Quarter), Secondary Education, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
4. Saroj Kanwar Nathawat, Presently Working As Principal, Government Senior Secondary School, Thabukada, Mandore, (503724) Jodhpur (Raj.).

----Respondents

.....

(37) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19547/2025

Rurmal Mahariya S/o Nopa Ram, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Dhani Hussainpura, Post Lachhari, Tehsil Ladnun, District Deedwana-Kuchaman At Present Posted As Principal, Mahatma Gandhi, Government School, Meetheri, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Secondary Education, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner.

----Respondents

.....

(38) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19552/2025

Sita Ram Meghwal S/o Sh. Bhaira Ram Meghwal Ji, Aged About 59 Years, 3 No Tyuwel Behind, Suraj Pura Colony, C 38, Se Aage, Akadeeyawala, Bikaner (Raj.) At Present Posted As Principal, Govt. Senior Secondary School, Lalasar, Block Nokha, District Bikaner.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Education Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Director, Department Of Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

.....

(39) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19598/2025

Fazlu Rahman S/o Munnan Khan, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Gh-5, Housing Board, Kumbhanagar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Education Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Director, Secondary Education And Ex-Officio Addl. State Project Director (Senior), Samgara Siksha Abhiyan (Smsa), Bikaner, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

(40) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19902/2025

Dinesh Kumar Pipara S/o Shri Paras Mal Pipara, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of 94-B, Subhash Nagar, Bhilwara (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of School Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. The Director, Secondary Education Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The District Education Officer, Secondary, Bhilwara.
4. Shri Jitendra Singh Rao, Posted As Principal, Mahatma Gandhi Govt. School Bhimganj, District Bhilwara.

----Respondents

.....

(41) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20055/2025

Nawab Ali S/o Sardar Khan, Aged About 53 Years, 229/83, Ekta Nagar, Madina Masjid Ke Pass, Saran Nagar, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.

----Respondents

(42) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19210/2025

Gena Ram Kodecha S/o Shri Aja Ram, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Sector 20-E, 30 Chopasni Housing Board Jodhpur (Raj.) (Presently) Posted Principal At Govt. Girls Senior Secondary School, Luni Jodhpur (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Education (Group-Ii), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Joint Director, School Education, Jodhpur Division, Jodhpur.
4. The District Education Officer, (Headquarter), Secondary Education, Jodhpur.

5. Beena Sharma, Principal At Govt. Girls Senior Secondary School, Deval Pali (Raj.).

----Respondents

.....

(43) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20004/2025

(Reserved on 10.10.2025)

Sashi Meena W/o Dilraj Meena, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of 253, Adarsh Nagar, Sirohi, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, School Education / Education Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director, (School Education), Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Education Officer, Ajmer (Or Concerned District Education Officer).

----Respondents

.....

(44) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 19665/2025

(Reserved on 14.10.2025)

Mohammed Ishaq Sheikh S/o Shri Abdul Karim Kherada, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of 513 Ganchivada Mukam Post Peeth District Dungarpur Rajasthan 314406.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Director Secondary Education Rajasthan Bikaner.
2. District Education Officer (Secondary), District Dungarpur Rajasthan.
3. District Education Officer (Secondary), District Dhaulpur Rajasthan.
4. Principal Government Senior Secondary School, Ratanpura Dungarpur, 225309.

----Respondents

.....

(45) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20020/2025

(Reserved on 14.10.2025)

Amolak Maurya S/o Shri Mitthu Prasad Maurya, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of House No. 1, Gali 1 Bidam Colony, Beawer, District Ajmer, Rajasthan. ----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Secondary Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner, Rajasthan And Ex-Officio Additional State Project Director (Senior), Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan (Smsa).

----Respondents

.....

(46) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20026/2025

(Reserved on 14.10.2025)

Ramesh Chandra Roat S/o Vaja Ji Roat, Aged About 51 Years, Ward No 1 Padliya Simalwara Dungarpur Rajasthan 314403.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Director Secondary Education Rajasthan Bikaner.
2. District Education Officer (Secondary), District Dungarpur Rajasthan.
3. District Education Officer (Secondary), District Baran Rajasthan.
4. Principal, Late Shree Revashanker Pandya Govt. Senior Secondary School Dhambola (223673) Dungarpur

----Respondents

....

(47) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20014/2025

(Reserved on 15.10.2025)

Prema Ram Rangera S/o Hari Ram, Aged About 53 Years, House No. 4/94, Ward No. 25, Towards West Of New Akashvani, Suratgarh, District Ganganagar.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Education Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner.
3. Prem Dan, Principal, Government Senior Secondary School, 10 Sarkari, Ganganagar.

----Respondents

.....

(48) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20069/2025

(Reserved on 15.10.2025)

Shanti Devi W/o Late Shri Bhagirath Mahariya, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Khudi Badi, Tehsil And District Sikar.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Education Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Bikaner.
3. Principal, Government Senior Secondary School Kuchor Aguni, Bikaner.
4. Manju, Government Senior Secondary School Hapas, Sikar.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Ram Pratap Saini
Mr. Bhola Ram chahar
Mr. Ratan Ankiya
Mr. Ashok Choudhary
Mr. Mahender Kumar Dudy
Mr. Ripudaman Singh
Mr. Gopal Sandu
Ms.Kamini Joshi
Mr. Kunal Singh Rathore
Mr. Mahaveer Singh Rathore
Mr. Manvendra Singh Rathore
Mr. Lukesh Kumar Ramdhari
Mr. Pradeep Jat
Mr. Moti Singh
Mr. Hanuman Singh
Mr. Vipul Dharnia
Mr. Kunwar Prikshit Raj Deora
Mr. Hanuman Singh

Mr. Ankur Mathur
Mr. Ravindra Paliwal
Mr. Parikshit Nayak
Mr. Mahendra Singh Godara
Mr. Parvez Khan Moyal
Mr. Vikram Singh Bhati
Mr. Sunil Kumar Singodiya
Mr. Zafar Khan
Mr. Harshit Yadav
Mr. Sarwar Khan
Mr. Jitender Singh Bhaleria
Mr. Dheerendra Singh Sodha
Mr. Surendra Singh Choudhary
Mr. Bhim Raj Mudia
Mr. Ashwin Kumar Nogiya for
Mr. Lakshya Singh Udawat
Mr. Vishal Jangid.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. S.S. Rathore, AAG with
Mr. R.S. Bhati and
Mr. Yuvraj Singh Rathore

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MUNNURI LAXMAN

Order

Reserved on : 09/10/2025, 10/10/2025, 14/10/2025 & 15/10/2025

Pronounced on : 16/10/2025

1. At the request and with the consent of learned counsels for the parties, all these writ petitions have been heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

2. All these writ petitions have been filed challenging the impugned transfer orders. The facts relating to all these writ petitions reflect that the petitioners are working as Principals. By the impugned transfer orders, they were transferred to new places from their existing places. The transfer order reflects that they were made with an approval of the competent authority.

3. The challenge to the transfer orders were made basically on the grounds of infraction of the transfer policy of the State Government which gives certain priorities in transfer for the

specific individuals like persons suffering with disability, cases of spouses, widows, abandoned women, single women, ex-servicemen, outstanding sportsmen, suffering with incurable diseases, dependents of martyrs, personnel working in remote areas, persons underwent by pass surgery or suffering from cancer, kidney transplantation surgery or dialysis, paralysis, the disability of two limbs, blindness etc.

4. Certain transfer orders were also challenged on the ground that the transfer orders were made in violation of the executive instructions relating to transfer policy wherein, a person about to retire within one year or two years should not be transferred.

5. The transfer orders also challenged on the ground that by the executive instructions, certain special priorities are given to the persons who won the medals at State, National and International level by accommodating them in the three preferential places opted by the candidates.

6. The stand taken by the State Government is that the transfers were made keeping in view the administrative exigencies/needs and they are not the regular transfers. The transfer orders were of special nature and the procedure which is required to be followed in the case of general transfers was not required to be adopted in the cases of special transfers. These transfers were effected with a view to rationalise the working pattern of the Principals. It is also the stand of the respondents that though the transfer policy gives certain priorities for special category of persons but those priorities were under the execution instructions and they are only a guidelines. The executive

instructions do not confer any enforceable right on the employee to remain in a place when he was holding a transferable post. It is the choice of the employer as to when, where and at what places, the employee is required to be worked.

7. The learned counsels appearing for the petitioners, who have filed the writ petitions challenging the transfer orders on the ground that as per the transfer policy of the State Government, contend that the persons retiring within one or two years should not be transferred. To support their contentions, they relied on the guidelines and the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***Dr. Smt. Pushpa Mehta Vs. Rajasthan Civil Services Appellate Tribunal & Ors***.: **RLW 2000 (1) RAJASTHAN 233** and also the decision of the co-ordinate Bench of this Court at Jaipur in the case of ***Smt. Rani Jain Vs. Secretary and Transport Commissioner, Government of Rajasthan & Ors.***: **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6971/2019**, **decided on 13.05.2019**.

8. The learned counsels appears for the petitioners who assailed the transfer orders on the ground that the transfer policy gives certain preferences to certain category of persons particularly spouses, persons suffering with cancer or heart surgery and disabilities contend that their cases have to be considered keeping in view the said guidelines. Infraction of the guidelines/the executive instructions would vitiates entire transfers. It is also contended that if the State Government itself framed certain guidelines being the welfare State, it has to follow its own guidelines so as to minimize the hardships of the

employees. The transfer powers cannot be exercised arbitrarily to cause hardship to employees that too, in the middle of the academic year ignoring the guidelines.

9. The learned counsels appearing for the petitioners who have challenged the transfer order on the allegation of frequent transfer contended that the powers of transfer cannot be arbitrarily exercised transferring the employees frequently causing undue hardships not only to the employee concerned and also to their families affecting the educational avenues of the children; therefore, such transfer orders are unsustainable.

10. The learned counsels appearing for the some of the writ petitioners who have assailed the transfer orders on the ground that they were working in the Mahatma Gandhi English Medium Schools and they cannot be transferred to the Hindi Medium Schools, contend that such transfers would amount to reversion which can only be done under Rule 13 of **The Rajasthan Civil Services (Special Selection and Special Conditions of Service for Appointment of Personnel in the English Medium Schools) Rules, 2023.**

11. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents – State submits that the judgment in **Dr. Smt. Pushpa Mehta's** case (cited supra), and **Smt. Rani Jain's** case, (cited supra), cannot be made applicable to the present cases. The ratio laid down therein is contrary to the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court which clearly held that the special priorities given under the executive instructions do not confer any legally enforceable right on the employee and infraction of such

guidelines and executive instructions do not vitiate the transfer orders. It is also contended that Section 80 of the Pension Rules of 1996 enables the employee to process the pension papers two years prior to the date of the retirement. It does not prohibit the transfer of employee. The initial concept of not transferring the employee within two years of retirement in the context of Rule 80 has paled into insignificance for the reason that the whole process of pension papers which used to be manual has now been made on-line. There is no inconvenience on such process even if the employee is transferred at the verge of retirement.

12. The learned Additional Advocate General also submitted that the priorities given to the various categories of the persons under the executive instructions/transfer policy would only be considered when regular transfer orders are effected and not in the cases of special transfer orders which are solely based on the administrative exigencies/interests which can only be done with the approval of the competent authority and it has rightly been done in the present impugned transfers by duly obtaining the consent from the competent authority.

13. It is also the submission of the learned Additional Advocate General that the concept of special treatments is advisory in nature and the same is not binding as they do not it give any legally enforceable right to the employee and violation of such advisory nature guidelines do not vitiate the transfer orders. It is also contended that the transfer orders were made after relaxing the prohibition by the competent authority and they cannot be said to be during the probation period.

14. The learned Additional Advocate General that the special priority for the medal winners were also under the executive instructions. They are not binding in nature and an employee cannot get any legal right therein. In support of his contentions, the learned Additional Advocate General has referred to and relied upon the following judgments:-

1. ***Shilpi Bose (Mrs.) & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar & Ors.*** : **1991 Supp. (2) SCC 659**;
2. ***Rajendra Roy Vs. Union of India & Anr.***: **(1993) 1 SCC 148**;
3. ***Union of India & Ors. Vs. S.L. Abbas***: **(1993) 4 SCC 357**;
4. ***State of U.P. & Ors. Vs. Gobardhan Lal and D.B. Singh Vs. D.K. Shukla & Ors.***: **(2004) 11 SCC 402**;
5. ***Mohd. Masood Ahmad Vs. State of U.P. & Ors.***: **(2007) 8 SCC 150**;
6. ***Pubi Lombi Vs. State of Arunachal Pradesh & Ors.***: **(2024) 12 SCC 292**;
7. ***Abhimanyu Choudhary Vs. Majer Ali & Ors***.: **D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 1044/2022, decided on 19.12.2022**;
8. ***Maan Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors***.: **D.B. Civil Special Appeal (W) No. 586/2013, decided on 02.07.2024**; and
9. ***The State of Rajasthan & Ors. Vs. Prabat singh Jaitawat***: **D.B. Spl. Appl. Writ No. 1253/2024, decided on 20.12.2024**.

15. In the above factual background and contentions, this Court is required to examine the challenge made to the impugned transfer orders. Rule 20 of the Rajasthan Service Rules, 1951 deals with the transfer of the Government Servant. The said provision reads hereunder:-

*"**20. Transfer of Government servant**.—(a) Government may transfer a Government servant from one post to another; provided that except—*

(i) on account of inefficiency or mis-behaviour, or

(ii) on his written request,

a Government servant shall not be transferred substantively to, or, except in a case covered by Rule 50 appointed to officiate in, a post carrying less pay than the pay of the permanent post on which he holds a lien or could hold a lien had his lien not been suspended under Rule 17."

16. A reading of the above provision, it is clear that the Government has a power to transfer the Government servant from one place to another. There are certain restrictions. Government servant cannot transfer an employee to the post which is carrying less pay than the pay of the permanent post on which he holds lien except on account of inefficiency or misbehaviour on his written request. This means that a Government servant cannot be transferred so as to effect his service conditions except in exceptional cases enumerated therein.

17. A scrutiny of all the judgments relied upon by the learned counsels appearing for the parties, the principles emerged are that it is for the employer to decide when, where and at what point of time, a public servant can be transferred from one place to other place. The judicial review is permissible in a transfer order only in a case, the transfer order is result of mala fides or in violation of any statutory rules or infraction of any professed norms or principle or the transfer being detrimental to the service conditions of the employee and against public interest. None

observance of executive instructions do not confer any legally enforceable right to an employee holding the transferable post. However, if any mala fides are attributed, the person against whom mala fides are attributed, they have to be necessarily impleaded and the facts relating to the mala fide must be pleaded and proved.

18. The ratio of the Division Bench decision in the case of ***Dr. Smt. Pushpa Mehta*** (supra) as relied upon by the learned counsels appearing for the petitioners has to be understood in the context of the facts thereto and the ratio which has been laid down with regard to judicial review by relying upon the various judgments of Hon'ble Apex Court was that the Tribunals or the Courts are not to interfere in the order of transfer unless they suffer from mala fide or they are effected for extraneous considerations other than the administrative reasons.

20. In the said case, the employee who was transferred, was about to retire and was at the verge of retirement and she challenged her transfer order on the ground that the transfer was made to accommodate the private respondent therein, who was interested in getting the post of the transferred employee. The findings of the Tribunal would show that the transfer order suffer from mala fide for the reason that the transfer order has been made to accommodate the private respondent therein and the State has not filed any appeal against the Tribunal's order which set aside the transfer order on the ground of proven mala fide. The said decision also do not laid any proposition that a person, who is at the verge of retirement, cannot be transferred and what

is observed therein was that such a transfer proved to be not in the public interest. It also said that while effecting such transfer, a minimum inconvenience is caused to the concerned employee. The transfer contrary to the said settled principles enabling the Court's interference on the ground of mala fide.

20. The principle laid down in **Smt. Rani Jain's** case (supra) is that the State being the welfare employer for all the Government servants should not ordinarily disturb the superannuating employees in the last years of their service and the decision cannot create any embargo on the State power to transfer any employee for the administrative reasons.

21. The Rule 80 of the Rajasthan Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1996 is also relevant in this regard which reads hereunder:-

> ***"80. Preparation of Pension papers***
>
> *Every Head of Office shall undertake the work of preparation of pension papers in Form 7 two years before the date on which a Government servant is due to retire on superannuation, or on the date on which he proceeds on leave preparatory to retirement whichever is earlier."*

22. The above Rule enable the Head of Office to prepare the pension papers in a required format two years before the date of retirement or superannuation of employee. It only deals with the stage when the preparation of pension papers required to be undertaken. Perhaps, the norm which has been developed in the context of Section 80 Preparation Rules is that such employee is not required to be transferred within such time so as not to impact process of his pension papers. This norm was invoked in the

context of manual presentation of the pension papers. With the advancement of the technology, now the presentation of the pension papers has been made on-line. The whole process of movement of pension papers could be monitored by the Head of the Office/Department of an employee irrespective of the place of posting where the employee is transferred/posted.

23. The law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is that the guidelines/norm do not create any embargo on transfer of an employee either within one year or within two years of superannuation. It only says that the cases of the preferential rights under the provisions, norms or the policy can be considered accordingly.

24. The judgments cited supra would also make it clear that the non-observance of such preferential rights created in favour of the employee on various grounds under the executive instructions or the policy do not create any legally enforceable right on the employee. It is the choice of the employer when, where and what time an employee can be transferred when such employee is holding the transferable post. The entire guidelines are advisory in nature and they are not binding on the employer. No doubt that such policy or preferential rights which are granted to the employees are required to be taken into account when the transfer orders are effected.

25. I have gone trough the transfer policy of the State Government. The preferential treatment and their consideration of the cases falling under that category do not put any embargo on the power of the State Government in the matter of transfer.

The general transfers are required to be made in between the 1st January and 30th April. The Transfer Policy and Guidelines also say that there are special transfers also. These transfers are based on administrative compulsions or exigencies. When the administrative exigencies was the reason for transfer of an employee, the general guidelines of general transfer are not required to be followed.

26. The case set up by the respondents – State is that the transfer orders which are under challenge were made with a view to make equitable distribution of the Principals in the various institutions not to effect proper running of the institutions. It tried to rationalize the filling up of the posts of Principals and, therefore, they are made in the middle of the academic session. They are for the administrative reasons. They are not general transfers. There is no doubt that the State Government has an authority to transfer the employees on the administrative grounds. The administrative reasons give a right to the employer to transfer any employee but at the same time, the State was supposed to look into the grievances of the affected employees who are otherwise entitled to consider special preferential rights. Such preferential treatment do not out-weigh the administrative needs or exigencies of the employer. This means that they have limited right of consideration and not a vested right to ask for the place which he has opted on the ground of special treatment.

27. The general rule is that when an employee is transferred from the particular place, he has expectation of assured tenure. The frequent transfers cannot be resorted to which would amount to abuse of transfer power and results arbitrariness. Such frequent

transfers could not be said to be arbitrary transfers if the administrative exigencies or needs arise. In the present cases, some of the petitioners who have challenged the transfer orders alleges frequent transfers. This Court has seen the background of such transfers which shows that the transfers were initially made on promotion and subsequently to rationalize the pattern of Principals, they resorted to exercise the special powers of transfers. If a single person is chosen, such frequent transfer can be said to be mala fide. However, a single petitioner was not chosen to frequent transfer. In the process of adjustment and rationalization, the transfers were necessitated. They cannot be said to be arbitrary exercise of powers.

28. The preferential treatment given to the Outstanding Sportsmen particularly, the employees who won the medals in the State, National and International level by giving postings in the three preferences given by the employee is concerned non compliance of such choices do not vitiate the transfers for the reason that it is only the executive instructions. Non-observance of such executive instructions do not create any legally enforceable right on the part of the employee.

29. Some of the writ petitions have also been filed challenging the transfer orders on the ground of mala fide. The mala fides were attributed to the employees who were posted in the post which the petitioners were holding prior to passing of the transfer orders. The necessary pleadings are lacking with regard to the definite facts relating to the allegation of mala fide. Further, there is no mala fide attributing to the transferring authority. The

concerned authorities against whom the allegations of mala fide are made were not made the parties. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to exercise its jurisdiction to interfere in the impugned transfer orders.

30. The cases of persons who are falling under disability category required to be considered on different footing for the reason that their rights are emanating from the statutory provisions dealing with the specially abled persons. Such employees cases are required to be considered depending upon the nature of disability, their inconvenience vis-a-vis the requirement of administrative exigencies. Both has to be balanced. Such rights of specially abled persons are also subservient to administrative needs. This Court is not inclined to stop the transfer process till the consideration of the representations, if any, to be filed in consequence oft his order as that would impact the public interest.

31. In the result, all these writ petitions are ***disposed of*** as follows:-

(i) This Court is not inclined to interfere in the orders of transfer;

(ii) The liberty is to the petitioners who are claiming preferential rights either under the executive instructions/transfer policy or who are retiring within two years or persons suffering with disability to make representations. Such representations shall be filed only after joining in the transferred post. Any such representations are filed, the same shall be considered

within a month keeping in view the executive instructions/transfer policy vis-a-vis administrative needs.

(iii) Other petitioners who are claiming various preferential rights under the above executive instructions/transfer policy are given liberty to make a representation in the upcoming general transfers, if any. If any such representations are made, the respondent-authorities shall consider the same according to the policy as well as administrative needs.

32. In the circumstances of the cases, there shall be no orders as to costs of these writ petitions.

(MUNNURI LAXMAN),J

[S/158, S/159, S/161, S/162, S/165, S/166, S/167, S/168, S/169, S/170, S/172, S/174, S/176,S/177, S/178, S/179, S/180, S/182, S/183, S/184, S/185, S/186, S/187, S/188, S/189, S/190, S/192, S/194, S/196, S/198, S/200, S/203, S/209, S/212,S/220, S/222, S/229, S/231, S/233, S/253 **(09.10.2025)**], S/167 **(10.10.2025)**, S/162 **(14.10.2025)**, S/163 **(14.10.2025)**, S/163 **(14.10.2025)**, S/139 **(15.10.2025)** and S/143 **(15.10.2025)**--Mohan/-