



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

D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) No. 1322/2018

With

Stay Application No.19675/2018

In

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9314/2018



1. Mahendra Kumar Jatolia S/o Shiv Bhagwan Jatolia, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Shivam Villa, Village Karnipura, Post Kuli, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar (Raj.)
2. Sunder Lal S/o Mohan Lal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ward No. 1, Barbirana, Beerna, District Hanumangarh (Raj.)
3. Pawan Kumar S/o Ramswarup Kumhar, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Doongrana, District Hanumangarh (Raj.)
4. Shishpal S/o Mahaveer Prasad, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Ward No. 6, Kishanpura Dikhanda 17 Ksp, Dikhanda, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
5. Farsa Ram S/o Jaimal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o 17 Ksp, 19 Ksp, (Kishanpura) Dikhanda, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
6. Harbans Lal S/o Gopal Ram, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Ward No. 4, Dushara Bus Adda, Vpo, Kishanpura Dikhanda, 20 Ksp Kishanpura Dikhanda, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
7. Puneet Kumar S/o Vinod Kumar, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Ward No. 10, 17 Bgp, (Bolanwali), Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
8. Sandeep Kumar S/o Krishan Kumar, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Ward No. 8, Bashir, Krishn Dukan Wali Gali, 4 Ftp Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
9. Madan Lal S/o Ram Swaroop, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Ward No. 2, 2 Ptp (Nukera), Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
10. Sushil Kumar S/o Bhup Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o 12 Ksd Dhani Rasuwala, Ward No. 2, Vpo Rasuwala, 7 Idg, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
11. Choti Devi Dhayal D/o Bodu Ram Dhayal, Aged About 24 Years, Village Bichpadi, Post Nangal, Via Jahota, Tehsil Amer Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
12. Mohammad Aftab S/o Chand Mohammad, Aged About 19 Years, R/o 358/36 Mithe Kuwe Ki Gali, Lohakhana, Police Line, Ajmer (Raj.)
13. Satyanarayan Yadav S/o Ramprasad Yadav, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Charanwas, Post Alisar, Via Kaladera, Tehsil Chomu, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
14. Ashish Yadav S/o Prabhu Dayal Yadav, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Sandarsar, Via Kaladera, Tehsil Chomu,



Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)

15. Ramkhiladi Gurjar S/o Ramkishore Gurjar, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village And Post Golak, Teshil Boli, Distt. Sawaimadhopur (Raj.)
16. Revant Kumar S/o Dewa Ram, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Dhaniyo Ka Tala, Dharasar, Teshil Chowhatan, Distt. Barmer (Raj.)
17. Harshad Gaur S/o Pyare Lal Gaur, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Post Ganeshpura, Garnaobadat, Tehsil Pathpad, Distt. Jhalawar (Raj.)
18. Dinesh Kumar S/o Daulat Ram, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Post Doongri, Chitalbana, Distt. Jalore (Raj.)
19. Imran Khan S/o Nabbi Khan, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Viyo Ka Goliya, Tehsil Punasa, Distt. Jalore (Raj.)
20. Sawai Singh S/o Narayan Singh, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village And Post Ghatiyalo, Distt. Jaisalmer (Raj.)
21. Kheenya Ram S/o Ray Chand, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Gayaton Ki Dhani, Post Hemgudha, Tehsil Chitalbana, Distt. Jalore(Raj.)
22. Rampratap Godora S/o Narayan Godara, Aged About 26 Years, R/o 8 Shpd, 8 Chak, Suratgarh, Distt. Ganganagar (Raj.)
23. Kiran Rani D/o Sohan Lal, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village And Post Nirwana, Tehsil Suratgarh, Distt. Sriganganagar (Raj.)
24. Hemant Paliwal S/o Narayan Lal, Aged About 21 Years, R/o House No. 117, Rajendra Nagar, Near Sharda Bal School, Distt. Pali (Raj.)
25. Shankar Kumar S/o Rameshwar Prasad, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Ramchandrapura, Post Barijori, Tehsil Shahpura, Distt. (Raj.)
26. Jeetendra Meena S/o Shreelal Meena, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Mereda, Post Khedi, Tehsil Todabhim, Distt. Karauli(Raj.)
27. Vinod Kumar Meena S/o Ramratan Meena, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Gadholi, Post Hansmahal, Tehsil Bassi, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
28. Sangeeta D/o Manak Ram, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Mandore, Tehsil Baap, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
29. Pratap Chaudhary S/o Chittar Mal Bagariya, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village And Post Umara, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar (Raj.)
30. Laxman La Mali S/o Bhanwar Lal Mali, Aged About 34 Years, R/o 52 Muradh, Village Nichli Otan, Distt. Rajsamand (Raj.)
31. Anil Kumar S/o Sukhram, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village And Post Doongry, Tehsil Chitalwana, Distt. Jalore (Raj.)
32. Rahul Singh Rathore S/o Vashudev Rathore, Aged About





- 21 Years, R/o Village Baroda Gaon, Distt. Jaisalmer (Raj.)
33. Ram Singh Yadav S/o Ganesh Yadav, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Tejaji Ki Dhani, Post Nangalkoju, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
34. Sandeep S/o Ramotar Sharma, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Vpo Sangtera, Tehsil Kotputli, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
35. Mukesh Gurjar S/o Jagdish Prasad Gurjar, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village And Post Kadeela, Tehsil Malpura, Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
36. Mayank Kumar Sharma S/o Sita Ram Sharma, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village And Post Bhordon Ka Bas, Via Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar (Raj.).
37. Narendra Singh Shekhawat S/o Bharat Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Borki Jhunjhunu (Raj.).
38. Sandeep Kumar S/o Ranveer Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Doomra, Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
39. Anil Saini S/o Sanwormal Saini, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Kocchor, Distt. Sikar(Raj.)
40. Ramniwas Saini S/o Jhabarmal Saini, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Bagora, Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
41. Kamlesh Kapuriya S/o Bhanwar Lal, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Hejampura, Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
42. Rakesh Kansotiya S/o Kishan Lal, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village And Post Shiv Chhapri, Tehsil Kuchaman City, Distt. Nagur (Raj.)
43. Yogendra Singh S/o Maharaj Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village And Post Katara, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
44. Natvar Singh S/o Harsukh Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Tohila, Post Atari, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
45. Madhav Sharma S/o Khubi Ram, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Mukhena, Post Butholi, Tehsil Weir, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.).
46. Lakhan Singh S/o Devi Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Kamlapura, Ward No. 1, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
47. Rajkumar S/o Devi Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Nagla Ajau, Post Sihi, Tehsil Kumher Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
48. Balmukand Upadhyay S/o Hari Ram Sharma, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village And Post Bolheda, Tehsil Kama, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
49. Preeti D/o Laxman Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Indra Nagar Nale Ke Pas, Heeradas, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
50. Vishnu Kumar S/o Kishan Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Post Singhada, Tehsil Bayana, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
51. Archana Kumari D/o Samay Singh, Aged About 25 Years,





R/o Village Janhageerpur, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)

52. Ishwar Singh S/o Jaidev Singh, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village And Post Badamadi Thakuran, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
53. Hemant Kumar S/o Bholaram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
54. Vishna Kumari D/o Harish Chandra Kuntal, Aged About 19 Years, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
55. Kusum D/o Rambharosi, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
56. Kushalpal Singh S/o Rambharosi, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
57. Satyendra Singh S/o Udayveer Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
58. Ravindra Singh S/o Satyapal, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Loki, Tehsil Kumher, Post Therawat, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
59. Maheepal Gurjar S/o Lekhram Gurjar, Aged About 19 Years, R/o Village Post Pingora, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.).
60. Ramdeen Paliyal S/o Jetha Ram, Aged About 19 Years, R/o Village And Post Narwa Katla, Tehsil Khinwansar, Distt. Nagaur (Raj.)
61. Sunil Matawa S/o Hari Ram, Aged About 27 Years, Beniwalon Ka Bas, Modi Kalan, Distt. Nagaur (Raj.)
62. Ramkishore Roj S/o Megha Ram, Aged About 18 Years, R/o Jayal, Distt. Nagaur (Raj.)
63. Rinky Yadav D/o Brij Kishore Yadav, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village And Post Chawandeda, Tehsil And Distt. Dausa (Raj.)
64. Prakash Chand Meena S/o Kalu Ram Meena, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Manpura, Post Salempura, Tehsil Ramgarh Pachewada, Distt. Dausa (Raj.)
65. Bheek Narayan Saini S/o Revar Mal Saini, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Sainthal, Distt. Dausa (Raj.)
66. Bhavesh Kansal S/o Mukesh Chandra Kansal, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Bayalpura, Hindauncity, Distt. Karauli (Raj.)
67. Jagdish S/o Mota Ram, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Saran Nagar, Rajsagar, Chamu Tehsil Balesar, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
68. Karna Ram S/o Phussa Ram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Kanediya Mahasingh, Tehsil Shergarh, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
69. Prem Singh S/o Gopal Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o





Village Pachla Khurd, Tehsil Tivri, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)

70. Khema Ram S/o Hema Ram, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Malasar And Post Falsun, Tehsil Baniyana, Distt. Jaisalmer (Raj.)
71. Kanhaiya Lal Sharma S/o Sohan Lal Sharma, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Meghras, Post Bhunas, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.)
72. Ranjana Kumawat D/o Badri Lal Kumawat, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village And Post Bagoliya, Tehsil Raipur, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.)
73. Kanhaiya Lal Sen S/o Sohan Lal Sen, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Ward No. 6, Gangapur, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.)
74. Karma Chaudhary S/o Harinarayan Chaudhary, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Kunder, Tehsil Uniara, Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
75. Vijay Kumar Sharma S/o Purushottam Sharma, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Soda, Tehsil Malpura Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
76. Kapil Sharma S/o Govind Narayan Sharma, Aged About 19 Years, R/o 39 Kalyan Nagar, Chhawni Tonk, Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
77. Vinod Kumar Nagar S/o Ramnarayan Dhakar, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Sitarampura Dhakran, Post Rindiya, Rampura Tehsil Tadarisingh, Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
78. Sanwar Singh Yadav S/o Ramkishor Yadav, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Ranoli, Tehsil Pipllu, Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
79. Himmat Singh Yadav S/o Banwari Lal Yadav, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village And Post Ranoli, Tehsil Pipllu, Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
80. Babu Lal Jat S/o Madan Lal Jat, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Panchunokha, Distt. Bikaner (Raj.).
81. Ramkishan Sain S/o Poonam Chand, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Lalu Ji Khedi, Jorawarpura, Nokha Distt. Bikaner (Raj.)
82. Hema D/o Shre Lal, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Gadhi Jonawat, Distt. Dholpur (Raj.)
83. Sushila Kanwar D/o Richpal Singh, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Ramnawali, Distt. Ganganagar (Raj.)
84. Shyam Lal Jatiya S/o Nana Lal Jatiya, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Purohiton Ka Sanwata, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh (Raj.)
85. Karan Singh Rathore S/o Udai Singh Rathore, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Gurjaniya, Post Hasampura, Tehsil Rashmi, Distt. Chittorgarh (Raj.)
86. Babu Lal Regar S/o Moolchand Regar, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Raigar Mohalla, Gosunda, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh (Raj.)





87. Seema Khandelwal D/o Jagdish Chand Khandelwal, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Biloda, Distt. Chittorgarh (Raj.).
88. Sangeeta Sharma D/o Ratan Lal Sharma, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Kunthana, Distt. Chittorgarh - 312024 (Raj.)
89. Chandra Dangi W/o Kanhaiya Lal, Aged About 23 Years, R/o 113 Natowali Ghati, 100 Ft. Circle, Shobhagpur, Udaipur (Raj.)
90. Mukesh Kumar Royal S/o Randheer Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village And Post Khansoli, Tehsil And Distt. Churu (Raj.)
91. Rohitashv Parashar S/o Harish Chand Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Brahmanpada, Maysil, Distt. Dholpur (Raj.)
92. Jogendra Singh S/o Jagdish Prasad, Aged About 25 Years, Chitora, Distt. Dholpura (Raj.)
93. Sunil Kumar S/o Ran Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o 328 Kushwaha Basti Nagla, Tailaya Doongri, Distt. Dholpura (Raj.)
94. Ram Avdhesh S/o Jagmohan Verma, Aged About 28 Years, R/o. 2/2 Type 3, Telephone Exchange Rambagh, Agra (Up)
95. Anita D/o Ajeet Singh, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Meerpur, Post Katopur, Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
96. Rajpal S/o Jeevandas, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Chadigadh Ka Bas, Post Nowgon, Tehsil Ramgarh, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
97. Dharam Singh Saini S/o Begraj, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village And Post Nowgoan, Chandigarh Ka Bas, Tehsil Ramgarh Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
98. Gordhan S/o Jile Singh, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Berawas Kalan, Post Bhonker, Tehsil Kotkasim Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
99. Chandrabhan Yadav S/o Nihal Singh Yadav, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Darbarpur, Post Ajraka, Mundwar, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
100. Pawan Kumar Sharma S/o Sheochand Sharma, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Renagiri, Post Shyopur, Tehsil Mundwar, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
101. Rajbala Yadav D/o Shishram Yadav, Aged About 27 Years, R/o B 363, Rathnagar, Near Pani Ki Tanki, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
102. Narendra Kumar Patwa S/o Matadeen Patwa, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village And Post Pratapgarh, Tehsil Thanagazi, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
103. Rinku Chaudhary D/o Pappu Ram Chaudhary, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village And Post Bijwar Naruka, Tehsil Malakheda, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)





104. Siya Ram Prajapat S/o Shri Narayana Prajapat, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Irniya Iteda, Tehsil Laxmangarh, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
105. Kailash Chand Gurjar S/o Kishan Lal Gurjar, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village And Post Atalikpura, Post Dodwadi, Tehsil Piplu, Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
106. Ramesh Kumar S/o Bhagirath Ram, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Saron Ki Dhani, Palina Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
107. Om Prakash S/o Ram Chander, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village And Post Doongri, Post Chitalwana, Distt. Jalore (Raj.)
108. Hanuman Ram S/o Poorana Ram, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village And Post Lorty Height, Undkha, Distt. Barmer (Raj.)
109. Ameda Ram Saran S/o Goma Ram Saran, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Khume Ke Bedi, Dhorimanna, Distt. Barmer (Raj.)
110. Gangaram S/o Thakara Ram, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Nehro Ki Dhani, Distt. Barmer (Raj.)
111. Arjun Ram Dhaka S/o Ramchandra Dhaka, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Balaknath Ki Kutiya Ke Pas, Ward No. 19, Balotra Distt. Barmer (Raj.)
112. Jagga Ram S/o Nethi Ram, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Amliyala Gudha Malani, Distt. Barmer (Raj.)
113. Om Prakash Yadav S/o Laxminarayan Yadav, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Thoth Walon Ki Dhani, Nangal Koju, Distt. Jaipur
114. Karan Singh Yadav S/o Arjun Lal Yadav, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Ward No. 28, Nidola, Khejoli, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
115. Pragya Sharma D/o Promod Kumar Sharma, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Brahmpuri, Gaushala, Dholpur (Raj.)
116. Kapil Dev S/o Pratap Singh, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Kawai, Bharatpur (Raj.)
117. Punit Sharma S/o Dhaniram Sharma, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Vardhman Nagar, Hindaun City, District Karauli (Raj.)
118. Vijay Pal S/o Jagdish Prasad, R/o Ward No. 9, 33 Amp, Kalwasiya, Distt. Ganganagar (Raj.)
119. Kapil Kumar S/o Bhagwan Singh, R/o Village And Post Bolheda, Tehsil Kama, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
120. Poonam Singh S/o Sri Malam Singh, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Gangapura, Post Girab, Tehsil Gadra Road, Distt. Barmer (Raj.)
121. Manish Kumar Sharma S/o Ramniwas Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Paragpura, Tehsil Kotputli, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
122. Firoz Khan S/o Subhan Ahmed, Aged About 22 Years, R/o





Village And Post Pinan, Tehsil Raini, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)

----Appellants

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Primary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner
3. The Board Of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Ajmer, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer
4. Amrik Singh S/o Iqbal Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Kishanpura Dikhanda, 17 K.s.p. 19 Ksp (Kishanpura) Dikhanda, Hanumangarh (Raj.)
5. Subhash Chander S/o Ramswarup Kumar, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Ward No. 03, Mohan Magariya, Tehsil And District Hanumangarh (Raj.)
6. Vinod Kumar S/o Rameshwar, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Ward No. 8 Madarpura District Hanumangarh (Raj.)
7. Rakesh Kumar S/o Mani Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Ward No. 27, Gali No. 1, Surya Nagar Vatika, Hanumangarh Town 8 Ssw, Hanumangarh (Raj)
8. Poonam D/o Balbir Singh, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Bhangarh Bhadra, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
9. Ashok Kumar Joshi S/o Ram Kumar, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ward No. Jasana, 25 Jsn, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
10. Balwan S/o Krishan Kumar, Aged About 28 Years, R/o House No. 5, Bakariana Gudiakhera, 29 Sirsa Gudiakhera (Haryana)
11. Pawan Kumar S/o Chanan Mal, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Ward No. 9 Doongrana, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
12. Naresh Kumar S/o Sohan Lal, Aged About 35 Years, R/o 17 Ksp, Ward No. 7, 19 Ksp, (Kishanpura) Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
13. Sukh Dev S/o Jagdeesh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Ward No. 4, 17 Ksp, Kishanpura, dikhanda, 19 Ksp (Kishanpura), Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
14. Satpal S/o Shrikrishan, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Ward No. 13, 2 Ptp (Nukera), Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
15. Vijender Singh S/o Baljeet Singh, Aged About 19 Years, R/o 6 Jgw, Ninan, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
16. Monika D/o Parveen Kumar, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Bhangarh, Post Bhangarh, Tehsil Bhadra, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.)
17. Poonam Baimad D/o Kailash Chand Baimad, Aged About 20 Years, R/o 45, Vigyan Nagar, Ranthamboreroad, Sawaimadhapur (Raj.)
18. Narayan S/o Girraj Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Tuhiya Pattipura, Uchain, Post Adhiyari, Tehsil Roopwas, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.).



19. Shivilal Bairwa S/o Ramswaroop Bairwa, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Todadhekla, Tehsil Lalsot, Distt. Dausa (Raj.).
20. Sunil Kumar Jat S/o Gopal Lal Jat, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Israwala, Post Bilochi, Tehsil Amer, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
21. Sunil Kumar Koli S/o Suwa Lal Koli, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village And Post Thali, Tehsil Jamwaramgarh, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
22. Pritam Chaudhary D/o Ramniwas Chaudhary, Aged About 20 Years, R/o B-6, Bahubali Nagar, Mansarover, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
23. Manisha Khoiya D/o Jeetram, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Mathuraheda, Post Indrawali, Tehsil Kathumar, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
24. Varsha Kumari D/o Satish Kumari, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Kayampur Jokha Bas, Post Budhibawal, Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
25. Monika D/o Sukhram Yadav, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Bilahedo, Post And Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar(Raj.)
26. Shankar Lal S/o Surendra Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Kulharion Ka Bas, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.).
27. Naveen Kumar S/o Satyaveer, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Dhandhar, Post D.k. Bas, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu(Raj.).
28. Govind Singh Rajawat S/o Amer Singh Rajawat, Aged About 30 Years, 18, Manu Vihar Vistar, Near Kishan Vidyapeeth, Jamdoli, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
29. Sumit Kumar Verma S/o Ummed Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Behind Ajeet Hospital, Gulal Ka Kua, Ward No. 13, Khetri, Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
30. Suresh Kumar S/o Moti Ram, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Sortha, Tehsil Roodar, Distt. Sirohi (Raj.)
31. Rajendra Kumar Chaudhary S/o Panchu Ram Jat, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Naradpura,post Narena, Tehsil Phulera, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.).
32. Mohan Lal S/o Tikuram, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Birdo Ka Tala, Post Bisarniya, Tehsil Chowhatan, Distt. Barmer (Raj.).
33. Raju Singh S/o Ajab Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Kanasi Moti, Tehsil Jodhani, Tiputapu, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.).
34. Choth Mal Raidas S/o Shyam Lal, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Jabar, Tehsil Manohar Thana, Distt. Jhalawar (Raj.).
35. Sunil Kumar S/o Megh Singh, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Jindpura, Post Khanwa, Tehsil Roopwas, Distt. Bhartpur (Raj.)





36. Suman Chaudhary D/o Dhura Ram Chaudhary, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Ward No. 2, Tehsil Hansalsar, Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
37. Pramod Kumar S/o Sewaram, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Dhana, Tehsil Laxmangarh, Distt. sikar (Raj.)
38. Sulochana D/o Manohar Ram, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Sarno Ki Dhani, Tehsil Sarpura, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
39. Narendra Naraniya S/o Pooran Mal Naraniya, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Post Chanwadiya, Tehsil Bassi, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
40. Ramesh Achara S/o Chhitar Mal Achara, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Mau, Srimadhampur, Distt. Sikar (Raj.).
41. Harish Kumar Chandeliya S/o Mamchand Chandeliya, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Chadeliya Ki Dhani, Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
42. Rajendra Kumar Meena S/o Dhanna Ram Meena, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Fatehpur Shekhawati, Distt. Sikar (Raj.)
43. Pankaj Dhariwal S/o Vijay Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Dewas, Distt. Sikar (Raj.)
44. Vikas Kumar S/o Rohtash, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Pratappura, Distt. Sikar (Raj.)
45. Dinesh Kumar Sharma S/o Surendra Kumar Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Jajod, Tehsil Laxamangarh, Distt. Sikar (Raj.)
46. Jaiprakash Jhakhar S/o Sri Ram Jhakhar, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Neem Ka Thana, Distt. Sikar (Raj.).
47. Bharat Singh S/o Ranveer Singh, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Jhorol, Post Karata, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
48. Lokendra Singh S/o Babu Singh, R/o Village Magren Khurd, Tehsil Bayana Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
49. Sachin Kumar Sharma S/o Lal Chand Sharma, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village And Post Bolheda, Tehsil Kama, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
50. Anuradha D/o Laxman Singh, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Indra Nagar Nale Ke Pas, Heeradas, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
51. Gaurav Sharma S/o Madan Lal Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Jaya, Post Usrani, Tehsil Kumher Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
52. Munesh Kumar S/o Vijay Singh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Katara, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
53. Gaurav Singh Chaudhary S/o Birendra Singh Chaudhary, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village And Post Jharkhai, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
54. Suresh Nehra S/o Badri Ram, Aged About 28 Years, R/o 116, Kumharon Ka Mohalla, Degana Chossali, Distt.





Nagaur (Raj.)

55. Rajendra Godara S/o Gordhan Godara, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Godara Market, Behind Nagar Palika, Deedwana, Distt. Nagaur (Raj.)
56. Hardeva Ram S/o Biwana Ram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Indrapura, Ambpa, Distt. Nagaur (Raj.)
57. Guru Prakash Kasana S/o Ramhet Singh Gurjar, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Sumel Kalan, Post Khuntla, Tehsil Baswa, Distt. Dausa (Raj.)
58. Renu Chhawari D/o Ranjeet Singh Chhawari, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Dhani Kishanpura Bid, Kherli, Distt. Dausa (Raj.)
59. Rajesh Kumar Gurjar S/o Ghamman Singh Gujar, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village And Post Dighariya, Tehsil Lawan, Distt. Dausa (Raj.)
60. Jatashankar Sharma S/o Babu Lal Sharma, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Post Gndarwa, Tehsil Shikari, Distt. Dausa (Raj.)
61. Manish Kumar Kaswa S/o Heera Lal Gujar, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Sumel Kalan, Post Kuntala, Tehsil Baswa Distt. Dausa (Raj.)
62. Praveen Kumar Sharma S/o Lalu Ram Sharma, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Delari, Tehsil Baswa, Distt. Dausa (Raj.)
63. Prithvi Raj Meghwal S/o Mangi Lal, Meghwal, R/o Village Luna, Tehsil Baap, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
64. Sukha Ram S/o Chola Ram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village And Post Dahikara, Via Benar, Tehsil And Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
65. Dagala Ram S/o Bhaga Ram, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Post Surchh Bagoriya, Tehsil Bhopalgarh, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
66. Naina Ram S/o Sona Ram, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Post Cherai, Tehsil Tigri, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
67. Bhagirath S/o Dhanna Ram, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Sihda, Tehsil Baap, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
68. Mahaveer Singh S/o Durg Singh, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village And Post Shivdan Singh Nagar, Post Bengri Kalan, Tehsil Falaudi Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.)
69. Lalit Kumar Jat S/o Roshan Lal Jat, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Ratanpura, Post Salera, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.)
70. Bheru Lal Kharol, S/o Champa Lal Kharol, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Baghera, Post Bharak, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.)
71. Shambhu Lal Gadri S/o Nandram Gadri, Aged About 23 Years, Village Baghera, Post Bharak, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.)
72. Anita Kumari Kumawat D/o Amba Lal Kumawat, Aged





About 26 Years, R/o Village Patiyon Ka Kheda (Thala) Tehsil Raipur, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.).

73. Ujjawal Singh Rajawat S/o Bhanwar Singh Rajawat, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Priyanka Garments, Luharon Ki Maszid, Newai, Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
74. Giriraj Sharma S/o Gordhan Sharma, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Ambapura, Post Tordi Sagar, Tehsil Malpura Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
75. Mukesh Singh Nathawat S/o Hanuman Singh, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village And Post Chatubhujpura, Tehsil Newai, Distt. Tonk (Raj.)
76. Kishan Lal Dhaker S/o Phool Chand Dhaker, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village And Post Palka, Via Bassi, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh (Raj.)
77. Gaurishankar Suthar S/o Inder Lal Suthar, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village And Post Kashmor, Via Gosunda, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh (Raj.)
78. Vikram Ahir S/o Panna Lal Ahir, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Maliya Khedi, Phalwa, Distt. Chittorgarh (Raj.)
79. Roshan Raj Gurjar S/o Ganpat Ram Gurjar, Aged About 22 Years, R/o D-25, Police Line, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.)
80. Balwan Singh S/o Sube Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Mundital, Tehsil Ragrah, Distt. Churu 331023 (Raj.)
81. Purushottam Puri S/o Sobaran Puri, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village Post Singorai, Tehsil Bari, Distt. Dholpura (Raj.)
82. Rakesh Singh S/o Omveer Singh, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Fatehpur, Post Bansuri, Janhagira Baisena, Bulandshahar (Up)
83. Himanshu Yadav S/o Mahesh Chand Yadav, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Darbarpur, Post Ajraka, Mundwar, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
84. Girraj Prasad Meena S/o Matadeen Meena, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village And Post Agar (Dudi Ki Dhani) Tehsil Thanagazi Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
85. Ram Lal Jat S/o Budhram Jat, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village And Post Beejwar Narukamal Kheda, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
86. Rajesh Kumar Soni S/o Satyanarayan Soni, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Post Dag, Tehsil Gangdhar, Distt. Jhalawar (Raj.)
87. Swarup Singh Bhati S/o Girdhar Singh Bhati, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village And Post Modha, Tehsil Fatehgarh, Distt. Jaisalmer (Raj.)
88. Mahaveer Singh Bhati S/o Narayan Singh Bhati, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village And Post Modha, Tehsil Fatehgarh, Distt. Jaisalmer (Raj.)
89. Ranbir Singh S/o Rajbir Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o





Village And Post Suratpura, Distt. Churu (Raj.)

90. Priya Narniya D/o Chhotu Lal Narniya, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Banjaro Ki Basti, Pachipalaiya, Distt. Sawaimadhopur (Raj.)
91. Jyoti D/o Resham Lal, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village And Post New Prem Nagar, Gali No. 9, Distt. Sriganganagar (Raj.).
92. Anil Parmar S/o Harji Ram, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village And Post Kelwa, Tehsil And Distt.rajsamand (Raj.)
93. Swati Sharma D/o Manoj Kumar Sharma, Aged About 19 Years, R/o 42, Balaji Vihar, Niwaru Road, Jhotwara, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.)
94. Suman Yadav D/o Bhagwan Sahay Yadav, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village And Post Nindola, Jaipur (Raj.)
95. Mamta Kumari D/o Nemichand Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Ward No. 13, Bisau, Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.)
96. Chandra Shekhar Swami S/o Babu Ram B/c Swami, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Adusiya, Post Lamba Hari Singh, Malpura, District Tonk.
97. Man Singh Gurjar S/o Babulal B/c Gurjar, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Julmi Road, Dhaker Colony, Ramganj Mandi, District Kota.
98. Shravan Singh Rathore S/o Shri Udai Singh Rathor, R/o Nayi Abadi Kanthariya, Bhadesar, Chittorgarh.
99. Hansa Devi Sharma D/o Hanuman Prasad Sharma, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Kirawal, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk.
100. Sanju Choudhary D/o Shri Balwant Ram W/o Rajeev, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Near Sarvodaya School, Chhanibari, Bhadra, District Hanumangarh (Raj.).
101. Ashok Kumar Bishnoi S/o Baburam, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Post Haripura Motai, Tehsil Falodi, District Jodhpur (Raj.).
102. Trilok Ram S/o Doongarram, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Aasanda, Post Khatimashi, Tehsil And District Jodhpur (Raj.).
103. Sunil Vishu S/o Bhanwarlal Vishu, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Karnisar, Tehsil Chatargarh, District Bikaner (Raj.).
104. Rahul Benewal S/o Mahaveer Prasad, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Dhamandiya, Tehsil Suratgarh, District Sriganganagar.
105. Umesh Kumar Gurjar S/o Banshidhar Gurjar, Resident Of Village Shyampura, Post Paldi, Tehsil Viratnagar, District Jaipur (Raj.).
106. Surajmal Prajapat S/o Badri Narayan Prajapat, Resident Of Village Bas Vinodipura, Village Panchayat Ramnagar, Tehsil Kotkhavda, Jaipur (Raj.).
107. Nemi Chand Goyal S/o Malaram Goyal, Resident Of Village Napasar, District Bikaner (Raj.).





108. Mahendra S/o Dhannaram, Resident Of Near Shiv Mandir, Ashok Colony, District Jodhpur (Raj.).
109. Pramod Kumar S/o Sharwan Kumar, Resident Of Suratgarh, District Bikaner (Raj.).
110. Lal Chand S/o Pannalal, Resident Of Village Post Office, Mannivali, Tehsil Sadul Sahar, District Srigangangar (Raj.).
111. Anil Kumar S/o Shri Kundan Lal, Resident Of Vpo Manniwali, Tehsil Sadul Sahar, District Srigangangar (Raj.).
112. Bhawani Singh S/o Rajroshi, Resident Of Village And Post Devlen, Tehsil Todabhim, Karauli.
113. Dhanraj Singh S/o Premraj, Resident Of Village And Post Mehmادpur, Tehsil Todabhim, District Karauli.
114. Rajesh Singh S/o Gyan Singh, Resident Of Village And Post Madoti, P.s. Singhania, Tehsil Todabhim, District Karauli (Raj.)
115. Pragyesh Kumar Shah S/o Shri Devilal Shah, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Peeth, Tehsil Simalwara, District Dungarpur.
116. Bahadur Muniya Son Of Shri Valu Muniya, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village And Post Palibadi, Tehsil Sajjangarh, District Banswara.
117. Lokesh Kumar Patel Son Of Shri Kurilal Patel, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Ghati, Post Sarera, Tehsil Kherwara, Distt. Udaipur.
118. Manisha Ameta Daughter Of Shri Bhgwatilal Ameta, Aged About 20 Years, Resident Of Village Titardi, Tehsil Girwa, Distt. Udaipur.
119. Priyank Thakor Son Of Shri Prakash Chandra Thakor, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village Sameliya, Post Badgaon, Tehsil And District Banswara.
120. Ranchod Damor Son Of Shri Balulal Damor, Aged About 20 Years, Resident Of Village Sajjan Singh Ka Gada, Post Bhuwasa, Tehsil Ganoda, District Bansawara.
121. Amar Singh Maida Son Of Shri Haliya Maida, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Dalpura, Post Bhaler Bhordar, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara.
122. Okesh Kumar Adiwasi Son Of Shri Shankarlal Adiwasi, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Asoda, Tehsil Garhi, District Banswara.
123. Mohanlal Rathore Son Of Shri Narji Rathore, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Padla, Post Miyasa, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
124. Urmila Kumari Dodiya Daughter Shri Gajeng Dodiya, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Adiwasi Mohalla, Village And Post Bhimsour, Tehsil Gorhi, District Banswara.
125. Kailash Nath Rawal Son Of Shri Heeralal Rawai, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Padoli





Rathod, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.

126. Rajesh Ninama Son Of Shri Surya Shankar Ninama, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Konji Ka Gada, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
127. Mamta Maida Daughter Of Shri Laxmanlal, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Piplod, Post Sewana, Tehsil And District Banswara.
128. Mukesh Kumar Son Of Shri Prabhulal, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Negred, Post Kherwa, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
129. Daulat Singh Son Of Shri Jeeta, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Andeshwar, Tehsil Sajjangarh, District Banswara.
130. Pooja Bhatt Daughter Of Shri Rajnikant Bhatt, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Anjana, Tehsil Garhi, District Banswara.
131. Prakash Chandra Vadkhiya Son Of Shri Kadawa Vadkhiya, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Padla Vadkhiya, Post Itala, Tehsil Sajjangarh, District Banswara.
132. Rajesh Kumar Patidar Son Of Shri Govind Ram Patidar, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Naugama, Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara.
133. Ravindra Kumar Son Of Shri Amritlal Ninama, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Prithvipura, Post Devda, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
134. Prabhulal Rawal Son Of Shri Kachru Rawal, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Padoli, Rathod, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
135. Mohanlal Damor Son Of Shri Tola Ramji Damor, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Ramgarh, Tehsil Kushalgarh, District Banswara.
136. Kailash Bhuriya Son Of Shri Par Singh Bhuriya, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Kakkanwani, Post Ramgarh, Tehsil Kushalgarh, District Banswara.
137. Dilip Singh Devda Son Of Shri Man Singh Devda, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Nishwat, Post Badwas Chhoti, Tehsil Kushalgarh, District Banswara.
138. Mukesh Chandra Son Of Shri Gajanand, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Rohaniya, Tehsil Gangartalai, District Banswara.
139. Saraswati Kumari Ahari Daughter Of Shri Dwarika Kumari Ahari, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Rani Road, New Colony, Tehsil Kherwarda, District Udaipur.
140. Ramesh Chandra Son Of Shri Gajanand Katara, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Rohaniya, Tehsil Gangartalai, District Banswara.
141. Anjali Rana Daughter Of Shri Mohan Lal, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Semal Pada, Post Khantav, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.





142. Kanhaiya Lal Son Of Shri Dhulji, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Udupua, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
143. Deependra Jain Son Of Shri Pawan Kumar Jain, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of A-226, Punawas Colony Sangwara, Tehsil Sangwara, District Dungarpur.
144. Kamal Kalal Son Of Shri Narayan Kalal, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Motagaon, Tehsil Ganoda, District Banswara, Tehsil Ganoda, District Banswara.
145. Prabhulal Adiwasi Son Of Shri Bhema, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Sogpura, Post Nogama, Tehsil, Bagidora, District Banswara.
146. Priyanka Solanki Daughter Of Shri Kuber Solanki, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Piplod, Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara.
147. Greesma Maida Daughter Of Shri Manilal Maida, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village Herapada, Post Sagrod, Tehsil And District Banswara.
148. Premji Patel Son Of Shri Dalji Patel, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Kanthdi, Post And Tehsil Aspur, District Dungarpur.
149. Sohanlal Ganava Son Of Shri Radhulal Ganava, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Varshalal, Post Bassi Tehsil Kushalgarh, District Banswara.
150. Bahadur Singh Son Of Shri Kanji, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Hawaipatti, Post Talwada, Tehsil And District Banswara.
151. Kan Singh Damor Son Of Shri Taj Singh Damor, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Gariyatodi, Post Dungra Chhota, Tehsil Sajjangarh, District Banswara.
152. Kalsingh Katara Son Of Shri Hurlpal Katara, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Chanderi, Post Timeda, Bada, Tehsil Kushalgarh, District Banswara.
153. Chandu Lal Pargi Son Of Shri Harish Chandra, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Malakholda, Tehsil Simalwara, District Dungarpur.
154. Varsha Joshi Daughter Of Shri Harih Joshi, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Panchwara, Tehsil Garhi, District Banswara.
155. Manish Pandya Son Of Shri Harshad Kumar Pandya, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Shyam Colony, Udaipur Road, Banswara, District Banswara.
156. Shushma Sharma Daughter Of Shri Suresh Chandra Sharma, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Near Aradhana Bhawan, Sadar Bajar Sangwara, District Dungarpur.
157. Rahul Jain Son Of Shri Kamlesh Jain, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Kun, Tehsil Lasadiya, District Udaipur.





158. Roshni Vyas Daughter Of Shri Vijay Prashad Vyas, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Ganoda, Tehsil Ganoda, District Banswra.
159. Gautamlal Charpota Son Of Shri Narayan Lal Charpota, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Rohaniya Kaliya, Post Dagal, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
160. Ganeshlal Parmar Son Of Shri Majuda Parmar, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Chelkari, Post Rohaniya, Tehsil Gangartalai, District Banswara.
161. Kalpana Rot Daughter Of Shri Murtisvaroop, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Thapda, Post Udaipura Bada, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara.
162. Pawan Kumar Meena Son Of Shri Hardariya Meena, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Bhudanpura, Post Rohida, Tehsil Garhi, District Banswara.
163. Sanjay Kothari Son Of Shri Nathu Singh Kothari, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Dunga Chhota, Tehsil Sajjangarh, District Banswara.
164. Kalpana Kumari Bamaniya Daughter Of Shri Babla Bamaniya, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Govind Nagar, Village And Post Bedwa, Tehsil Garhi, District Banswara.
165. Durga Kumari Barjod Daughter Of Shri Devilal Barjod, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Asoda, Tehsil Garhi, District Banswara.
166. Darmistha Soni Daughter Of Shri Jayantilal Soni, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Amar Singh Ka Gada, Tehsil Ganoda, District Banswara.
167. Kalyani Kumari Darji Daughter Of Shri Ramesh Chandra Darji, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Ganoda, Tehsil Ganoda, District Banswara.
168. Kalpana Kumari Jain Daughter Of Shri Dharmilal Jain, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Ganoda, Tehsil Ganoda, District Banswara.
169. Jagdish Chandra Huvor Son Of Shri Hurji Huvor, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Sagpura, Post Navgama, Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara.
170. Badamilal Adiwasi Son Of Shri Tulshiram, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Naugama, Tehsil Bagidora District Banswara.
171. Santosh Kumari Bhagora Daughter Of Shri Manilal Bhagora, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Patiyagaliya, Post Bhadar, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara.
172. Jugal Kishore Pandya Son Of Shri Purushotam Pandya, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Purushotam Guest House Opposite Vinod Cinema Old Bus Stand Banswara, Block And District Banswara.
173. Yashesh Bhatt Son Of Shri Arvind Bhatt, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Jolana, Tehsil Garhi, District





Banswara.

174. Mahesh Ahari Son Of Shri Manalal Ahari, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Masaro Ki Obir, Tehsil Rishabhdev, District Banswara.
175. Seema Nanoma Daughter Of Shri Devilal Nanoma, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Veerpur, Post Bildi, Tehsil And District Banswara.
176. Rajmal Maida Son Of Shri Karulal Maida, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Kannela, Post Devda, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
177. Mansukhlal Ninama Son Of Shri Rangji Ninama, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Kanji Ka Gara, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
178. Payal Ninama Daughter Of Shri Mukesh Ninama, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Lohariya, Tehsil Garhi, District Banswara.
179. Kalu Singh Patel Son Of Shri Arjnega Patel, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Itauva, Post Barodya, Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara.
180. Saurabh Rawal Son Of Shri Dinesh Rawal, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Near Sanjay Petrol Pump Satyampura C Shiv Colony Ward No. 4, Udaipur Road Banswara, Tehsil And District Banswara.
181. Maya Pathak Daughter Of Shri Shankarlal, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village And Ramsour Vaya Chikhli, Tehsil Galiyakot, District Banswara.
182. Manoj Choubisa Son Of Shri Ramesh Chandra Choubisa, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Valwasa Mafi, Post Munged, Tehsil Sabla, District Dungarpur.
183. Narendra Ninama Son Of Shri Veerji Ninama, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Pipalapada, Post Mangela Pada Padoli Rathod, Tehsil Ghatol, District Banswara.
184. Vimal Kumar S/o Shri Kanji, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village Pateliya, Post Pindarma, Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara, Rajasthan.
185. Shivilal Charpota Son Of Shri Valu Charpota, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Khokharwa, Post Pindarma, Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara Rajasthan.
186. Tara Kumari D/o Shri Jagdish Charpota, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village And Post Naugama Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara Rajasthan.
187. Arujulal Charpota S/o Shri Prameshwar Charpota, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village And Post Jolana, Tehsil Garhi, District Banswara Rajasthan.
188. Naresh Ninama S/o Shri Rajmal, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Ambazi Bela Para, Post And Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara Rajasthan.
189. Mukesh Chandra Garasiya S/o Shri Ramsu Garasiya, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village And Post Handi, Tehsil





Gangartalia, District Banswara Rajasthan.

190. Gayatri Patidar D/o Shri Ranchhod Patidar, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village And Post Karji, Tehsil And District Banswara Rajasthan.
191. Dilip Son Of Shri Surendra Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village And Post Tandaratna, Tehsil Sajjangarh, District Banswara Rajasthan.
192. Hukka Ram Surawat S/o Shri Madsiya Surawat, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Rupakhera, Post Magarda, Tehsil Sajjangarh, District Banswara Rajasthan.
193. Rekha Kumari Maida D/o Shri Kanhaiyalal, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Jhamri, Post Andeshwar, Tehsil Sajjangarh, District Banswara Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) No. 1391/2018

With

Stay Application No.20780/2018

In

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9603/2018

1. Vivek Kumar Devesh S/o Kishan Singh, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Bharithal, Post Masari, Tehsil Kathumar, Distt. Alwar (Raj.).
2. Beena Sharma D/o Ramswaroop Sharma, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Dholi Madhogarh, Tehsil Bassi, Distt. Jaipur (Raj.).
3. Seema Panwar D/o Vasudev, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Ward No. 34, Sutharon Ki Badi Buwad, Distt. Bikaner (Raj.).
4. Manish Kumar S/o Mohmmadam, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Kiwrali, Distt. Sirohi (Raj.).
5. Nemichand Meena S/o Hajari Lal Meena, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Ward No. 24, Meeno Ka Mohalla, Fatehpur, Distt. Sikar (Raj.).
6. Praveen Kumar Jatolia S/o Sohan Lal Jatolia, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Karnipura, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar (Raj.).
7. Kailash Chand Gadri S/o Pana Chand Gadri, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Sahada, Sahara, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.).
8. Sushila Jat D/o Madan Lal Jat, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Bili Kohda, Borda, Distt. Sawaimadhopur (Raj.).
9. Satish Kumar Dhawan S/o Kanhaiya Lal Dhawan, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Rahimpur, Chandlai, Distt. Tonk (Raj.).
10. Gunjan Jain D/o Mukesh Jain, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Udaipur Margh, Bus Stand Khondan, Banswara, Gadhi (Raj.).



11. Neeraj Trivedi S/o Jagdish Trivedi, Aged About 27 Years, Ansik Thikariya, Distt. Banswara (Raj.).
12. Rachna Sharma D/o Gyanendra Kumar Sharma, Aged About 38 Years, R/o 29-A, Indraprasth Nagar, Kesri Colony, Adarsh Nagar, Distt. Ajmer (Raj.).
13. Himank Mehta S/o Kamlesh Mehta, Aged About 25 Years, R/o House No. 34, Ward No. 06, Village Bhopanag, Behri, Banswara (Raj.).
14. Shimla Jangid D/o Sh.gyarsi Lal Jangid, W/o Late Sh. Birdhi Chand Jangid, Aged About 37 Years, R/o 98, Prahlad Colony, Tonk Road, Airport Sanganer, Jaipur (Raj.).

----Appellants

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Director, Primary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Board Of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Ajmer Through Its Secretary, Ajmer
4. Bhagchand Jat S/o Hazari Lal Jat, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Devki Nandanpura, Post Badapadampura, Tehsil Chaksu, Jaipur (Raj.).
5. Sumer Meena S/o Babu Lal, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Dhanshipura Patan Neem Ka Thana, Distt. Sikar (Raj.).
6. Pradeep Meena S/o Satyanarayan Meena, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Bamboliya, Badbar, Tehsil Manoharghana, Distt. Jhalawar (Raj.).
7. Sohan Singh S/o Mahendra Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Pana, Post Nagla, Terhiya, Tehsil Roopbas, Distt. Bharatpur (Raj.)
8. Asha Kumari Nehra W/o Ranveer Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Nizampura, Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.).
9. Rinku Chaudhary D/o Ramdayan Chaudhary, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Atmja Kheda, Distt. Tonk (Raj.).
10. Khushi Ram S/o Sugga Ram, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Mousam, Post Mohammadpur, Tehsil Behror, Distt. Alwar (Raj.).
11. Ranjeet Singh S/o Ishwar Singh, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village And Post Patapsatpura, Distt. Hanumangarh (Raj.).
12. Raveena Kumari D/o Harish Chand, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Surauta, Post Penghore, Tehsil Kumher, Distt.bharatpur.
13. Beena Meena D/o Prabhu Lal Meena, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Chajelo Ka Kheda, Kuradiya, District Bhilawara (Raj.)
14. Chandra Shekhar Swami S/o Babu Ram, b/c Swami, aged



27 years, R/o Adusiya Post Lamba Hari Singh, Malpura,
District Tonk.

-----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) No. 1637/2018

With

Stay Application No.22772/2018

In

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9314/2018



1. Balwan Singh S/o Sube Singh, R/o Village And Post Mundital, Tehsil Ragrah, Distt. Churu-331023 Raj.
2. Gaurav Sharma S/o Madan Lal Sharma, R/o Village Jaya, Post Ustrani, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
3. Rajesh Kumar Gurjar S/o Ghamman Singh Gurjar, R/o Village And Post Dighariya, Tehsil Lawan, Distt. Dausa, Raj.
4. Dagala Ram S/o Bhaga Ram, R/o Village Post Surchh Bagoriya, Tehsil Bhopalgarh, Distt. Jodhpur, Raj.
5. Naresh Kumar S/o Sohan Lal, R/o 17 Ksp, Ward No. 7, 19 Ksp, Kishanpura, Distt. Hanumangarh, Raj.
6. Gaurishankar Suthar S/o Inder Lal Suthar, R/o Village And Post Kashmir, Via Gosunda, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh, Raj.
7. Vikram Ahir S/o Panna Lal Ahir, R/o Village Maliya Khedi, Phalwa, Distt. Chittorgarh, Raj.
8. Puroshottam Puri S/o Sobaran Puri, R/o Village Post Singorai, Tehsil Bari, Distt. Dholpura, Raj. 31
9. Shivilal Bairwa S/o Ramswaroop Bairwa, R/o Village And Post Todadhekla, Tehsil Lalsot, Distt. Dausa, Raj.
10. Varsha Kumari D/o Satish Kumar, R/o Village Kayampur Jokha Bas, Post Budhibawal, Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar Raj.
11. Govind Singh Rajawat S/o Amer Singh Rajawat, 18, Manu Vihar Vistar, Near Kishan Vidyapeeth, Jamdoli, Distt. Jaipur, Raj.
12. Sumit Kumar Verma S/o Ummed Singh, R/o Behind Ajeet Hospital, Gulal Ka Kua, Ward No. 13, Khetri, Distt. Jhunjhunu, Raj.
13. Mohan Lal S/o Tikuram, R/o Birdo Ka Tala, Post Bisarniya, Tehsil Chowhatan, Distt. Barmer, Raj.
14. Raju Singh S/o Ajab Singh, R/o Village Kanasi Moti, Tehsil Jodhani, Tiputapu, Distt. Jodhpur, Raj.
15. Sunil Kumar S/o Megh Singh, R/o Village Jindpura, Post Khanwa, Tehsil Roopwas, Distt. Bharatpur, Raj.
16. Jaiprakash Jhakar S/o Sri Ram Jhakar, R/o Neem Ka Thana, Distt. Sikar, Raj.

-----Appellants



Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner.
3. The Board Of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Ajmer Through Its Secretary.
4. Mahendra Kumar Jatolia S/o Shiv Bhagwan Jatolia, R/o Shivam Villa, Village Karnipura, Post Kuli, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar Raj.
5. Ashok Kumar Joshi S/o Ram Kumar, R/o Ward No. Jasana, 25 Jsn, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
6. Vishnu Kumar S/o Kishan Singh, R/o Village Post Singhada, Tehsil Bayana, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
7. Archana Kumari D/o Samay Singh, R/o Village Janhageerpur, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
8. Ishwar Singh S/o Jaidev Singh, R/o Village And Post Badamadi Thakuran, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
9. Hemant Kumar S/o Bholaram, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
10. Vishna Kumari D/o Harish Chandra Kuntal, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
11. Kusum D/o Rambharosi, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
12. Kushalpal Singh S/o Rambharosi, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
13. Satyendra Singh S/o Udayveer Singh, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
14. Munesh Kumar S/o Vijay Singh, R/o Village Katara, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
15. Balwan S/o Krishan Kumar, R/o House No. 5, Bakariana Gudiakhera, 29 Sirsa Gudiakhera Haryana.
16. Ravindra Singh S/o Satyapal, R/o Village Loki, Tehsil Kumher, Post Therawat, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
17. Gaurav Singh Chaudhary S/o Birendra Singh Chaudhary, R/o Village And Post Jharkhai, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
18. Maheepal Gurjar S/o Lekhram Gurjar, R/o Village Post Pingora, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
19. Ramdeen Paliyal S/o Jetha Ram, R/o Village And Post Narwa Katla, Tehsil Khinwansar, Distt. Nagaur Raj.
20. Sunil Matawa S/o Hari Ram, Beniwalon Ka Bas, Modi Kalan, Distt. Nagaur Raj..
21. Suresh Nehra S/o Badri Ram, R/o 116, Kumharon Ka Mohalla, Degana Chossali, Distt. Nagaur Raj.
22. Rajendra Godara S/o Gordhan Godara, R/o Godara Market, Behind Nagar Palika, Deedwana, Distt. Nagaur





Raj..

23. Hardeva Ram S/o Biwana Ram, R/o Indrapura, Ambpa, Distt. Nagaur Raj.
24. Ramkishore Roj S/o Megha Ram, R/o Jayal, Distt. Nagaur Raj.
25. Guru Prakash Kasana S/o Ramhet Singh Gurjar, R/o Village Sumel Kalan, Post Khuntla, Tehsil Baswa, Distt. Dausa, Raj.
26. Pawan Kumar S/o Chanan Mal, R/o Ward No. 9 Doongrana, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj
27. Rinky Yadav D/o Brij Kishore Yadav, R/o Village And Post Chawandeda, Tehsil And Distt. Dausa Raj.
28. Renu Chhawari D/o Ranjeet Singh Chhawari, R/o Dhani Kishanpura Bid, Kherli, Distt. Dausa Raj.
29. Prakash Chand Meena S/o Kalu Ram Meena, R/o Village Manpura, Post Salempura, Tehsil Ramgarh Pachewada, Distt. Dausa Raj..
30. Bheek Narayan Saini S/o Revar Mal Saini, R/o Village And Post Sainthal, Distt. Dausa Raj..
31. Bhavesh Kansal S/o Mukesh Chandra Kansal, R/o Bayalpura, Hindauncity, Distt. Karauli Raj..
32. Jatashankar Sharma S/o Babu Lal Sharma, R/o Village Post Gndarwa, Tehsil Shikari, Distt. Dausa Raj..
33. Manish Kumar Kaswa S/o Heera Lal Gujar, R/o Sumel Kalan, Post Kuntala, Tehsil Baswa Distt. Dausa Raj..
34. Praveen Kumar Sharma S/o Lalu Ram Sharma, R/o Village Delari, Tehsil Baswa, Distt. Dausa Raj..
35. Jagdish S/o Mota Ram, R/o Saran Nagar, Rajsagar, Chamu Tehsil Balesar, Distt. Jodhpur Raj
36. Shishpal S/o Mahaveer Prasad, R/o Ward No. 6, Kishanpura Dikhanda 17 Ksp, Dikhanda, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj..
37. Karna Ram S/o Phussa Ram, R/o Kanediya Mahasingh, Tehsil Shergarh, Distt. Jodhpur Raj.
38. Prithvi Raj Meghwal S/o Mangi Lal, R/o Village Luna, Tehsil Baap, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
39. Sukha Ram S/o Chola Ram, R/o Village And Post Dahikara, Via Benar, Tehsil And Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
40. Prem Singh S/o Gopal Singh, R/o Village Pachla Khurd,tehsil Tivri, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
41. Khema Ram S/o Hema Ram, R/o Village Malasar And Post Falsun, Tehsil Baniyana, Distt. Jaisalmer Raj..
42. Naina Ram S/o Sona Ram, R/o Village Post Cherai, Tehsil Tigri, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
43. Bhagirath S/o Dhanna Ram, R/o Village And Post Sihda, Tehsil Baap, Distt. Jodhpur Raj.
44. Mahaveer Singh S/o Durg Singh, R/o Village And Post





Shivdan Singh Nagar, Post Bengri Kalan, Tehsil Falaudi, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..

45. Kanhaiya Lal Sharma S/o Sohan Lal Sharma, R/o Village Meghras, Post Bhunas, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
46. Lalit Kumar Jat S/o Roshan Lal Jat, R/o Village Ratanpura, Post Salera, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj.
47. Bheru Lal Kharol, S/o Champa Lal Kharol, R/o Village Baghera, Post Bharak, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
48. Shambhu Lal Gadri S/o Nandram Gadri, Village Baghera, Post Bharak, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
49. Ranjana Kumawat D/o Badri Lal Kumawat, R/o Village And Post Bagoliya, Tehsil Raipur, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
50. Anita Kumari Kumawat D/o Amba Lal Kumawat, R/o Village Patiyon Ka Kheda Thala Tehsil Raipur, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
51. Kanhaiya Lal Sen S/o Sohan Lal Sen, R/o Ward No. 6, Gangapur, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj
52. Karma Chaudhary S/o Harinarayan Chaudhary, R/o Village Kunder, Tehsil Uniara, Distt. Tonk Raj..
53. Vijay Kumar Sharma S/o Purushottam Sharma, R/o Village And Post Soda, Tehsil Malpura Distt. Tonk Raj..
54. Kapil Sharma S/o Govind Narayan Sharma, R/o 39 Kalyan Nagar, Chhawani Tonk, Distt. Tonk Raj..
55. Ujjawal Singh Rajawat S/o Bhanwar Singh Rajawat, R/o Priyanka Garments, Luharon Ki Maszid, Newai, Distt. Tonk, Raj.
56. Farsa Ram S/o Jaimal, R/o 17 Ksp, 19 Ksp, Kishanpura Dikhanda, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj..
57. Giriraj Sharma S/o Gordhan Sharmaz, R/o Village Ambapura, Post Tordi Sagar, Tehsil Malpura Distt. Tonk, Raj.
58. Vinod Kumar Nagar S/o Ramnarayan Dhakar, R/o Village Sitarampura Dhakran, Post Rindiya, Rampura Tehsil Todarisingh, Distt. Tonk Raj.
59. Mukesh Singh Nathawat S/o Hanuman Singh, R/o Village And Post Chatubhujpura, Tehsil Newai, Distt. Tonk Raj
60. Sanwar Singh Yadav S/o Ramkishor Yadav, R/o Village And Post Ranoli, Tehsil Piplu, Distt. Tonk Raj..
61. Himmat Singh Yadav S/o Banwari Lal Yadavz, R/o Village And Post Ranoli, Tehsil Piplu, Distt. Tonk Raj..
62. Babu Lal Jat S/o Madan Lal Jat, R/o Panchunokha, Distt. Bikaner Raj..
63. Ramkishan Sain S/o Poonam Chand, R/o Lalu Ji Khedi, Jorawarpura, Nokha Distt. Bikaner Raj..
64. Hema D/o Shre Lal, R/o Gadhi Jonawat, Distt. Dholpur, Raj.
65. Sushila Kanwar D/o Richpal Singh, R/o Ramnawali, Distt.





Ganganagar, Raj.

66. Kishan Lal Dhaker S/o Phool Chand Dhaker, R/o Village And Post Palka, Via Bassi, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh, Raj.
67. Harbans Lal S/o Gopal Ram, R/o Ward No. 4, Dushara Bus Adda, Vpo, Kishanpura Dikhanda, 20 Ksp Kishanpura, Dikhanda, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj
68. Shyam Lal Jatiya S/o Nana Lal Jatiya, R/o Purohiton Ka Sanwata, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
69. Karan Singh Rathore S/o Udai Singh Rathore, R/o Village Gurjaniya, Post Hasampura, Tehsil Rashmi, Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
70. Babu Lal Regar S/o Moolchand Regar, R/o Village Raigar Mohalla, Gosunda, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
71. Seema Khandelwal D/o Jagdish Chand Khandelwal, R/o Village Biloda, Distt. Chittorgarh Raj..
72. Sangeeta Sharma D/o Ratan Lal Sharma, R/o Village Kunthana, Distt. Chittorgarh - 312024 Raj..
73. Roshan Raj Gurjar S/o Ganpat Ram Gurjar, R/o D-25, Police Line, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
74. Chanda Dangi W/o Kanhaiya Lal, R/o 113 Natowali Ghati, 100 Ft. Circle, Shobhagpur, Udaipur Raj.
75. Mukesh Kumar Royal S/o Randheer Singh, R/o Village And Post Khansoli, Tehsil And Distt. Churu Raj.
76. Sukh Dev S/o Jagdeesh, R/o Ward No. 4, 17 Ksp, Kishanpura, Dikhana, 19 Ksp Kishanpura, Distt., Hanumangarh Raj.
77. Rohitashv Parashar S/o Harish Chand Sharma, R/o Brahmanpada, Maysil, Distt. Dholpur Raj..
78. Jogendra Singh S/o Jagdish Prasad, Chitora, Distt., Dholpura Raj..
79. Sunil Kumar S/o Ran Singh, R/o 328 Kushwaha Basti, Nagla, Tailaya Doongri, Distt. Dholpura Raj.
80. Ram Avdhesh S/o Jagmohan Verma, R/o. 2/2 Type - 3, Telephone Exchange Rambagh, Agra, Up.
81. Rakesh Singh S/o Omveer Singh, R/o Fatehpur, Post Bansuri, Janhagira Baisena, Bulandshahar Up
82. Anita D/o Ajeet Singh, R/o Village Meerpur, Post Katopur, Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar Raj.
83. Rajpal S/o Jeevandas, R/o Village Chadigadh Ka Bas, Post Nowgon, Tehsil Ramgarh, Distt. Alwar Raj
84. Dharam Singh Saini S/o Begraj, R/o Village And Post Nowgoan, Chandigarh Ka Bas, Tehsil Ramgarh Distt. Alwar, Raj.
85. Puneet Kumar S/o Vinod Kumar, R/o Ward No. 10, 17 Bgp, Bolanwali, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
86. Gordhan S/o Jile Singh, R/o Berawas Kalan, Post Bhonker, Tehsil Kotkasim Distt. Alwar Raj.





87. Himanshu Yadav S/o Mahesh Chand Yadav, R/o Village Darbarpur, Post Ajraka, Mundwar, Distt. Alwar Raj
88. Chandrabhan Yadav S/o Nihal Singh Yadav, R/o Village Darbarpur, Post Ajraka, Mundwar, Distt. Alwar Raj.
89. Pawan Kumar Sharma S/o Sheochand Sharma, R/o Renagiri, Post Shyopur, Tehsil Mundwar, Distt. Alwar Raj.
90. Firoz Khan S/o Subhan Ahmed, R/o Village And Post Pinan, Tehsil Raini, Distt. Alwar Raj.
91. Girraj Prasad Meena S/o Matadeen Meena, R/o Village And Post Agar Dudi Ki Dhani Tehsil Thanagazi Distt. Alwar Raj.
92. Rajbala Yadav D/o Shishram Yadav, R/o B 363, Rathnagar, Near Pani Ki Tanki, Distt. Alwar Raj.
93. Narendra Kumar Patwa S/o Matadeen Patwa, R/o Village And Post Pratappgarh, Tehsil Thanagazi, Distt. Alwar Raj.
94. Ram Lal Jat S/o Budhram Jat, R/o Village And Post Beejwar Narukamal Kheda, Distt. Alwar Raj
95. Rinku Chaudhary D/o Pappu Ram Chaudhary, R/o Village And Post Bijwar Naruka, Tehsil Malakheda, Distt. Alwar, Raj.
96. Satpal S/o Shrikrishan, R/o Ward No. 13, 2 Ptp Nukera, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
97. Siya Ram Prajapat S/o Shri Narayana Prajapat, R/o Village Irniya Iteda, Tehsil Laxmangarh, Distt. Alwar Raj.
98. Rajesh Kumar Soni S/o Satyanarayan Soni, R/o Post Dag, Tehsil Gangdhar, Distt. Jhalawar Raj.
99. Swarup Singh Bhati S/o Girdhar Singh Bhati, R/o Village And Post Modha, Tehsil Fatehgarh, Distt. Jaisalmer Raj.
100. Mahaveer Singh Bhati S/o Narayan Singh Bhati, R/o Village And Post Modha, Tehsil Fatehgarh, Distt. Jaisalmer, Raj.
101. Ranbir Singh S/o Rajbir Singh, R/o Village And Post Suratpura, Distt. Churu Raj.
102. Kailash Chand Gurjar S/o Kishan Lal Gurjar, R/o Village And Post Atalikpura, Post Dodwadi, Tehsil Piplu, Distt. Tonk Raj.
103. Priya Narniya D/o Chhotu Lal Narniya, R/o Banjaro Ki Basti, Pachipalaiya, Distt. Sawaimadhopur Raj.
104. Ramesh Kumar S/o Bhagirath Ram, R/o Village And Post Saron Ki Dhani, Palina Distt. Jodhpur Raj.
105. Jyoti D/o Resham Lal, R/o Village And Post New Prem Nagar, Gali No. 9, Distt. Sriganganagar Raj.
106. Om Prakash S/o Ram Chander, R/o Village And Post Doongri, Post Chitalwana, Distt. Jalore Raj.
107. Amrik Singh S/o Iqbal Singh, R/o Kishanpura Dikhanda, 17 K.s.p. 19 Ksp Kishanpura Dikhanda, Hanumangarh, Raj.
108. Sandeep Kumar S/o Krishan Kumar, R/o Ward No. 8,





Bashir, Krishn Dukan Wali Gali, 4 Ftp Distt. Hanumangarh, Raj.

109. Anil Parmar S/o Harji Ram, R/o Village And Post Kelwa, Tehsil And Distt. Rajsamand Raj.
110. Hanuman Ram S/o Poornaram, R/o Village And Post Lorty Height, Undkha, Distt. Barmer Raj.
111. Ameda Ram Saran S/o Goma Ram Saran, R/o Khume Ke Bedi, Dhorimanna, Distt. Barmer Raj.
112. Gangaram S/o Thakra Ram, R/o Nehro Ki Dhani, Distt. Barmer Raj.
113. Arjun Ram Dhaka S/o Ramchandra Dhaka, R/o Balaknath Ki Kutiya Ke Pas, Ward No. 19, Balotra Distt. Barmer, Raj.
114. Jagga Ram S/o Nethi Ram, R/o Amliyala Gudha Malani, Distt. Barmer, Raj.
115. Poonam Singh S/o Sri Malam Singh, R/o Village Gangapura, Post Girab, Tehsil Gadra Road, Distt. Barmer, Raj..
116. Swati Sharma D/o Manoj Kumar Sharma, R/o 42, Balaji Vihar, Niwaru Road, Jhotwara, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
117. Suman Yadav D/o Bhagwan Sahay Yadav, R/o Village And Post Nindola, Jaipur Raj.
118. Om Prakash Yadav S/o Laxminarayan Yadav, R/o Thoth Walon Ki Dhani, Nangal Koju, Distt. Jaipur
119. Madan Lal S/o Ram Swaroop, R/o Ward No. 2, 2 Ptp Nukera, Distt. Hanumangarh, Raj.
120. Karan Singh Yadav S/o Arjun Lal Yadav, R/o Ward No. 28, Nidola, Khejoli, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
121. Mamta Kumari D/o Nemichand Singh, R/o Ward No. 13, Bisau, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
122. Pragya Sharma D/o Promod Kumar Sharma, R/o Brahmpuri, Gaushala, Dholpur Raj.
123. Kapil Dev S/o Pratap Singh, R/o Kawai, Bharatpur Raj.
124. Punit Sharma S/o Dhaniram Sharma, R/o Vardhman Nagar, Hindaun City, District Karauli Raj.
125. Sushil Kumar S/o Bhup Ram, R/o 12 Ksd Dhani Rasuwala, Ward No. 2, Vpo Rasuwala, 7 Idg, Distt. Hanumangarh, Raj.
126. Vijender Singh S/o Baljeet Singh, Aged About 18-19 Years, R/o 6 Jgw, Ninan, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
127. Monika D/o Parveen Kumar, R/o Village Bhangarh, Post Bhangarh, Tehsil Bhadra, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
128. Poonam Baimad D/o Kailash Chand Baimad, R/o 45, Vigyan Nagar, Ranthambore Road, Sawaimadhopur Raj
129. Choti Devi Dhayal D/o Bodu Ram Dhayal, Village Bichpadi, Post Nangal, Via Jahota, Tehsil Amer Distt. Jaipur Raj.
130. Mohammad Aftab S/o Chand Mohammad, R/o 358/36





Mithe Kuwe Ki Gali, Lohakhana, Police Line, Ajmer Raj.

131. Narayan S/o Girraj Singh, R/o Village Tuhiya Pattipura, Uchain, Post Adhiyari, Tehsil Roopwas, Distt. Bharatpur, Raj.
132. Satyanarayan Yadav S/o Ramprasad Yadav, R/o Village Charanwas, Post Alisar, Via Kaladera, Tehsil Chomu, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
133. Subhash Chander S/o Ramswarup Kumar, R/o Ward No. 03, Mohan Magariya, Tehsil And District Hanumangarh, Raj.
134. Ashish Yadav S/o Prabhu Dayal Yadav, R/o Village Sandarsar, Via Kaladera, Tehsil Chomu, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
135. Sunil Kumar Jat S/o Gopal Lal Jat, R/o Village Israwala, Post Bilochi, Tehsil Amer, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
136. Ramkhiladi Gurjar S/o Ramkishore Gurjar, R/o Village And Post Golak, Teshil Boli, Distt. Sawaimadhapur Raj.
137. Sunil Kumar Koli S/o Suwa Lal Koli, R/o Village And Post Thali, Tehsil Jamwaramgarh, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
138. Pritam Chaudhary D/o Ramniwas Chaudhary, R/o B-6, Bahubali Nagar, Mansarover, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
139. Manisha Khoiya D/o Jeetram, R/o Village Mathuraheda, Post Indrawali, Tehsil Kathumar, Distt. Alwar Raj.
140. Monika D/o Sukhram Yadav, R/o Bilahedo, Post And Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar, Raj.
141. Shankar Lal S/o Surendra Singh, R/o Village Kulharion Ka Bas, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
142. Sunder Lal S/o Mohan Lal, R/o Ward No. 1, Barbirana, Beerna, District Hanumangarh Raj.
143. Naveen Kumar S/o Satyaveer, R/o Village Dhandhar, Post D.k. Baas, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunuraj..
144. Rewant Kumar S/o Devaram, R/o Village Dhaniyo Ka Tala, Dharasar, Teshil Chowhatan, Distt. Barmer Raj.
145. Suresh Kumar S/o Moti Ram, R/o Village Sortha, Tehsil Roodar, Distt. Sirohi Raj.
146. Harshad Gaur S/o Pyare Lal Gaur, R/o Village Post Ganeshpura, Garnaobadat, Tehsil Pathpad, Distt. Jhalawar, Raj.
147. Rajendra Kumar Chaudhary S/o Panchu Ram Jat, R/o Village Naradpura, post Narena, Tehsil Phulera, Distt. Jaipur Raj..
148. Dinesh Kumar S/o Daulat Ram, R/o Village Post Doongri, Chitalbana, Distt. Jalore Raj.
149. Imran Khan S/o Nabbi Khan, R/o Village Viyo Ka Goliya, Tehsil Punasa, Distt. Jalore Raj..
150. Pawan Kumar S/o Ramswarup Kumhar, R/o Doongrana, District Hanumangarh Raj.
151. Sawai Singh S/o Narayan Singh, R/o Village And Post Ghatiyalo, Distt. Jaisalmer Raj.





152. Manish Kumar Sharma S/o Ramniwas Sharma, R/o Paragpura, Tehsil Kotputli, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
153. Kheeyna Ram S/o Ray Chand, R/o Village Gayaton Ki Dhani, Post Hemgudha, Tehsil Chitalbana, Distt. Jaloreraj.
154. Choth Mal Raidas S/o Shyam Lal, R/o Village And Post Jabar, Tehsil Manohar Thana, Distt. Jhalawar Raj.
155. Rampratap Godora S/o Narayan Godara, R/o 8 Shpd, 8 Chak, Suratgarh, Distt. Ganganagar Raj.
156. Kiran Rani D/o Sohan Lal, R/o Village And Post Nirwana, Tehsil Suratgarh, Distt. Sriganganagar Raj.
157. Hemant Paliwal S/o Narayan Lal, R/o House No. 117, Rajendra Nagar, Near Sharda Bal School, Distt. Pali Raj..
158. Shankar Kumar S/o Rameshwar Prasad, R/o Village Ramchandrapura, Post Barijori, Tehsil Shahpura, Distt., Raj..
159. Vinod Kumar S/o Rameshwar, R/o Ward No. 8 Madarpura District Hanumangarh Raj..
160. Jeetendra Meena S/o Shreelal Meena, R/o Village Mereda, Post Khedi, Tehsil Todabhim, Distt. Karauliraj
161. Vinod Kumar Meena S/o Ramratan Meena, R/o Village Gadholi, Post Hansmahal, Tehsil Bassi, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
162. Suman Chaudhary D/o Dhura Ram Chaudhary, R/o Ward No. 2, Tehsil Hansalsar, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
163. Sangeeta D/o Manak Ram, R/o Village Mandore, Tehsil Baap, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
164. Pratap Chaudhary S/o Chittar Mal Bagariya, R/o Village And Post Umara, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar Raj.
165. Laxman La Mali S/o Bhanwar Lal Mali, R/o 52 Muradh, Village Nichli Otan, Distt. Rajsamand Raj.
166. Anil Kumar S/o Sukhram, R/o Village And Post Doongry, Tehsil Chitalwana, Distt. Jalore Raj
167. Rahul Singh Rathore S/o Vashudev Rathore, R/o Village Baroda Gaon, Distt. Jaisalmer Raj..
168. Ram Singh Yadav S/o Ganesh Yadav, R/o Village Tejaji Ki Dhani, Post Nangalkoju, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
169. Pramod Kumar S/o Sewaram, R/o Village Dhana, Tehsil Laxmangarh, Distt.sikar Raj.
170. Vijay Pal S/o Jagdish Prasad, R/o Ward No. 9, 33 Amp, Kalwasiya, Distt. Ganganagar Raj.
171. Sulochana D/o Manohar Ram, R/o Village Sarno Ki Dhani, Tehsil Sarpura, Distt. Jodhpur Raj
172. Sandeep S/o Ramotar Sharma, R/o Vpo Sangtera, Tehsil Kotputli, Distt. Jaipur Raj..
173. Narendra Naraniya S/o Pooran Mal Naraniya, R/o Village Post Chanwadiya, Tehsil Bassi, Distt. Jaipur Raj
174. Mukesh Gurjar S/o Jagdish Prasad Gurjar, R/o Village And Post Kadeela, Tehsil Malpura, Distt. Tonk Raj.





175. Mayank Kumar Sharma S/o Sita Ram Sharma, R/o Village And Post Bhordon Ka Bas, Via Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar Raj..
176. Ramesh Achara S/o Chhitar Mal Achara, R/o Mau, Srimadhapur, Distt. Sikar Raj..
177. Narendra Singh Shekhawat S/o Bharat Singh, R/o Borki Jhunjhunu Raj..
178. Harish Kumar Chandeliya S/o Mamchand Chandeliya, R/o Chadeliya Ki Dhani, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
179. Sandeep Kumar S/o Ranveer Singh, R/o Doomra, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
180. Anil Saini S/o Sanwormal Saini, R/o Kocchor, Distt. Sikarraj.
181. Rakesh Kumar S/o Mani Ram, R/o Ward No. 27, Gali No. 1, Surya Nagar Vatika, Hanumangarh Town 8 Ssw, Hanumangarh Raj.
182. Rajendra Kumar Meena S/o Dhanna Ram Meena, R/o Fatehpur Shekhawati, Distt. Sikar Raj.
183. Ramniwas Saini S/o Jhabarmal Saini, R/o Bagora, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
184. Pankaj Dhariwal S/o Vijay Singh, R/o Dewas, Distt. Sikar Raj.
185. Vikas Kumar S/o Rohtash, R/o Pratappura, Distt. Sikar, Raj.
186. Dinesh Kumar Sharma S/o Surendra Kumar Sharma, R/o Jajod, Tehsil Laxamangarh, Distt. Sikar Raj.
187. Kamlesh Kapuriya S/o Bhanwar Lal, R/o Hejampura, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
188. Rakesh Kasotiya S/o Kishan Lal, R/o Village Andpost Shiv Chhapri, Tehsil Kuchaman City, Distt. Nagur Raj.
189. Yogendra Singh S/o Maharaj Singh, R/o Village And Post Katara, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
190. Bharat Singh S/o Ranveer Singh, R/o Village Jhorol, Post Karata, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
191. Poonam D/o Balbir Singh, R/o Village Bhangarh Bhadra, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
192. Natwar Singh S/o Harsukh Singh, R/o Village Tohila, Post Atari, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
193. Madhav Sharma S/o Khubi Ram, R/o Village Mukhena, Post Butholi, Tehsil Weir, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
194. Lokendra Singh S/o Babu Singh, R/o Village Magren Khurd, Tehsil Bayana Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
195. Lakhan Singh S/o Devi Singh, R/o Kamlapura, Ward No. 1, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
196. Rajkumar S/o Devi Singh, R/o Nagla Ajau, Post Sihi, Tehsil Kumher Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
197. Sachin Kumar Sharma S/o Lal Chand Sharma, R/o Village





And Post Bolheda, Tehsil Kama, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.

198. Kapil Kumar S/o Bhagwan Singh, R/o R/o Village And Post Bolheda, Tehsil Kama, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
199. Balmukund Upadhyay S/o Hari Ram Sharma, R/o Village And Post Bolheda, Tehsil Kama, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
200. Preeti D/o Laxman Singh, R/o Indra Nagar Nale Ke Pas, Heeradas, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
201. Anuradha D/o Laxman, R/o Indra Nagar Nale Ke Pas, Heeradas, Distt. Bharatpur Raj

-----Respondents

D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) No. 79/2019

With

Stay Application No.561/2019

In

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9314/2018

1. Narendra, S/o Ramlal, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Rinau, Post Chuwas, Tehsil-Fatehpur, Sikar, Rajasthan
2. Abhimanyu Singh, S/o Bhanwar Singh, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Arabanimbakhera, Tehsil Pachpadra, District Barmer, Rajasthan
3. Nutandosi, W/o Rajesh Shah, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Nayafalabagidora, Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara, Rajasthan
4. Vikram Singh, S/o Babu Ram, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Palli 2 Khileriyo Ki, Dhaniya, Palli, Jodhpur, Rajasthan
5. Shyam Pratap Singh, S/o Lakhmi Chand, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Manotakhurd, Post-Manotakalan, The - Nagar, Bharatpur, Rajasthan
6. Ganga Nehra, W/o Rajendra Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Vpo-Sanwalodadhaylan, Dhod, Sikar, Rajasthan
7. Mukesh Kumar, S/o Dauji Ram, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Vpo Khuntkheda, The-Bayana, Bharatpur, Rajasthan

-----Appellants

सत्यमेव जयते
Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Raj., Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Director, Primary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner
3. Board Of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Ajmer, Through Its Secretary, Ajmer
4. Mahendra Kumar Jatolia S/o Shiv Bhagwan Jatolia, R/o Shivam Villa, Village Karnipura, Post Kuli, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar Raj.
5. Ashok Kumar Joshi S/o Ram Kumar, R/o Ward No. Jasana, 25 Jsn, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj..
6. Vishnu Kumar S/o Kishan Singh, R/o Village Post



Singhada, Tehsil Bayana, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..

7. Gaurav Sharma S/o Madan Lal Sharma, R/o Village Jaya, Post Usrani, Tehsil Kumher Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
8. Archana Kumari D/o Samay Singh, R/o Village Janhageerpur, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
9. Ishwar Singh S/o Jaidev Singh, R/o Village And Post Badamadi Thakuran, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
10. Hemant Kumar S/o Bholaram, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
11. Vishna Kumari D/o Harish Chandra Kuntal, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
12. Kusum D/o Rambharosi, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
13. Kushalpal Singh S/o Rambharosi, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
14. Satyendra Singh S/o Udayveer Singh, R/o Village And Post Rareh, Tehsil Kumher, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
15. Munesh Kumar S/o Vijay Singh, R/o Village Katara, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
16. Balwan S/o Krishan Kumar, R/o House No. 5, Bakariana Gudiakhera, 29 Sirsa Gudiakhera Haryana.
17. Ravindra Singh S/o Satyapal, R/o Village Loki, Tehsil Kumher, Post Therawat, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
18. Gaurav Singh Chaudhary S/o Birendra Singh Chaudhary, R/o Village And Post Jharkhai, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
19. Maheepal Gurjar S/o Lekhram Gurjar, R/o Village Post Pingora, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
20. Ramdeen Paliyal S/o Jetha Ram, R/o Village And Post Narwa Katla, Tehsil Khinwansar, Distt. Nagaur Raj..
21. Sunil Matawa S/o Hari Ram, Beniwalon Ka Bas, Modi Kalan, Distt. Nagaur Raj..
22. Suresh Nehra S/o Badri Ram, R/o 116, Kumharon Ka Mohalla, Degana Chossali, Distt. Nagaur Raj..
23. Rajendra Godara S/o Gordhan Godara, R/o Godara Market, Behind Nagar Palika, Deedwana, Distt. Nagaur Raj..
24. Hardeva Ram S/o Biwana Ram, R/o Indrapura, Ambpa, Distt. Nagaur Raj..
25. Ramkishore Roj S/o Megha Ram, R/o Jayal, Distt. Nagaur Raj..
26. Guru Prakash Kasana S/o Ramhet Singh Gurjar, R/o Village Sumel Kalan, Post Khuntla, Tehsil Baswa, Distt. Dausa Raj..
27. Pawan Kumar S/o Chanan Mal, R/o Ward No. 9 Doongrana, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj..
28. Rinky Yadav D/o Brij Kishore Yadav, R/o Village And Post





Chawandeda, Tehsil And Distt. Dausa Raj..

29. Renu Chhawari D/o Ranjeet Singh Chhawari, R/o Dhani Kishanpura Bid, Kherli, Distt. Dausa Raj..
30. Rajesh Kumar Gurjar S/o Ghamman Singh Gujar, R/o Village And Post Dighariya, Tehsil Lawan, Distt. Dausa Raj..
31. Prakash Chand Meena S/o Kalu Ram Meena, R/o Village Manpura, Post Salempura, Tehsil Ramgarh Pachewada, Distt. Dausa Raj..
32. Bheek Narayan Saini S/o Revar Mal Saini, R/o Village And Post Sainthal, Distt. Dausa Raj..
33. Bhavesh Kansal S/o Mukesh Chandra Kansal, R/o Bayalpura, Hindauncity, Distt. Karauli Raj.
34. Jatashankar Sharma S/o Babu Lal Sharma, R/o Village Post Gndarwa, Tehsil Shikari, Distt. Dausa Raj..
35. Manish Kumar Kaswa S/o Heera Lal Gujar, R/o Sumel Kalan, Post Kuntala, Tehsil Baswa Distt. Dausa Raj..
36. Praveen Kumar Sharma S/o Lalu Ram Sharma, R/o Village Delari, Tehsil Baswa, Distt. Dausa Raj..
37. Jagdish S/o Mota Ram, R/o Saran Nagar, Rajsagar, Chamu Tehsil Balesar, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
38. Shishpal S/o Mahaveer Prasad, R/o Ward No. 6, Kishanpura Dikhanda 17 Ksp, Dikhanda, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
39. Karna Ram S/o Phussa Ram, R/o Kanediya Mahasingh, Tehsil Shergarh, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
40. Prithvi Raj Meghwal S/o Mangi Lal, R/o Village Luna, Tehsil Baap, Distt. Jodhpur Raj.
41. Sukha Ram S/o Chola Ram, R/o Village And Post Dahikara, Via Benar, Tehsil And Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
42. Dagala Ram S/o Bhaga Ram, R/o Village Post Surchh Bagoriya, Tehsil Bhopalgarh, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
43. Prem Singh S/o Gopal Singh, R/o Village Pachla Khurd, Tehsil Tivri, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
44. Khema Ram S/o Hema Ram, R/o Village Malasar And Post Falsun, Tehsil Baniyana, Distt. Jaisalmer Raj.
45. Naina Ram S/o Sona Ram, R/o Village Post Cherai, Tehsil Tigri, Distt. Jodhpur Raj.
46. Bhagirath S/o Dhanna Ram, R/o Village And Post Sihda, Tehsil Baap, Distt. Jodhpur Raj.
47. Mahaveer Singh S/o Durg Singh, R/o Village And Post Shivdan Singh Nagar, Post Bengri Kalan, Tehsil Falaudi Distt. Jodhpur Raj.
48. Kanhaiya Lal Sharma S/o Sohan Lal Sharma, R/o Village Meghras, Post Bhunas, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj.
49. Naresh Kumar S/o Sohan Lal, R/o 17 Ksp, Ward No. 7, 19 Ksp, Kishanpura Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.





50. Lalit Kumar Jat S/o Roshan Lal Jat, R/o Village Ratanpura, Post Salera, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
51. Bheru Lal Kharol, S/o Champa Lal Kharol, R/o Village Baghera, Post Bharak, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
52. Shambhu Lal Gadri S/o Nandram Gadri, Village Baghera, Post Bharak, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
53. Ranjana Kumawat D/o Badri Lal Kumawat, R/o Village And Post Bagoliya, Tehsil Raipur, Distt. Bhilwara Raj.
54. Anita Kumari Kumawat D/o Amba Lal Kumawat, R/o Village Patiyon Ka Kheda Thala Tehsil Raipur, Distt. Bhilwara Raj..
55. Kanhaiya Lal Sen S/o Sohan Lal Sen, R/o Ward No. 6, Gangapur, Tehsil Sahada, Distt. Bhilwara Raj.
56. Karma Chaudhary S/o Harinarayan Chaudhary, R/o Village Kunder, Tehsil Uniara, Distt. Tonk Raj.
57. Vijay Kumar Sharma S/o Purushottam Sharma, R/o Village And Post Soda, Tehsil Malpura Distt. Tonk Raj..
58. Kapil Sharma S/o Govind Narayan Sharma, R/o 39 Kalyan Nagar, Chhawni Tonk, Distt. Tonk Raj..
59. Ujjawal Singh Rajawat S/o Bhanwar Singh Rajawat, R/o Priyanka Garments, Luharon Ki Maszid, Newai, Distt. Tonk Raj..
60. Farsa Ram S/o Jaimal, R/o 17 Ksp, 19 Ksp, Kishanpura Dikhanda, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
61. Giriraj Sharma S/o Gordhan Sharmaz, R/o Village Ambapura, Post Tordi Sagar, Tehsil Malpura Distt. Tonk Raj..
62. Vinod Kumar Nagar S/o Ramnarayan Dhakar, R/o Village Sitarampura Dhakran, Post Rindiya, Rampura Tehsil Tadarisingh, Distt. Tonk Raj.
63. Mukesh Singh Nathawat S/o Hanuman Singh, R/o Village And Post Chatubhujpura, Tehsil Newai, Distt. Tonk Raj.
64. Sanwar Singh Yadav S/o Ramkishor Yadav, R/o Village And Post Ranoli, Tehsil Pipllu, Distt. Tonk Raj..
65. Himmat Singh Yadav S/o Banwari Lal Yadavz, R/o Village And Post Ranoli, Tehsil Pipllu, Distt. Tonk Raj.
66. Babu Lal Jat S/o Madan Lal Jat, R/o Panchunokha, Distt. Bikaner Raj.
67. Ramkishan Sain S/o Poonam Chand, R/o Lalu Ji Khedi, Jorawarpura, Nokha Distt. Bikaner Raj.
68. Hema D/o Shre Lal, R/o Gadhi Jonawat, Distt. Dholpur Raj.
69. Sushila Kanwar D/o Richpal Singh, R/o Ramnawali, Distt. Ganganagar Raj.
70. Kishan Lal Dhaker S/o Phool Chand Dhaker, R/o Village And Post Palka, Via Bassi, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
71. Harbans Lal S/o Gopal Ram, R/o Ward No. 4, Dushara Bus





Adda, Vpo, Kishanpura Dikhanda, 20 Ksp Kishanpura Dikhanda, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.

72. Shyam Lal Jatiya S/o Nana Lal Jatiya, R/o Purohiton Ka Sanwata, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
73. Karan Singh Rathore S/o Udai Singh Rathore, R/o Village Gurjaniya, Post Hasampura, Tehsil Rashmi, Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
74. Gaurishankar Suthar S/o Inder Lal Suthar, R/o Village And Post Kashmor, Via Gosunda, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
75. Babu Lal Regar S/o Moolchand Regar, R/o Village Raigar Mohalla, Gosunda, Tehsil And Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
76. Vikram Ahir S/o Panna Lal Ahir, R/o Village Maliya Khedi, Phalwa, Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
77. Seema Khandelwal D/o Jagdish Chand Khandelwal, R/o Village Biloda, Distt. Chittorgarh Raj.
78. Sangeeta Sharma D/o Ratan Lal Sharma, R/o Village Kunthana, Distt. Chittorgarh - 312024 Raj.
79. Roshan Raj Gurjar S/o Ganpat Ram Gurjar, R/o D-25, Police Line, Distt. Bhilwara Raj.
80. Chanda Dangi W/o Kanhaiya Lal, R/o 113 Natowali Ghati, 100 Ft. Circle, Shobhagpur, Udaipur Raj.
81. Mukesh Kumar Royal S/o Randheer Singh, R/o Village And Post Khansoli, Tehsil And Distt. Churu Raj.
82. Sukh Dev S/o Jagdeesh, R/o Ward No. 4, 17 Ksp, Kishanpura, Dikhanda, 19 Ksp Kishanpura, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
83. Balwan Singh S/o Sube Singh, R/o Village And Post Mundital, Tehsil Ragrah, Distt. Churu - 331023 Raj.
84. Rohitashv Parashar S/o Harish Chand Sharma, R/o Brahmanpada, Maysil, Distt. Dholpur Raj.
85. Jogendra Singh S/o Jagdish Prasad, Chitora, Distt. Dholpura Raj.
86. Sunil Kumar S/o Ran Singh, R/o 328 Kushwaha Basti Nagla, Tailaya Doongri, Distt. Dholpura Raj.
87. Purushottam Puri S/o Sobaran Puri, R/o Village Post Singorai, Tehsil Bari, Distt. Dholpura Raj.
88. Ram Avdhesh S/o Jagmohan Verma, R/o. 2/2 Type - 3, Telephone Exchange Rambagh, Agra Up.
89. Rakesh Singh S/o Omveer Singh, R/o Fatehpur, Post Bansuri, Janhagira Baisena, Bulandshahar Up.
90. Anita D/o Ajeet Singh, R/o Village Meerpur, Post Katopur, Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar Raj.
91. Rajpal S/o Jeevandas, R/o Village Chadigadh Ka Bas, Post Nowgon, Tehsil Ramgarh, Distt. Alwar Raj.
92. Dharam Singh Saini S/o Begraj, R/o Village And Post Nowgoan, Chandigarh Ka Bas, Tehsil Ramgarh Distt. Alwar Raj.





93. Puneet Kumar S/o Vinod Kumar, R/o Ward No. 10, 17 Bgp, Bolanwali, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
94. Gordhan S/o Jile Singh, R/o Berawas Kalan, Post Bhonker, Tehsil Kotkasim Distt. Alwar Raj.
95. Himanshu Yadav S/o Mahesh Chand Yadav, R/o Village Darbarpur, Post Ajraka, Mundwar, Distt. Alwar Raj.
96. Chandrabhan Yadav S/o Nihal Singh Yadav, Renagiri, Post Shyopur, Tehsil Mundwar, Distt. Alwar Raj.
97. Pawan Kumar Sharma S/o Sheochand Sharma, R/o Renagiri, Post Shyopur, Tehsil Mundwar, Distt. Alwar Raj.
98. Firoz Khan S/o Subhan Ahmed, R/o Village And Post Pinan, Tehsil Raini, Distt. Alwar Raj.
99. Girraj Prasad Meena S/o Matadeen Meena, R/o Village And Post Agar Dudi Ki Dhani Tehsil Thanagazi Distt. Alwar Raj.
100. Rajbala Yadav D/o Shishram Yadav, R/o B 363, Rathnagar, Near Pani Ki Tanki, Distt. Alwar Raj.
101. Narendra Kumar Patwa S/o Matadeen Patwa, R/o Village And Post Pratapgarh, Tehsil Thanagazi, Distt. Alwar Raj.
102. Ram Lal Jat S/o Budhram Jat, R/o Village And Post Beejwar Narukamal Kheda, Distt. Alwar Raj.
103. Rinku Chaudhary D/o Pappu Ram Chaudhary, R/o Village And Post Bijwar Naruka, Tehsil Malakheda, Distt. Alwar Raj.
104. Satpal S/o Shrikrishan, R/o Ward No. 13, 2 Ptp Nukera, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
105. Siya Ram Prajapat S/o Shri Narayana Prajapat, R/o Village Irniya Iteda, Tehsil Laxmangarh, Distt. Alwar Raj.
106. Rajesh Kumar Soni S/o Satyanarayan Soni, R/o Post Dag, Tehsil Gangdhar, Distt. Jhalawar Raj.
107. Swarup Singh Bhati S/o Girdhar Singh Bhati, R/o Village And Post Modha, Tehsil Fatehgarh, Distt. Jaisalmer Raj.
108. Mahaveer Singh Bhati S/o Narayan Singh Bhati, R/o Village And Post Modha, Tehsil Fatehgarh, Distt. Jaisalmer Raj.
109. Ranbir Singh S/o Rajbir Singh, R/o Village And Post Suratpura, Distt. Churu Raj.
110. Kailash Chand Gurjar S/o Kishan Lal Gurjar, R/o Village And Post Atalikipura, Post Dodwadi, Tehsil Piplu, Distt. Tonk Raj.
111. Priya Narniya D/o Chhotu Lal Narniya, R/o Banjaro Ki Basti, Pachipalaiya, Distt. Sawaimadhopur Raj.
112. Ramesh Kumar S/o Bhagirath Ram, R/o Village And Post Saron Ki Dhani, Palina Distt. Jodhpur Raj.
113. Jyoti D/o Resham Lal, R/o Village And Post New Prem Nagar, Gali No. 9, Distt. Sriganganagar Raj.
114. Om Prakash S/o Ram Chander, R/o Village And Post Doongri, Post Chitalwana, Distt. Jalore Raj.





115. Amrik Singh S/o Iqbal Singh, R/o Kishanpura Dikhanda, 17 K.s.p. 19 Ksp Kishanpura Dikhanda, Hanumangarh Raj.
116. Sandeep Kumar S/o Krishan Kumar, R/o Ward No. 8, Bashir, Krishn Dukan Wali Gali, 4 Ftp Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
117. Anil Parmar S/o Harji Ram, R/o Village And Post Kelwa, Tehsil And Distt.rajsamand Raj.
118. Hanuman Ram S/o Poornaram, R/o Village And Post Lorty Height, Undkha, Distt. Barmer Raj.
119. Ameda Ram Saran S/o Goma Ram Saran, R/o Khume Ke Bedi, Dhorimanna, Distt. Barmer Raj.
120. Gangaram S/o Thakra Ram, R/o Nehro Ki Dhani, Distt. Barmer Raj.
121. Arjun Ram Dhaka S/o Ramchandra Dhaka, R/o Balaknath Ki Kutiya Ke Pas, Ward No. 19, Balotra Distt. Barmer Raj.
122. Jagga Ram S/o Nethi Ram, R/o Amliyala Gudha Malani, Distt. Barmer Raj.
123. Poonam Singh S/o Sri Malam Singh, R/o Village Gangapura, Post Girab, Tehsil Gadra Road, Distt. Barmer Raj
124. Swati Sharma D/o Manoj Kumar Sharma, R/o 42, Balaji Vihar, Niwaru Road, Jhotwara, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
125. Suman Yadav D/o Bhagwan Sahay Yadav, R/o Village And Post Nindola, Jaipur Raj.
126. Om Prakash Yadav S/o Laxminarayan Yadav, R/o Thoth Walon Ki Dhani, Nangal Koju, Distt. Jaipur.
127. Madan Lal S/o Ram Swaroop, R/o Ward No. 2, 2 Ptp Nukera, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
128. Karan Singh Yadav S/o Arjun Lal Yadav, R/o Ward No. 28, Nidola, Khejoli, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
129. Mamta Kumari D/o Nemichand Singh, R/o Ward No. 13, Bisau, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
130. Pragya Sharma D/o Promod Kumar Sharma, R/o Brahmpuri, Gaushala, Dholpur Raj.
131. Kapil Dev S/o Pratap Singh, R/o Kawai, Bharatpur Raj.
132. Punit Sharma S/o Dhaniram Sharma, R/o Vardhman Nagar, Hindaun City, District Karauli Raj.
133. Sushil Kumar S/o Bhup Ram, R/o 12 Ksd Dhani Rasuwala, Ward No. 2, Vpo Rasuwala, 7 Idg, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
134. Vijender Singh S/o Baljeet Singh, Aged About 18 19 Years, R/o 6 Jgw, Ninan, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
135. Monika D/o Parveen Kumar, R/o Village Bhangarh, Post Bhangarh, Tehsil Bhadra, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj.
136. Poonam Baimad D/o Kailash Chand Baimad, R/o 45, Vigyan Nagar, Ranthamboreroad, Sawaimadhopur Raj.





137. Choti Devi Dhayal D/o Bodu Ram Dhayal, Village Bichpadi, Post Nangal, Via Jahota, Tehsil Amer Distt. Jaipur Raj.
138. Mohammad Aftab S/o Chand Mohammad, R/o 358/36 Mithe Kuwe Ki Gali, Lohakhana, Police Line, Ajmer Raj.
139. Narayan S/o Girraj Singh, R/o Village Tuhiya Pattipura, Ucchain, Post Adhiyari, Tehsil Roopwas, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.
140. Satyanarayan Yadav S/o Ramprasad Yadav, R/o Village Charanwas, Post Alisar, Via Kaladera, Tehsil Chomu, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
141. Subhash Chander S/o Ramswarup Kumar, R/o Ward No. 03, Mohan Magariya, Tehsil And District Hanumangarh Raj.
142. Ashish Yadav S/o Prabhu Dayal Yadav, R/o Village Sandarsar, Via Kaladera, Tehsil Chomu, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
143. Shivilal Bairwa S/o Ramswaroop Bairwa, R/o Village And Post Todadhekla, Tehsil Lalsot, Distt. Dausa Raj.
144. Sunil Kumar Jat S/o Gopal Lal Jat, R/o Village Israwala, Post Bilochi, Tehsil Amer, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
145. Ramkhiladi Gurjar S/o Ramkishore Gurjar, R/o Village And Post Golak, Teshil Boli, Distt. Sawaimadhapur Raj.
146. Sunil Kumar Koli S/o Suwa Lal Koli, R/o Village And Post Thali, Tehsil Jamwaramgarh, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
147. Pritam Chaudhary D/o Ramniwas Chaudhary, R/o B-6, Bahubali Nagar, Mansarover, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
148. Manisha Khoiya D/o Jeetram, R/o Village Mathuraheda, Post Indrawali, Tehsil Kathumar, Distt. Alwar Raj.
149. Varsha Kumari D/o Satish Kumari, R/o Village Kayampur Jokha Bas, Post Budhibawal, Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar Raj.
150. Monika D/o Sukhram Yadav, R/o Bilahedo, Post And Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar Raj.
151. Shankar Lal S/o Surendra Singh, R/o Village Kulharion Ka Bas, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
152. Sunder Lal S/o Mohan Lal, R/o Ward No. 1, Barbirana, Beerna, District Hanumangarh Raj.
153. Naveen Kumar S/o Satyaveer, R/o Village Dhandhar, Post D.k. Bas, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
154. Govind Singh Rajawat S/o Amer Singh Rajawat, 18, Manu Vihar Vistar, Near Kishan Vidyapeeth, Jamdoli, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
155. Sumit Kumar Verma S/o Umed Singh, R/o Behind Ajeet Hospital, Gulal Ka Kua, Ward No. 13, Khetri, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
156. Rewant Kumar S/o Devaram, R/o Village Dhaniyo Ka Tala, Dharasar, Teshil Chowhatan, Distt. Barmer Raj.
157. Suresh Kumar S/o Moti Ram, R/o Village Sortha, Tehsil





Roodar, Distt. Sirohi Raj.

158. Harshad Gaur S/o Pyare Lal Gaur, R/o Village Post Ganeshpura, Garnaobadat, Tehsil Pathpad, Distt. Jhalawar Raj.
159. Rajendra Kumar Chaudhary S/o Panchu Ram Jat, R/o Village Naradpura, post Narena, Tehsil Phulera, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
160. Dinesh Kumar S/o Daulat Ram, R/o Village Post Doongri, Chitalbana, Distt. Jalore Raj.
161. Mohan Lal S/o Tikuram, R/o Birdo Ka Tala, Post Bisarniya, Tehsil Chowhatan, Distt. Barmer Raj.
162. Imran Khan S/o Nabbi Khan, R/o Village Viyo Ka Goliya, Tehsil Punasa, Distt. Jalore Raj.
163. Pawan Kumar S/o Ramswarup Kumhar, R/o Doongrana, District Hanumangarh Raj.
164. Raju Singh S/o Ajab Singh, R/o Village Kanasi Moti, Tehsil Jodhani, Tiputapu, Distt. Jodhpur Raj.
165. Sawai Singh S/o Narayan Singh, R/o Village And Post Ghatiyalo, Distt. Jaisalmer Raj..
166. Manish Kumar Sharma S/o Ramniwas Sharma, R/o Paragpura, Tehsil Kotputli, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
167. Kheenya Ram S/o Ray Chand, R/o Village Gayaton Ki Dhani, Post Hemgudha, Tehsil Chitalbana, Distt. Jaloreraj..
168. Choth Mal Raidas S/o Shyam Lal, R/o Village And Post Jabar, Tehsil Manohar Thana, Distt. Jhalawar Raj.
169. Rampratap Godora S/o Narayan Godara, R/o 8 Shpd, 8 Chak, Suratgarh, Distt. Ganganagar Raj.
170. Kiran Rani D/o Sohan Lal, R/o Village And Post Nirwana, Tehsil Suratgarh, Distt. Sriganganagar Raj..
171. Hemant Paliwal S/o Narayan Lal, R/o House No. 117, Rajendra Nagar, Near Sharda Bal School, Distt. Pali Raj..
172. Sunil Kumar S/o Megh Singh, R/o Village Jindpura, Post Khanwa, Tehsil Roopwas, Distt. Bhartpur Raj..
173. Shankar Kumar S/o Rameshwar Prasad, R/o Village Ramchandrapura, Post Barijori, Tehsil Shahpura, Distt. Raj.
174. Vinod Kumar S/o Rameshwar, R/o Ward No. 8 Madarpura District Hanumangarh Raj..
175. Jeetendra Meena S/o Shreelal Meena, R/o Village Mereda, Post Khedi, Tehsil Todabhim, Distt. Karauliraj..
176. Vinod Kumar Meena S/o Ramratan Meena, R/o Village Gadholi, Post Hansmahal, Tehsil Bassi, Distt. Jaipur Raj.
177. Suman Chaudhary D/o Dhura Ram Chaudhary, R/o Ward No. 2, Tehsil Hansalsar, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj.
178. Sangeeta D/o Manak Ram, R/o Village Mandore, Tehsil Baap, Distt. Jodhpur Raj.





179. Pratap Chaudhary S/o Chittar Mal Bagariya, R/o Village And Post Umara, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar Raj.
180. Laxman La Mali S/o Bhanwar Lal Mali, R/o 52 Muradh, Village Nichli Otan, Distt. Rajsamand Raj..
181. Anil Kumar S/o Sukhram, R/o Village And Post Doongry, Tehsil Chitalwana, Distt. Jalore Raj..
182. Rahul Singh Rathore S/o Vashudev Rathore, R/o Village Baroda Gaon, Distt. Jaisalmer Raj..
183. Ram Singh Yadav S/o Ganesh Yadav, R/o Village Tejaji Ki Dhani, Post Nangalkoju, Distt. Jaipur Raj..
184. Pramod Kumar S/o Sewaram, R/o Village Dhana, Tehsil Laxmangarh, Distt.sikar Raj.
185. Vijay Pal S/o Jagdish Prasad, R/o Ward No. 9, 33 Amp, Kalwasiya, Distt. Ganganagar Raj..
186. Sulochana D/o Manohar Ram, R/o Village Sarno Ki Dhani, Tehsil Sarpura, Distt. Jodhpur Raj..
187. Sandeep S/o Ramotar Sharma, R/o Vpo Sangtera, Tehsil Kotputli, Distt. Jaipur Raj..
188. Narendra Naraniya S/o Pooran Mal Naraniya, R/o Village Post Chanwadiya, Tehsil Bassi, Distt. Jaipur Raj..
189. Mukesh Gurjar S/o Jagdish Prasad Gurjar, R/o Village And Post Kadeela, Tehsil Malpura, Distt. Tonk Raj
190. Mayank Kumar Sharma S/o Sita Ram Sharma, R/o Village And Post Bhordon Ka Bas, Via Dantaramgarh, Distt. Sikar Raj..
191. Ramesh Achara S/o Chhitar Mal Achara, R/o Mau, Srimadhopur, Distt. Sikar Raj..
192. Narendra Singh Shekhawat S/o Bharat Singh, R/o Borki Jhunjhunu Raj..
193. Harish Kumar Chandeliya S/o Mamchand Chandeliya, R/o Chadeliya Ki Dhani, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj..
194. Sandeep Kumar S/o Ranveer Singh, R/o Doomra, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj..
195. Anil Saini S/o Sanwarmal Saini, R/o Kocchor, Distt. Sikar Raj..
196. Rakesh Kumar S/o Mani Ram, R/o Ward No. 27, Gali No. 1, Surya Nagar Vatika, Hanumangarh Town 8 Sw, Hanumangarh Raj.
197. Rajendra Kumar Meena S/o Dhanna Ram Meena, R/o Fatehpur Shekhawati, Distt. Sikar Raj..
198. Ramniwas Saini S/o Jhabarmal Saini, R/o Bagora, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj..
199. Pankaj Dhariwal S/o Vijay Singh, R/o Dewas, Distt. Sikar Raj..
200. Vikas Kumar S/o Rohtash, R/o Pratappura, Distt. Sikar Raj..
201. Dinesh Kumar Sharma S/o Surendra Kumar Sharma, R/o





Jajod, Tehsil Laxamangarh, Distt. Sikar Raj..

202. Kamlesh Kapuriya S/o Bhanwar Lal, R/o Hejampura, Distt. Jhunjhunu Raj..
203. Jaiprakash Jhakar S/o Sri Ram Jhakar, R/o Neem Ka Thana, Distt. Sikar Raj..
204. Rakesh Kasotiya S/o Kishan Lal, R/o Village Andpost Shiv Chhapri, Tehsil Kuchaman City, Distt. Nagur Raj..
205. Yogendra Singh S/o Maharaj Singh, R/o Village And Post Katara, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
206. Bharat Singh S/o Ranveer Singh, R/o Village Jhorol, Post Karata, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
207. Poonam D/o Balbir Singh, R/o Village Bhangarh Bhadra, Distt. Hanumangarh Raj..
208. Natwar Singh S/o Harsukh Singh, R/o Village Tohila, Post Atari, Tehsil Nadbai, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
209. Madhav Sharma S/o Khubi Ram, R/o Village Mukhena, Post Butholi, Tehsil Weir, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
210. Lokendra Singh S/o Babu Singh, R/o Village Magren Khurd, Tehsil Bayana Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
211. Lakhan Singh S/o Devi Singh, R/o Kamlapura, Ward No. 1, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
212. Rajkumar S/o Devi Singh, R/o Nagla Ajau, Post Sihi, Tehsil Kumher Distt. Bharatpur Raj
213. Sachin Kumar Sharma S/o Lal Chand Sharma, R/o Village And Post Bolheda, Tehsil Kama, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
214. Kapil Kumar S/o Bhagwan Singh, R/o R/o Village And Post Bolheda, Tehsil Kama, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
215. Balmukund Upadhyay S/o Hari Ram Sharma, R/o Village And Post Bolheda, Tehsil Kama, Distt. Bharatpur Raj
216. Preeti D/o Laxman Singh, R/o Indra Nagar Nale Ke Pas, Heeradas, Distt. Bharatpur Raj..
217. Anuradha D/o Laxman, R/o Indra Nagar Nale Ke Pas, Heeradas, Distt. Bharatpur Raj.

सत्यमेव जयते

----Respondents

- For Appellant(s) : Mr. R.N. Mathur, Senior Counsel assisted by Mr. Prateek Mathur and Mr. Shovit Jhajharia.
Mr. N.K. Maloo, Senior Counsel assisted by Mr. N.K. Singhal, Mr. Vishnu Bohra; Mr. Vigyan Shah with Mr. Kamlesh Sharma, Mr. Rajaram Choudhary; Mr. Akshit Gupta, Mr. Arvind Kumar Arora.
- For Respondent(s) : Mr. M.S. Singhvi, Advocate General assisted by Mr. C.L. Saini, AAG, Mr. Raunak Singhvi, Mr. Sheetanshu



Sharma and Mr. Darsh Pareek;
Mr. A.K. Sharma, Senior Counsel
assisted by Mr. V.K. Sharma and Mr.
Rachit Sharma;

Mr. S.C. Gupta and Mr. Vinor Kumar
Gupta for respondent Raj. Board for
Secondary Education; Mr. Anoop
Dhand, Mr. Anand Sharma,
Mr. Raghunandan Sharma for selected
candidates; Mr. Ram Dev Potalia, and
Mr. Deepak Nehra for TSP selected
candidates.



HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD RAFIQ
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GOVERDHAN BARDHAR

Judgment

//Reportable//

08/02/2019

Per Hon'ble Mr. Justice Mohammad Rafiq:-

All these appeals are directed against the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 08.10.2018, whereby two writ petitions, being S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9314/2018, filed by Mahendra Kumar Jatolia and Others (appellants in D.B. Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No.1322/20188) and S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9603/2018 filed by Vivek Kumar Devesh and Others (appellants in D.B. Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No.1391/2018), were dismissed. D.B. Civil Special Appeals (Writ) No.1637/2018 and 79/2019 have been filed against the same judgment with applications seeking leave of the court to assail the same judgment and were therefore clubbed with the two special appeals that were filed by the original writ-petitioners.

The writ petitioners challenged Clause 13(2) of the advertisement dated 12.04.2018 which prescribed the marks



secured by the candidates in different examinations of the Rajasthan Teachers Eligibility Test 2011, 2012 (for short, 'the RTET') and the Rajasthan Eligibility Examination for Teachers 2015 & 2017 (for short, 'the REET') as the sole criteria of selection on the post of Teacher Gr.III (Level-I). Prayer was made that the respondents be directed to normalize/standardize the marks of the said different four examinations before making the selection on the post of Teacher Gr.III (Level-I). Further prayer was made that the respondents be directed to correct the answer key in respect of the questions no.1, 11, 17, 21 (subject of Child Development and Pedagogy), 37 (subject of Language-I Hindi), 99, 107 (Subject of Mathematics) and 137 (subject of Environment Studies), all of E-series, of the REET 2017. An alternative prayer was made for a direction to the respondents to conduct the written examination for selection on the post of Teacher Gr.III (Level-I) or to make selection solely on the basis of marks in REET 2017 with weightage of marks being given to qualifying examination. The learned Single Judge was, however, not persuaded to grant any of the prayers and therefore dismissed the writ petitions in toto. Hence these appeals.

According to the criteria of selection notified by the respondents in clause 13(2) of the advertisement, the merit list was required to be prepared on the basis of marks secured by the candidates in RTET/REET examinations respectively in the years 2011, 2012, 2015 and 2017. Therefore, the highest marks secured in any of them would form the basis for selection. No weightage whatsoever has been given to the marks secured by the candidates in their eligibility academic examinations such as Senior Secondary or BSTC. The appointment to the post of



Teacher Gr.III is governed by the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (for short, 'the Act of 1994') and the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Rules, 1996 (for short, 'the Rules of 1996'). The Teachers have been divided in the category of Level-I and Level-II. The Teachers at Level-I teach students of Class I to Class V, whereas the Teachers at Level-II teach the students of Class VI to Class VIII. Rule 266(3) of the Rules of 1996, incorporated vide notification dated 08.06.2016, provides that whatever qualification has been laid down by the National Council for Teacher Education (for short, 'the NCTE') under the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section 23 of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (for short, 'the RTE Act') from time to time, shall be the eligibility for appointment. Rule 270 to Rule 277-B relate to 'Procedure for Direct Recruitment', while Rules 270 to 273 are general in nature. Rule 270 mandates for inviting applications. Rule 271 states that there shall be a format of application, which shall be prescribed by the Committee. Rule 277 provides that the Committee shall scrutinize the applications and Rule 273 gives a discretion to hold the written test for all categories of posts except for the posts of Driver and Class-IV and the posts enumerated in Clause (iii) of Section 89 (2) of the Act of 1994. Primary and Upper Primary School Teachers are the posts enumerated in Clause (iii) of Section 89 (2). Rule 277-A of the Rules of 1996 inserted on 15.10.2015 provides the procedure and method of direct recruitment to the post of Primary and Upper Primary School Teachers. Clause (i) of Rule 277-A provides that the authorized agency, (which is Board of Secondary Education for Rajasthan, Ajmer), shall invite applications by advertising the vacancies. Clause (iv) of Rule 277-A provides that the authorized



agency shall prepare category wise select list of the candidates declared successful on the basis of the criteria of selection laid down by the State Government from time to time. The Rules of 1996 do not provide the criteria for selection and leave it to the wisdom of the State Government to prescribe such criteria. The NCTE by notification dated 11.02.2011 issued the guidelines under Section 23(1) of the RTE Act, for conducting the Teachers Eligibility Test by all the States. Clause 9(a) of the said guidelines provides that whosoever scores 60% or more in the examination will be considered as having qualified the TET. Clause 9(b) of the guidelines states that weightage should be given to scores of TET in the recruitment process but qualifying the TET by itself does not confer right on any person for recruitment/employment because TET is only an eligibility criterion. The NCTE issued another notification dated 29.07.2011, according to which the minimum qualification for a person to be eligible for appointment as a Teacher for Classes I to V, would be Senior Secondary or its equivalent with at least 50% marks and 2-year Diploma in Elementary Education or Senior Secondary or its equivalent with at least 45% marks and 2-year Diploma in Elementary Education in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure), Regulations, 2012 or Senior Secondary or its equivalent with at least 50% marks and 2-year Diploma in Education (Special Education) or Graduation and two year Diploma in Elementary Education, with further condition that the candidate should have passed the TET conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the NCTE.

Mr. R.N. Mathur and Mr. N.K. Maloo, the learned Senior Counsels, and Mr. Vigyan Shah, the learned counsel, appearing for



the appellants, argued that the State Government issued the advertisement on 06.07.2016 for appointment of Teachers Gr.III (Level-II) in the State excluding non-tribal areas. In Clause 10 of the aforesaid advertisement, the criterion for preparing the merit list was the highest marks secured by the candidates in any of the Teachers Eligibility Test conducted in the years 2011, 2012 and 2015. This criterion was challenged by certain candidates in the writ petitions filed before this court, which were dismissed. The writ petitioners filed special appeals against that judgment, leading one being **D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) no.1464/2016** titled **Sher Singh and Others Vs. Dinesh Singh and Others**, which was disposed of vide judgment dated 27.04.2017. The Division Bench in para 23 of the judgment settled the issue "As to whether one can ignore the marks obtained in the B.Ed. or in the Graduation and simply preparing a merit on the basis of TET marks...". Since the controversy in the said case was regarding appointment of Primary Teachers (Level-II), therefore, in para 35 of the judgment, the Division Bench held that mere marks obtained in the TET examination cannot form basis/criteria of selection and the marks secured in a particular subject for which candidate has applied, should also be given weightage. This court disapproved of the method of preparing the merit list solely on the basis of the marks of the TET. However the respondents again retained the same criteria in Clause 13 of the fresh advertisement dt. 12.04.2018. The respondent-State has committed an illegality by making the Teachers Eligibility Test as the sole criteria for appointment ignoring the marks secured by the candidates in the eligibility qualification. Moreover, it further committed illegality in clubbing the four examinations of TET together for the purpose of



preparing the merit list. It is argued that as per Clause 11 of the guidelines issued by the NCTE vide Notification dated 11.02.2011, the validity period of the qualifying certificate of the TET shall be decided by the appropriate Government subject to maximum of seven years. Therefore, the qualifying certificate obtained by the candidates in the TET examination of the years 2011 and 2012 would remain valid for seven years. However, the validity period of the qualifying certificate for REET 2015 onwards, has been reduced to three years. The candidates should have been brought on a common platform for the purpose of preparing the merit list to give employment on a public post by applying the statistical formula of moderation/normalization.

It is submitted that the petitioners in para 25 to 28 of the writ petitions clearly demonstrated the inequality in the standards of examinations in different years. Otherwise also, it is well established that not only the years of examinations were different but also the paper setters were different, the questions were different, the teachers, who examined the answer sheets, were different. Thus, each examination had its own level of difficulty as well as number of errors in the questions/answers. In order therefore to ensure fair and equitable treatment to all the candidates, the marks of different examinations should have been normalized/standardized by applying the statistical formula, which is adopted by various government bodies like Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangthan and Graduate Aptitude Test for Engineering (GATE), etc. Even though, the learned Single Judge has in para 23 of the judgment referred to the cited precedents but thereafter in para 27 merely stated that since validity of Eligibility Test is seven



years, the results of different years can be clubbed together. The learned Single Judge failed to specifically deal with the question that even though para 9 of the NCTE guidelines dated 11.02.2011 provides that weightage can also be given to the marks secured by the candidate in the TET examination but this Clause cannot be read to mean that the marks secured in the TET examination alone shall form the basis for preparation of the merit list. Reliance is placed on the judgment of the Supreme Court in **State of U.P. and Others Vs. Shiv Kumar Pathak – AIR 2017 SC 3612** to submit that the Supreme Court in that case also considered the question regarding 'weightage of marks in TET' and held that 'the weightage to TET is only suggestive and not mandatory'. In such circumstances, the respondents ought not to be allowed to make the appointment solely on the basis of the marks secured in the TET examination. Reliance is also placed on the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Sanjay Singh and Others Vs. U.P. Public Service Commission, Allahabad and Others – (2007) 3 SCC 720**. The learned Senior Counsels submitted that the Circular dated 23.10.2017 issued by the State Government was mere internal correspondence and therefore does not partake the character of law. In fact, it was not even a Circular but was an order which for the first time was produced before the Single Bench with the written submissions of the State on 09.01.2018. This order was not given wide publication, though the order itself states that it should be widely published. The appellants were therefore not required to challenge this order, which in any case does not form part of the Rules.





Referring to the additional affidavit filed on behalf of the State on 10.01.2019, it is submitted that as per Table-A given therein, 59.36% candidates qualified REET 2015 as against only 38.309% candidates in REET 2017, whereas only 1.607% candidates could qualify the RTET 2011 and 0.72% RTET 2012. Even as per Table-B, the passing percentage of the candidates of RTET 2011 examination with 60% and above marks was 33.94%, and that of RTET 2012 was 36.97%, REET 2015 was 48.41% and REET 2017 was 35.32%. This clearly demonstrate that the difficulty level of examination in REET 2015 was comparatively easier but it was quite tough in REET 2017. While the candidates who appeared in RTET 2011 and 2012 had the opportunity to improve their performance in REET 2015, the candidates, who for the first time became eligible to appear in REET 2017, had no such opportunity. Reference is made to the affidavit of the respondent filed on 11.01.2019 in Writ Petition No.3047/2018, in which Table-C and Table-D were given to show that 12115 candidates were selected in the select list of 2018 from REET 2015. Approximately 5000 candidates were selected in the recruitment of 2016 from the REET 2015. Thus total 17115 candidates were selected in 2018 recruitment out of REET 2015 alone. If one goes by the number of candidates selected in the recruitment of 2018, only 11.58% candidates were selected as against the total number of 147797 candidates who appeared in REET 2015. This when applied to total number of 71547 candidates who qualified by securing 60% marks, 23.92% out of them were selected in the recruitment of 2018. But when the data of REET 2017 are analyzed, as against total number of 183556 candidates who





appeared therein, 7817 candidates were selected in the recruitment of 2018, which constituted only 4.25% of total number of candidates who appeared. When examined in the light of 64828 candidates who qualified with 60% and above marks in REET 2017, only 12.06% of them could find place in the merit list. The Table-D indicates that there were 24996 candidates in REET 2015, who obtained marks in the bloc of 60 to 65 percentage as against 27395 in REET 2017, in the block of 65.1 to 70 there were 20175 candidates in REET 2015 as against 18872 in REET 2017, in the block of 70.1. to 75 there were 11576 candidates in REET 2015 as against 8012 candidates in REET 2017, in the block of 75.1 to 80 there were 6452 candidates in REET 2015 as against 2774 candidates in REET 2017, in the block of 80.1 to 85 there were 1494 candidates in REET 2015 as against 375 candidates in REET 2017, in the block of 85.1 to 90 there were 211 candidates in REET 2015 as against 27 candidates in REET 2017, in the block of 90.1 and above there were candidates in REET 2015 as against 0 candidate in REET 2017. It is submitted that difficulty level of knowledge of the same candidates, who appeared both in REET-2015 and REET-2017 examinations, is evident from the details of eleven candidates submitted on the counter-affidavit of the appellant Balwan Singh in Appeal No.1637/208 filed before this court on 16.01.2019. While they scored much higher percentage of the marks in REET 2015, their performance in REET 2017 was quite dismal.

It is argued that the validity of the examination for initial two tests being seven years and for latter years being three years, has no nexus with the object of selecting the candidates on the basis



of the marks secured in such examination. Any criteria for appointment must necessarily satisfy the right to equality to consider the candidates for appointment on a public post. Even from the affidavit filed on behalf of the State on 19.01.2019, the figures demonstrate that relaxation in different categories is inconsequential because the very fact that relaxation was given to different categories in different examinations, clearly demonstrates that the yardsticks for determining the merit even in the Teachers Eligibility Test were different. The respondents ought to have therefore evolved the statistical formula in consultation with expert statisticians to equalize/normalize the marks of different RTET/REET examinations. Reliance in support of this argument is placed on the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Delhi Development Authority and Another Vs. Joint Action Committee and Allottee of SFS Flats and Others – (2008) 2 SCC 672.**

The learned Senior Counsels appearing for the appellants have extensively argued that while the respondents have in respect of certain questions taken incorrect option as correct answer and all four options given for some of the questions were wrong. At least three questions were out of syllabus. Such objections have been raised with regard to question numbers 1, 11, 17, 21, 37, 99, 107 and 137, all of E-series. In order not to be repetitive, we shall deal with the arguments of the appellants and response of respondents thereto simultaneously with our finding on each of questions at appropriate place hereinafter. It is submitted that as per clause 4.1 (5) of the advertisement no.04/2015, all objective type questions would be based on the



syllabus prescribed by the State Government for Class I to V but difficulty level of the questions would be of secondary standard. The respondent-Board has however committed a grave illegality in relying on the books of the foreign authors. The learned Senior Counsel submitted that this court in the scope of its power of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution can very much examine the correctness of the questions and answers to ensure that merit of the candidates is correctly evaluated. Reliance in support of this argument is placed on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **Ran Vijay Singh Vs. State of U.P. - (2018) 2 SCC 357**, **Richal and Others Vs. RPSC - (2018) 8 SCC 81**, **Disha Panchal Vs. Union of India - 2018 SCC Online SC 603**, **Washim Akram Hossain Vs. Union of India - 2018 SCC Online Cal 9060**, **Rajesh Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar - (2013) 4 SCC 690** and **Kanpur University v. Samir Gupta - (1983) 4 SCC 309**.

Per contra, Mr. M.S. Singhvi, the learned Advocate General, submitted that the original writ-petitioners having appeared in the REET-2017 examination and also in REET-2015 examination, were fully aware of the fact that the aforesaid condition of the advertisement would form basis for preparation of the merit and consequential appointments. Having appeared in that examination without any demur or objection, they have acquiesced in favour of correctness of such condition, which would amount to waiver on their part. They are therefore estopped from questioning the same. The learned Advocate General in support of this argument, has relied on the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Dhananjay Malik Vs. State of Uttaranchal - (2008) 4 SCC 171**. The



aforesaid condition contained in Clause 13(2) of the advertisement is in conformity with Rule 277A(1)(vi) read with Circular/Order dated 23.10.2017 of the Government prescribing that the marks of anyone of the RTET/REET examination of 2011, 2012, 2015 and 2017 would be the basis for preparation of the merit list. Neither Rule 277A(1)(vi) nor Circular/Order dated 23.10.2017 has been challenged by the writ-petitioners. The inclusion of the condition in Clause 13(2) of the advertisement was only a consequence thereof. The writ petitions are therefore liable to be dismissed.

Mr. M.S. Singhvi, the learned Advocate General, submitted that claim of the writ-petitioners regarding equalization/standardization of the marks of the RTET/REET examination 2011, 2012, 2015 and 2017 and also their demand for grant of weightage to the marks of the qualifying examination of Senior Secondary and BSTC and for holding written examination for selection on the post of Teacher Gr.III Level-I is wholly untenable. It is trite that laying down criteria for selection is purely a policy matter and this court would not like to interfere with the policy matter of the employer State Government, particularly when it is based on sound criteria. It is argued that the criteria laid down by the respondent-State is fully justified in view of the guidelines of the NCTE contained in the notification dated 11.02.2011, which permit a candidate to appear in the Teachers Eligibility Test for the purpose of improving his rank/score. Para 11 of the aforesaid notification provides that the appropriate Government should conduct TET at least once every year. The validity period of TET qualifying certificate for appointment will be decided by the appropriate Government



subject to a maximum of seven years for all categories. However, there will be no restriction on the number of attempts a person can take for acquiring a TET Certificate. A person who has qualified TET may also appear again for improving his/her score. The learned Advocate General, in support of his arguments, has relied on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **State of Punjab Vs. Ram Lubhaya Bagga – (1998) 4 SCC 117, BALCO Employees' Union (Regd.) Vs. Union of India – (2002) 2 SCC 333, V. Lavanya Vs. State of Tamil Nadu – (2017) 1 SCC 322.**

It is argued that the criteria prescribed in the order/circular providing for preparation of the merit on the basis of the marks obtained in the RTET/REET cannot be described as arbitrary. When the RTET/REET itself is based on a written examination, there being no element of interview involved, there is no need for a further written examination. Therefore, the criteria of preparing merit on the basis of marks obtained at the said examination notified by order dated 23.10.2017 is perfectly justified. The question of standardization/normalization does not arise as the written examinations of REET are held year-wise and all these examinations are based on the objective type questions drawn from the same syllabus. It cannot, therefore, be argued that different yardsticks are applied in different examinations. Moreover, the candidates are given the opportunity to improve their marks in subsequent examination.

The learned Advocate General submitted that ratio of the judgment of this Court in **Sher Singh**, supra, is not applicable to the present case for the reason that the dispute therein pertained



to selection of teachers relating to Level II (Class VI-VIII), for which the subject-wise appointments are required to be made. Clause 6.2(B) of the advertisement also provides so. The advertisement of posts of Teacher Gr.III (Level-II) was also subject-wise. It was owing to these reasons that this court held that the marks secured in RTET/REET examinations cannot be the sole criteria for selection. Since the selected candidate has to teach subject wise, it may so happen that the person selected on the basis of TET marks, may not be of the subject he may be required to teach. This would be an anomalous situation. In the present case, the selection pertains to Teachers of Level-I, who teach Class I-V, where neither the appointments are required to be made subject-wise nor are the students taught subject-wise. Therefore, appointments on the post of Teacher Gr.III (Level-I) are not required to be made subject-wise. At that level, the teaching is of a very primary and generalized level. The judgment in **Sher Singh**, supra, therefore can have no application. The difference between the Teacher Gr.III (Level-I) and Teacher Gr.III (Level-II) is amply borne out from Item 1(a) and (b) of the Schedule to RTE Act.

It is argued that the contention of the petitioner that since the manner of taking and evaluating the examination is different for each year and therefore equalization/normalization would be necessary, is wholly untenable. Further contention that the marking in the REET 2015 was quite lenient as compared to REET 2017 is also not admitted. This case is sought to be built up by the appellants solely on the basis of percentage of the candidates passing the examination in different years. The



equalization/normalization cannot be allowed as the RTE Act does not require any such situation. Power to decide the issue of clubbing of RTET/REET of different years is a matter of policy and, therefore, the question whether or not any leniency has to be allowed, ought to be left to the discretion of the State Government. The experts do not feel the need for equalization keeping in view the level of classes for which teachers are being selected. The State, being a policy maker, does not deem it necessary. It is argued that the guidelines of the NCTE as per Section 23 of the RTE Act are binding on the State. Clause 11 of the said Guidelines clearly prescribes life of TET pass certificate for appointment is upto 7 years with no restriction as to number of appointments to appear in such examination to improve the percentage. The said guidelines thus provide for clubbing of different examinations, but at the same time it does not require equalization of the marks. The learned Advocate General, in support of his arguments, has relied on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **State of Kerala Vs. T.P. Roshana – (1979) 1 SCC 572, Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education Vs. Paritosh Bhupeshkumar Sheth – (1984) 4 SCC 27, V. Lavanya Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, supra.**

The learned Advocate General submitted that validity of the policy under question cannot be examined by this court in exercise of its power of judicial review, particularly when there is no allegation of any mala-fides. State does not prescribe books or does not advise candidates from where to study. Even the guidelines of the NCTE do not prescribe the books to be studied. The candidates with superior knowledge can appear in REET, who





might not have studied in Rajasthan. They may study books of other authors including foreign authors. The experts have examined all these issues thoroughly and found all the questions from within the syllabus. The learned Advocate General, in support of his argument, has relied on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **H.P. Public Service Commission Vs. Mukesh Thakur – (2010) 6 SCC 759, Ran Vijay Singh Vs. State of U.P., supra, Uttar Pradesh Public Service Commission Vs. Rahul Singh – (2018) 7 SCC 254.**

The learned Advocate General further submitted that an expert committee was constituted as per the direction of this court in **Gopal Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan – S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.970/2017**, decided on 25.07.2017. The expert committee after the examination published the provisional answer key and invited objections from the candidates, which were examined by the expert committee. The expert committee did not find any merit in those objections raised by the writ-petitioners in respect of certain questions. The learned Advocate General submitted that the REET cannot be held to be mere qualifying examination as the marks of this examination are taken into consideration for preparing merit. The marks obtained in REET are based on uniform pattern with an option given to the candidate to improve his/her score and maximum of the marks obtained in any of the examinations has been treated to be the base for preparing merit, thus eliminating any possibility of arbitrariness.

It is argued that Clause 9(b) of the Guidelines has not been correctly analyzed by the writ-petitioners. Clause 9(b) nowhere prohibits the State Government to prescribe the marks obtained at



RTET/REET as a criteria for preparing merit. In fact, this is implicit in Clause 11. The State Government keeping in view the objectives of TET and its rationale has adopted TET marks as sole criteria for selection of teachers for Classes I to V. When already this examination is being conducted by the State Government functionaries, there is no point in conducting another examination for selection of teachers, which would merely result in duplication. The learned Advocate General submitted that owing to interim order passed in these proceedings, appointment of more than 26000 candidates have been stayed. Students throughout the State are suffering because of non-availability of teachers. He therefore submits that all the appeals being devoid of merit ought to be dismissed.

Shri S.C. Gupta, learned counsel, and Shri Vinod Kumar Gupta, learned counsel, appearing for the Board of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, submitted that an expert committee was constituted following declaration of the result of the REET 2017 in conformity with the direction contained in the judgment of this court in **Gopal Singh**, supra. This committee re-evaluated the answer-key of all the questions so published and invited objections. After receiving the objections, the second expert committee consisting of three experts, has thoroughly examined the same and the answers were checked and thereafter the answer key was published. These expert committees consisted of subject-wise three experts, having very good education background being (1) Professor from the College of Education, (2) Associate Professor, and (3) Principal of School Education. These committees reviewed the answer suggested by the paper setters



in the light of the objections received. The re-appraisal committee has suggested the final answer-keys which was published by the respondents on their website and also in daily newspaper 'Rajasthan Patrika' on 17.03.2018 and all other leading newspapers of the State having wide circulation. The respondents also sent message to each and every candidate on his/her mobile phone inviting the objections within 15 days. More than 14000 students submitted their objections on 226 questions out of total 510 questions. The expert committee, on examination of the objections, suggested for giving bonus marks in respect of eight questions only. After complying with the said suggestions of the Committee, the respondents gave benefit of 8 bonus marks and prepared final answer-key and accordingly result of the Teacher Gr.III (Level-I) examination was declared on 11.04.2018.

On the question of scope of the jurisdiction of the Courts on the issues of correctness of experts opinions in relation to key answers of the competitive examinations, the learned counsel relied on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **Ram Vijay Singh and Others Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Others**, supra, **U.P.P.S.C. through its Chairman and Another Vs. Rahul Singh and Another**, supra, **Manish Ujwal and Others Vs. Maharishi Dayanand Saraswati University and Others – (2005) 13 SCC 744** and **Kanpur University through Vice Chancellor and Others Vs. Samir Gupta and Others**, supra. It is submitted that according to the ratio of the aforesaid judgments, interference should be made by this court only if the incorrect answer-keys are palpably wrong and the examining body does not dispute the same or if the incorrect answer-keys are



assumed to be correct. It was also held that the answer-keys have to be assumed correct unless proved to be wrong. In the event of doubt, benefit goes to the examining body. The entire examination process is not to be derailed only because some are dissatisfied or perceive some injustice. The Supreme Court also held that answer-keys cannot be held to be wrong by an inferential process of reasoning. The court should refrain from interfering with the academic field, because it is not an expert in the relevant subject. It can weigh only the submissions of both sides. Reliance in this regard is placed on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **H.P. Public Service Commission Vs. Mukesh Thakur**, supra, and **Kanpur University Vs. Samir Gupta**, supra.

Mr. A.K. Sharma, the learned Senior Counsel, Mr. Anoop Dhand, Mr. Raghunand Sharma and Mr. Deepak Nehra, learned counsels, all appearing for the selected candidates, submitted that this court should not interfere with the correctness of the model answer-keys and should not substitute its opinion for that of the experts. The answer-key has to be assumed to be correct unless it is proved to be palpably wrong and that it should not be held to be wrong by an inferential process of reasoning or by the process of rationalization. The final answer-key was prepared only after objections were considered by experts as per the mechanism suggested by this Court in **Gopal Singh**, supra, and result was declared on 11.04.2018. The selected candidates were allotted the schools where they were required to report but even as they were about to give their joining, this court vide interim order dated 23.10.2018 issued the directions in the terms that till the final decision of the appeals the select list prepared by the respondents



shall not be given effect to. As regards the weightage to be given to other academic qualifications for preparation of the merit list, it is submitted that if the State Government in its discretion has taken decision that a particular qualification is the only eligibility criteria for appointment, its correctness cannot be doubted on mere allegations of the writ-petitioners. The RTET/REET of the years 2011, 2012, 2015 and 2017 were conducted strictly in accordance with the course structure provided by the NCTE in the notification dated 11.02.2011. The State Government has applied it uniformly and therefore kept it as eligibility criteria for the vacancies in question. Reliance placed by the writ-petitioners on **Sher Singh**, supra, is misplaced. Therein the dispute pertained to the appointment on the post of Teacher Gr.III (Level-II) for a particular subject to impart education to students of Class VI to VIII and therefore there may be requirement for subject-wise appointment of Teachers. No such necessity has arisen for appointment on the post of Teacher Gr.III (Level-I).

The learned counsels also relied on the judgment of the Supreme Court in **State of U.P. and Others Vs. Shiv Kumar Pathak**, supra, in which it was held that the appropriate Government may on its own wisdom decide the eligibility of the candidates on the basis of TET. The appointment on the post in question was based on the eligibility criteria which was uniformly applied as per the policy decision of the State Government. Reliance is placed on the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Union of India Vs. Pushpa Rani and Others – (2008) 9 SCC 242**. It is argued that the rules of the game cannot be changed once the game has started and this principle applies to the process of



recruitment as well. The plea of the writ-petitioners for adding additional qualifications for appointment after issuance of the advertisement, cannot be accepted to change the criteria of appointment now in the midst of the process of selection. It is submitted that rules cannot be amended with retrospective effect so as to affect the finalised selection. Reliance in support of this argument is placed on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **K. Manjusree Vs. State of A.P. - (2008) 3 SCC 512**, **P.K. Ramchandra Iyer Vs. Union of India - (1984) 2 SCC 141**, **Umesh Chandra Shukla Vs. Union of India - (1985) 3 SCC 721**, **Durgacharan Misra Vs. State of Orissa - (1987) 4 SCC 646**, **Vikas Sankhala and Others Vs. Vikas Kumar Agarwal and Others - 2016 SCC Online SC 1154** and **V. Lavanya and Others Vs. State of Tamil Nadu**, supra.

It is argued that most of the writ-petitioners have not submitted any objections as to the correctness of the answer-key in regard to eight questions under scrutiny. Writ-petitioner Mahendra Kumar Jatolia, who submitted objection in respect of question no.3 of the booklet of F-series contending that the right answer is option (D), is now asking bonus marks as some of the writ-petitioners have come out with the case that they did not attempt that question owing to difference of meaning. Kanhiya Lal Sharma (writ-petitioner no.139) has also submitted his objections with regard to three questions, i.e., questions no.9, 15 and 118 of H-series, which are equivalent to questions no.1, 11 and 107 of E-series, though he did not submit any objection with regard to remaining five questions. The expert committee has properly considered the objections with regard to their correctness. Relying



on the judgment of the Supreme Court in **U.P. Public Service Commission Vs. Rahul Singh and Another**, supra, it is argued that the onus is on the candidate to not only demonstrate that the key answer is incorrect but also that it is a glaring mistake which is totally apparent and no inferential process of reasoning is required to show that the key answer is wrong.

Learned counsels, relying on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **Bal Ram Bali Vs. Union of India – (2017) 6 SCC 805** and **State of U.P. Vs. Anil Kumar Sharma – (2015) 6 SCC 716**, submitted that the power of judicial review of the court does not extend to directing the Parliament or the State Legislature to enact a particular law. On the same analogy, this court cannot require the State Government or NCTE to prescribe a particular qualification. Relying on the judgments of the Supreme Court in **UGC Vs. Neha Anil Bobde – (2013) 10 SCC 519**, **V. Lavanya Vs. State of Tamil Nadu**, supra, and **UPSC Vs. M. Sathiya Priya – (2018) 5 Scale 668**, the learned counsel argued that the authority of UGC and NCTE would prevail regarding terms of the appointment. The RTE Act, 2009 does not require any such normalization or equalization and that the power to decide the issue of clubbing the TET of different years is a matter of policy. Moreover, the writ-petitioners have not at all challenged the advertisement issued for TSP area, which would mean that if the appeals of the writ-petitioners are allowed, there would be two criteria for appointment in two parts of the State.

We have given our anxious consideration to rival submissions and perused the material on record.



Before considering the objections of the appellants to eight questions, we shall first deal with the argument of the appellant that according to the condition no.5 of the advertisement dated 12.04.2018, the questions should be asked from the text books prescribed by the respondent-Board or the State Government. This argument cannot be countenanced for the simple reason that all that was mentioned in that condition of the advertisement dated 12.04.2018 was that the examination would be based on the objective type questions of the 1st to 5th standard as per the syllabus prescribed by the State Government but the difficulty level of the questions would be that of secondary standard. What therefore the advertisement refers to is only the syllabus and not the text books approved by the respondent-Board or the State Government itself.

Objection has been raised by the appellants with regard to question no.E-17, which was to the effect that "Psychoanalysts believe that there is a primary means by which the ego "keeps the lid on the id." It is called", the respondents have treated the option '(D) Repression' as the correct answer, the Hindi version of which is 'दबाव', whereas the respondents have wrongly treated 'दमन' as the correct answer. In the question no.E-22 in option (D) Hindi meaning of the English word 'Repression' has been given as 'दमन'. They have thus given two different meaning of the English word 'Repression' at two places. In similar matter of wrong translation in question F-24 the respondent-Board gave bonus marks. The question F-24 was to the effect "The law of use and disuse in learning is also called as". The respondents took option '(B) law of



exercise' as the correct answer. The meaning of 'law of exercise' is given in Hindi translation thereto was 'श्रम का नियम', which was not treated as the correct Hindi meaning and bonus mark was given. Therefore, bonus mark should also be given for question E-17. The OXFORD dictionary has been referred for the purpose of Hindi meaning of the word 'Repression' as 'दमन' and for Hindi meaning of word 'Stressful' as 'दबाव'. This court is inclined to agree with the respondent-Board that the word 'Repression' in question no.E-17 and question no.E-22 have been used in different context and, therefore, the answer will have to be considered in the context. In so far as answer in Hindi is concerned, while word 'दबाव' may be correct answer to question no.E-17, word 'दमन' at the same time could be correct answer to question no.E-22, though in English language both these words can be referred as 'Repression'. According to the expert opinion placed on the record "focus of the question is on the process, not on the actor as ego and superego. Objections raised by the candidates are about the act and not on the process. Question is misunderstood by the candidates. The correct answer is option '(D)'. "The experts have relied on the authority of Tata McGraw-Hill and N.W. Smith, copy of which has been placed on the record. We have no basis to take a different view.

Question no.11 of the E-series was to the effect "Howard Gardner says that there are many specific types of intelligence or frames of mind. Which one is the category of intelligence as suggested by him?" There were four options. Option (A) was 'Analytical Intelligence', option (B) was 'Creative Intelligence',



option (C) was 'Naturalist Skills' and option (D) was 'Practical Intelligence'. According to the appellants, none of the options (A), (B), (C), (D) is the correct answer, as they are not the types of intelligence given by Howard Gardner. The 'Naturalist Skills' given in option (C) is not a type of intelligence but it is a type of skill and therefore all the options were wrong. Reference is made to the book published by the Rajasthan Hindi Granth Academy and also to the book of 12th standard at page 251 to 255, to contend that it is a separate type of intelligence. The respondent-Board has treated option '(C) Naturalist Skills' as the correct answer to this question. According to the respondent-Board, there were certain categories of 'Practical Intelligence' and this category of intelligence was added in the year 1998 by Howard Gardner. Since the question itself refers to category of intelligence, referred to by Howard Gardner, it would be relevant to analyze the evidence (at page 403 of the writ petition no.9314/2018) from the same book "Santrock, J.W. (2011) Educational Psychology" by Tata McGraw-Hill, where 'Naturalist Skills' has been described as 'The ability to observe pattern in nature and understand natural and human-made systems.' The paper setter and the examiner would, therefore, not be completely unjustified in taking 'Naturalist Skills' as the question appears to have been taken from the aforementioned book in which Howard Gardner says that there are many specific types of intelligence or frames of minds, as described along-with the examples of the occupations in which they are reflected as strengths. Opinion of the experts in this behalf is also significant to quote where they have stated that "The question is not understood by the candidate. The specific



focus of the question is on category of intelligence, not on the types of intelligence, as suggested by Howard Gardner.”

Question no.1 of E-Series was to the effect that “In Piaget's theory a process which is the balancing act between the “old” and the “new” - between perceptions and experience known as”. The respondents have treated option ‘(C) Equilibration’ as the correct, whereas, according to the appellants, option ‘(A) Assimilation’ and option ‘(B) Accommodation’ were also the correct answers as per the books published by the Rajasthan Education Research Institute, Udaipur, and the Rajasthan Text Board, Jaipur. Similar question was asked in CTET examination. Reference is also made to page no.247C and 247D from prescribed book for BSTC 2nd Year and at page 230 and 231 from prescribed book for BSTC 1st Year. Since the question itself refers to Piaget's theory of balancing, therefore, balancing is the most important and essential process implicit in the question. The ‘balancing’ contemplated in Piaget's theory is ‘assimilation’ and ‘accommodation’. The respondent-Board has relied on the same book Piaget's theory wherein ‘balancing’ of ‘assimilation’ and ‘accommodation’ have been indicated as ‘equilibration’. The experts also in their opinion categorically mention that “the statement in this question refers to Piaget's theory, which focus on the balancing act of ‘old’ and ‘new’ between perceptions and experience. It refers to the phenomenon of equilibration as explaining the theory.”

Question no.E-137 is that ““Minamata” disease is related to which of the following?’ and, according to the respondent-Board, the correct answer would be option ‘(C) Hg pollution’. The objection of the appellants is that this question was out of



syllabus, whereas, according to the respondent-Board, the disease pertains to mercury pollution, which is a water born disease. It is there in the syllabus under 'matter and energy' and that the concept and scope of environmental studies, which is covered by the syllabus Part-V environmental syllabus, also describes different kind of pollution. The experts have also opined so.

Coming now to the question no.E-37, this question is pertaining to Hindi grammar, in which option '(C) कारक संबंधी' has been accepted as correct option by the respondents. As per the appellants, 'कारक' is not the part of the syllabus of Teacher Gr.III Level-I but is rather included in the syllabus of Teacher Gr.III level-II as declared by the Board of Secondary Education, Ajmer for REET 2017. According to the appellants, this question is out of syllabus as it is a question pertaining to Hindi grammar, therefore, bonus marks should be awarded. As would be evident from the question itself, the candidates were required to indicate the inaccuracy in the sentence. The syllabus of the examination in part relating to the Hindi-I language (Unit-3) includes sentence formation and also the kinds of sentence, etc., and, therefore, the respondents cannot be said to be wholly unjustified in not accepting the objections about this question being out of syllabus.

Now coming to the question no.E-107, this question is as to what is the device for finding out what pupils understand and can do with a purpose of adapting future teaching to the needs of the individual or the class? Relying on the book prescribed for BSTC (D.El.Ed.) by the Rajasthan State Council of Educational Research & Training (RSCERT), the appellants contend that option '(A)



Summative Assessment' is the correct answer. According to the respondent-Board, option '(C) Diagnostic Assessment' is the correct answer. The respondents have relied on the book 'Teaching Mathematics: Developing as a Reflective Secondary Teacher' by Paul Chambers of the SAGE Publications, which at page 413 provides that "Diagnostic assessment is a device for finding out what pupils understand and can do, with a purpose of adapting future teaching to the needs of the individual or the class." The experts also, therefore, agreed with the view that option '(C) Diagnostic Assessment' is the correct answer and in our view rightly.

The question no.E-05 is to the effect "Which of the following statement is not true for norm reference test?". While the appellants contend that the option '(B) Student's score is interpreted by comparing it with how others performed.' is the correct answer. The respondent-Board has treated option '(D) Student's performance is compared with established criteria.' as the correct answer. One has to appreciate that the question has been formulated by the paper setter in the negative, namely, "Which of the following statement is not true for norm reference test?". The appellants relied on the NCTE guidelines whereas the respondent-Board relied on the book "Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation", which contains the guidelines of the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). This book in Section 4.7 states that "Teachers should neither compare children's performance with other children nor encourage parents to do so. Knowing that each child is unique, valuable and would grow and develop to his/her full potential if proper learning



opportunities are made available, placing a child in any hierarchy against others will restrict his/her self-growth and development.” The respondent-Board therefore cannot be said to be unjustified in treating option (D) as the correct answer.

The question no.E-99 is to the effect “3 litre mixture of water and sugar has 40% sugar. If 1 litre water is added in this mixture, then sugar percentage in new mixture is equal to”. According to the respondent-Board, the correct answer is option '(B) 30%'. The objection of the appellants is that this question is out of syllabus as the percentage was not covered thereunder, whereas the experts did not find any substance in the objection. The part IV of the question no.1 relating to mathematics, covers “comparison of units” and, therefore, further micro classification of the syllabus cannot be insisted to contend that the percentage was not covered therein.

The question no.E-21 is to the effect that “A systematic science which provides rules, laws and principles for achieving adjustment with self and environment is called?” According to the appellants, option '(C) Learning' is the correct answer, but the respondent-Board has treated option '(B) Mental hygiene' as the correct answer. The respondent-Board has relied on the book “Pathak R.P. (2012) Educational Psychology”, which at page 132 states that “literally speaking, mental hygiene means the science that maintains a condition of health in connection with mental functions. It discovers laws, principles and means to keep the individual health in all the walks of life. In simple words, it is concerned with the study of factors which go against mental health and efficiency.” The option '(B) Mental Hygiene' was,



therefore, the closest correct answer and not the option '(A) Motivation', as is being claimed by the appellants. The experts have also opined accordingly.

According to the affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents on 18.01.2019, 6 appellants gave the correct answer to question no.E-1, 17 appellants gave correct answer to question no.E-11, 9 appellants gave correct answer to question no.E-17, 5 appellants gave correct answer to question no.E-21, 50 appellants gave correct answer to question no.E-37, 37 appellants gave correct answer to question no.E-99, 25 appellants gave correct answer to question no.E-107, 30 appellants gave correct answer to question no.E-137. Names of all such appellants have been given. It therefore cannot be said that all the appellants have not correctly understood the questions and were misled by the options given to various objective type questions.

Even if it could be said that as per understanding of the candidates, there could be more than one answer to a question, the candidates are expected to select more correct option out of alternative answers. We may for this proposition of law rely on the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Subhash Chandra Verma and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others – 1995 Supp (1) SCC 325**, in para 25 of the report, wherein their Lordships observed as under:-

"25. We will now examine, whether these grounds had been made out by those candidates who took the objective test as well as the viva voce and yet could qualify for selection.

(1) xxxxxxxxxxxx

2. xxxxxxxxxxxx



3. Several controversial questions were set and in relation to some questions, there could be more than one answer: In an objective type of test, more than one answer are given. The candidates are required to tick mark the answer which is the most appropriate out of the plurality of answers. The questions and answers were prescribed by the experts in the field with reference to standard books. Therefore, it is incorrect to say that a question will have more than one correct answer. Even if the answers could be more than one, the candidates will have to select the one which is more correct out of the alternative answers. In any event, this is a difficulty felt by all the candidates."

The Supreme Court in a recent decision in **Richal and Others V.s Rajasthan Public Service Commission**, supra, pertaining to the recruitment of School Lecturers for various subjects in the State of Rajasthan under Secondary School Education, held that answer-keys prepared by the paper setters or the examining body should be presumed to have been prepared after due deliberations, particularly when they have been published with opportunity to the candidates to submit objections which are then examined by the experts.

The Supreme Court in **Kanpur University Vs. Samir Gupta**, supra, considered the issue pertaining to scope of judicial review to examine the correctness of key-answers and held that in the case of multiple choice objective type tests, the key answers supplied by the paper setters should normally be assumed to be correct. The correctness thereof should be ascertained from the standard of prescribed test books and not merely on the basis of inferences. It is fair to publish the key answers of the questions along-with the result of the test involving future of the students pertaining to admissions to professional courses, who aspire for admission thereto. The observations of the Supreme Court in para 15 and 16 of the report are relevant to quote:-



“15. The findings of the High Court raise a question of great importance to the student community. Normally, one would be inclined to the view, especially if one has been a paper-setter and an examiner, that the key answer furnished by the paper-setter and accepted by the University as correct, should not be allowed to be challenged. One way of achieving it is not to publish the key answer at all. If the University had not published the key answer along with the result of the Test, no controversy would have arisen in this case. But that is not a correct way of looking at these matters which involve the future of hundreds of students who are aspirants for admission to professional courses. If the key answer were kept secret in this case, the remedy would have been worse than the disease because, so many students would have had to suffer the injustice in silence. The publication of the key answer has unravelled an unhappy state of affairs to which the University and the State Government must find a solution. Their sense of fairness in publishing the key answer has given them an opportunity to have a closer look at the system of examinations which they conduct. What has failed is not the computer but the human system.

16. Shri Kacker, who appears on behalf of the University, contended that no challenge should be allowed to be made to the correctness of a key answer unless, on the face of it, it is wrong. We agree that the key answer should be assumed to be correct unless it is proved to be wrong and that it should not be held to be wrong by an inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalisation. It must be clearly demonstrated to be wrong, that is to say, it must be such as no reasonable body of men well-versed in the particular subject would regard as correct. The contention of the University is falsified in this case by a large number of acknowledged textbooks, which are commonly read by students in U.P. Those textbooks leave no room for doubt that the answer given by the students is correct and the key answer is incorrect.”

In **Ran Vijay Singh**, supra, the Supreme Court upon considering many of its previous decisions on this subject held that sympathy or compassion do not play any role in the matter of directing or not directing re-evaluation of answer-sheets. If an error is committed by the examination authority, the complete body of candidates suffers but at the same time their Lordships





held that entire examination process does not deserve to be derailed only because some candidates are disappointed or dissatisfied or perceive some injustice having been caused to them by an erroneous question or an erroneous answer. All candidates suffer equally, though some might suffer more but then that cannot be helped since mathematical precision is not always possible. Relevant observations of the Supreme Court in para 32 and 33 of the report read thus:-



"32. It is rather unfortunate that despite several decisions of this Court, some of which have been discussed above, there is interference by the Courts in the result of examinations. This places the examination authorities in an unenviable position where they are under scrutiny and not the candidates. Additionally, a massive and sometimes prolonged examination exercise concludes with an air of uncertainty. While there is no doubt that candidates put in a tremendous effort in preparing for an examination, it must not be forgotten that even the examination authorities put in equally great efforts to successfully conduct an examination. The enormity of the task might reveal some lapse at a later stage, but the Court must consider the internal checks and balances put in place by the examination authorities before interfering with the efforts put in by the candidates who have successfully participated in the examination and the examination authorities. The present appeals are a classic example of the consequence of such interference where there is no finality to the result of the examinations even after a lapse of eight years. Apart from the examination authorities even the candidates are left wondering about the certainty or otherwise of the result of the examination-whether they have passed or not; whether their result will be approved or disapproved by the Court; whether they will get admission in a college or University or not; and whether they will get recruited or not. This unsatisfactory situation does not work to anybody's advantage and such a state of uncertainty results in confusion being worse confounded. The overall and larger impact of all this is that public interest suffers.

33. The facts of the case before us indicate that in the first instance the learned Single Judge took it upon himself to actually ascertain the correctness of the key answers to seven questions. This was completely beyond his jurisdiction and as decided by this Court on several occasions, the exercise carried out was



impermissible. Fortunately, the Division Bench did not repeat the error but in a sense, endorsed the view of the learned Single Judge, by not considering the decisions of this Court but sending four key answers for consideration by a one-man Expert Committee.”

As regards the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Disha Panchal**, supra, where normalization formula was adopted, the facts of that case were entirely different. The candidates in that case were complaining about the loss of time as a result of deficiency on the part of examination conducting body in not ensuring adequate facilities and not affording them single log in session without any interruption. The court was of the view that if the interest of those candidates who suffered loss of time could otherwise be compensated, there is no reason that the entire admission test be cancelled or annulled. The total number of candidates who fell in this category was 4690. In peculiar facts of that case, the normalization formula was suggested, considered and accepted. Such are not the facts in the present case. The judgment of the Supreme Court in **Rajesh Kumar**, supra, relied by the appellants, is also distinguishable because in that case also the Single Bench of the High Court, relying on the report of the two experts, held that 41 model answers out of 100 were wrong and therefore finally the judgment turned out on its own facts. The judgment of the Supreme Court in **Manish Ujwal**, supra, was also based on the opinion of the experts of the Jodhpur University and Udaipur University, who both agreed that six key-answers were incorrect or erroneous. Therefore, that judgment was also based on its own facts.





A Full Bench judgment dated 18.11.2005 of this court in **Lalit Mohan Sharma and Others Vs. Rajasthan Public Service Commission – 2016 (3) RLW 2082 (Raj.)**, answered vide judgment dated 18.11.2005, held as under:-

“In the context of impressive array of facts, as fully detailed above, we are not inclined to accept the contention raised on behalf of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that the key-answers provided by the respondent Commission for evaluating the answer-sheets of the petitioners were wrong or that despite there being a report by the Expert Committee the court must take in hand the exercise of finding out as to whether the key-answers are correct or wrong. There is no need to go into the plea raised by the petitioners for examining the disputed questions and the authenticity of the key-answers provided by the respondent Commission in view of the report of the Expert Committee constituted for the purpose. Surely, the court is not an expert in the field of education and the various subjects from which the question paper was settled. Expert Committee constituted for the purpose has given its report based upon recognised text books authored by persons of repute in the field. There is no allegation, whatsoever that the members constituting the Committee did not know or had no specialisation in the concerned subjects nor is there any allegation of bias against them. In the facts and circumstances of the case, no occasion at all arises for the court to further probe the matter. The contention of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners needs thus no further comments. Suffice is it, however, to mention that while urging that the key-answers provided by the respondent Commission are wrong, all that is being urged is that in some of the recognised text book or books of repute, different answers of the concerned questions have been provided. Assuming what has been urged by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners to be correct, it would neither be permissible nor just and proper to interfere and order re-evaluation of the answer sheets.”

In **Uttar Pradesh Public Service Commission Vs. Rahul Singh**, supra, the facts were that before publishing the first list of key-answers, the Commission had got the key-answers moderated by two expert committees. Thereafter, objections were invited and a 26 member committee was constituted to verify the objections





and after this exercise the Committee recommended that 5 questions be deleted and in 2 questions, key answers in respect of two questions be changed. It was held that it must be presumed that these committees consisted of experts in various subjects acted correctly. The Judges cannot take on the role of experts in academic matters unless, the candidate demonstrates that the key-answers are patently wrong on the face of it.

In our considered view, the respondent-Board has acted fairly in going by the directives of this court in **Gopal Singh**, supra. Aforesaid judgment was rendered in a petition challenging results of REET 2015 but the respondent-Board has followed the same mechanism evolved by this Court in that judgment in REET 2017 with which we are concerned in the present matter. Following directions were issued by this court in **Gopal Singh**, supra:-

"Secrecy and punctuality on the one hand and transparency and accuracy on the other, are quintessentials of a reliable system of examination. With a view to enhance the sanctity of the examination process and foster faith in the system, this Court feels that following steps are imperative to give impetus to the Board's efforts, in achieving the desired goals in all the ensuing exams :-

(i) The Board shall constitute a committee of three experts as 'Re-appraisal Committee'. As soon as the examinations are over, the answer key prepared by the paper setter shall be forwarded to such Committee, which would review the answers suggested by the paper setter;

(ii) The answer key duly reviewed by the 'Re-appraisal Committee' shall alone be published as 'final answer key';

(iii) Cut off marks or list of select candidates shall not be announced at the time of the publication of the 'final answer key';



(iv) With the publication of the final answer key, the Board shall give at least 15 days' notice to the candidates to lodge their objections regarding the questions and answers;

(v) Such objections shall be decided by an expert committee, which would be comprised of minimum one and maximum two members out of the members of the 'Re-appraisal Committee';

(vi) After the resolution of the grievance by the aforesaid expert committee, the revised result, 'revised answer key' or 'final result' shall be published and the 'cut off' shall be declared;

(vii) The list of selected candidates will thereafter be published or notified in tune with the revised result.

This Court has suggested the aforesaid steps with a view to make the process/examination more transparent and insulated to ward off, against possible errors and to ensure that the sentiments of the selected candidates may not be hurt, on account of uncalled for and repeated revision of results."

It must be said to the credit of the respondent-Board that it has acted fairly by constituting committee of three experts as re-appraisal committee to evaluate correctness of the answer-key given by paper setter keeping in view the guidelines provided by this court. The answer-key so prepared was reviewed by the said committee and then published as final answer-key and objections received thereto were then considered by the expert committee comprising of one or two members of the re-appraisal committee and thereafter answer-key was published and final result was declared. Fairness of the respondent-Board is reflected from the fact that it has accepted the recommendations of the re-appraisal committee and awarded bonus marks for eight questions to the candidates. Even then we have examined the objections of the appellants with respect to various questions and the response thereto by the respondent-Board along-with the opinion of the



experts and not found any substance therein. We find no reason to interfere with the view taken by the respondent-Board, which also had the benefit of the opinion of the experts on the objections to all such questions.

This now takes us to the question whether the marks secured by the candidates, who qualified REET 2017, should be standardized/normalized/moderated vis-a-vis marks of candidates qualifying the REET 2015 as according to the appellants the number of candidates who qualified having secured more than 60% in REET 2015 is quite high as compared to those who passed in REET 2017 and further that the candidates who acquired the eligibility to appear in REET 2017 did not have the opportunity to improve their marks, whereas the candidates, who appeared in RTET 2011 and RTET 2012 have had such opportunity to improve their performance by appearing in REET 2015. The argument also is that while in REET 2015, 14 bonus marks were awarded to the candidates whereas in REET 2017 only 8 bonus marks were awarded for the reasons that questions/answers were not properly framed or were outside the syllabus.

In our considered view, the writ petitions could have been dismissed because the appellants neither challenged the validity of Rule 277-A(i) nor the Circular of the Government dated 23.10.2017, which provided for preparation of common merit based on different RTET/REET examinations as inclusion of such condition in Clause 13 of the advertisement was only in consequence of the stipulation in the aforesaid Rule read with the Circular dated 23.10.2017. Appellants have also not questioned the correctness of Clause 11 of the guidelines of the NCTE vide



notification dated 11.02.2011, which implies clubbing of different TET results. Moreover, the appellants knowing fully well about this condition appeared in the REET 2017 and have chosen to challenge the same later realising that they are unlikely to find place in the select list. They are therefore estopped by reason of their conduct from questioning the same. The contention that the Circular/Order dated 23.10.2017 for the first time was produced with the written argument before the learned Single Judge also cannot be accepted in view of the fact that this document was brought on record by the respondent no.1 as Annexure R/1 with their reply having a specific plea in para 6 thereabout. Since the learned Single Judge has not examined the challenge to this condition, we also deem it proper to deal this question on merits.

As per the data furnished by the respondent-Board on the affidavit, as against total 62530 General Male candidates who appeared in RTET 2011, 21206 candidates passed out with 60% marks and above. Similarly, as against total 8732 General Male candidates, who appeared in RTET 2012, 1744 candidates passed out with 60% marks and above, in RTET 2012. In REET 2015, however, 24% relaxation was available to only those candidates who belonged to TSP area and candidates from all other areas were declared qualified only upon securing 60% or more marks. The total number of candidates who appeared in REET 2015 was 147797 as against which 70972 candidates qualified. Of them, only 64912 candidates qualified with 60% and above marks, thus there remained 6060 candidates who qualified with the advantage of relaxation of 24%, being candidates pertaining to TSP areas. In REET 2017, however, total number of 183556 candidates



appeared, out of which 64827 candidates passed but only 57455 candidates were such amongst them who qualified the examination with 60% and above marks and remaining 7372 candidates were such who passed the examination with relaxation of 24% since they belonged to TSP areas.

In the affidavit dated 19.01.2019 different four tables have been furnished giving statistics of candidates who were eligible, appeared and qualified, with or without relaxation. The table in relation to RTET 2012 was corrected by the specific affidavit of the Secretary of the respondent-Board dated 24.01.2019, seeking permission of the Court, with apology for mistake in the figures given in the earlier affidavit. These tables are as follows:-

RTET 2011 LEVEL-1

Statistics of candidates who were eligible on 40% (20% relaxation was available)

Category	Appeared	Total passed	60% and above	Advantaged Candidates
Total	10502	8143	1395	6748

Statistics of candidates who were eligible on 45% (15% relaxation was available)

Total	155135	86923	18093	68830
-------	--------	-------	-------	-------

Statistics of candidates who were eligible on 50% (10% relaxation was available)

Total	343214	182687	73494	109193
-------	--------	--------	-------	--------

Statistics of candidates who were eligible on 60% and above (no relaxation)

Total	62530	21206	21206	0
-------	-------	-------	-------	---

Grand Total	571381	298959	114188	184771
-------------	--------	--------	--------	--------

RTET 2012 LEVEL-1

Statistics of candidates who were eligible on 36% (24% relaxation was available)

Category	Appeared	Total passed	60% and above	Advantaged Candidates
Total	4832	3748	97	3651

Statistics of candidates who were eligible on 40% (20% relaxation was available)

Total	1997	1560	138	1422
-------	------	------	-----	------

Statistics of candidates who were eligible on 45% (15% relaxation was available)



Total	26357	17710	3604	12405
-------	-------	-------	------	-------

Statics of candidates who were eligible on 50% (10% relaxation was available)

Total	35892	18416	6011	12405
-------	-------	-------	------	-------

Statics of candidates who were eligible on 60% and above (no relaxation)

Total	8732	1744	1744	0
-------	------	------	------	---

Grand Total	77810	43178	11594	31584
-------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

REET 2015 LEVEL-1

Statics of candidates who were eligible on 36% (24% relaxation was available)

Category	Appeared	Total passed	60% and above	Advantaged Candidates
Total	7208	6937	877	6060

Statics of candidates who were eligible on 60% and above (no relaxation)

Total	140589	64035	64035	0
-------	--------	-------	-------	---

Grand Total	147797	70972	64912	6060
-------------	--------	-------	-------	------

REET 2017 LEVEL-1

Statics of candidates who were eligible on 36% (24% relaxation was available)

Category	Appeared	Total passed	60% and above	Advantaged Candidates
Total	9389	7774	402	7372

Statics of candidates who were eligible on 60% and above (no relaxation)

Total	174167	57053	57053	0
-------	--------	-------	-------	---

Grand Total	183556	64827	57455	7372
-------------	--------	-------	-------	------

Further details have been furnished by the respondents on the affidavit dated 23.01.2019 of the Coordinator REET & Secretary, Board of Secondary Education, according to which following is the percentage of the candidates who appeared in the above-mentioned four examinations and were not entitled to any relaxation in any of the examinations:-

OTHER THAN TSP AREA

RTET/REET	CATEGORY	APPEARED	PASSED	PERCENTAGE
RTET-2011	GEN-MALE	62530	21206	33.91
RTET-2012	GEN-MALE	8732	1744	19.97
REET-2015	ALL EXCEPT TSP (SCHEDULED AREA) CANDIDATE	140589	64035	45.54



REET-2017	ALL EXCEPT TSP (SCHEDULED AREA) CANDIDATE	174167	57053	32.76
-----------	---	--------	-------	-------

The appellants have given slightly different percentage of total number of candidates who passed in RTET 2011, RTET 2012, REET 2015 and REET 2017. The Table-B provided with their written submissions is quoted below:-

Exam	Level	Appeared	Passed	Percentage	With 60% Pass Marks
RTET-2011	I	571406	298639	52.26%	33.94%
RTET-2012	I	85599	43177	50.44%	36.97%
REET-2015	I	147797	71547	48.41%	48.41%
REET-2017	I	183556	64828	35.32%	35.32%

It is on the basis of aforesaid figures and data that the appellants are seeking to argue that the difficulty level in the REET 2015 was comparatively easier than that of REET 2017. The appellants have sought to compare this difficulty level in the bloc of every 5% commencing from 60% and above, by indicating the percentage of marks of different levels. The respondents have in their affidavit dated 18.01.2019 produced on record the break-up of the students who have passed in the REET 2015 and REET 2017 with 60% and above marks in the bloc of every 5%, which would be evident from the following Table:-

S.No.	Block of percentage obtained by students	Total candidates in REET 2015	Total candidates in REET 2017
1	60 to 65	24996	27395
2	65.1 to 70	20175	18872
3	70.1 to 75	11576	8012
4	75.1 to 80	6452	2774
5	80.1 to 85	1494	375
6	85.1 to 90	211	27
7	90.1 and above	8	0



According to the respondents, 6217 candidates were selected in the recruitment on the post of Teacher Gr.III Level-1 held in 2016, who qualified REET 2015, 131 candidates were selected out of RTET 2011, 31 candidates were selected out of RTET 2012, thus total 6379 candidates were given appointment in 2016 selection in the General Education Department. As far as the Sanskrit Education Department is concerned, total 1676 candidates were selected in the recruitment of 2016, out of which 1641 candidates were selected from REET 2015, 24 candidates were selected from RTET 2011 and 11 candidates were selected from RTET 2012. It was further stated therein that in all 571381 candidates appeared in the RTET 2011 and percentage of those who secured 60% or more marks are 19.98%. Relaxation of 10% was given to male candidates of SC/ST/OBC/SBC and general female candidates. In addition to this, relaxation of 15% was given to female candidates of SC/ST/OBC/SBC, as also divorcee and widow candidates. 20% relaxation was given to physically handicapped candidates. So far as RTET 2012 is concerned, same percentage of relaxation was provided to the candidates with additional relaxation of 10% to ex-servicemen. In REET 2015, relaxation was provided to candidates belonging to TSP area (Scheduled Area) only and out of total number of successful candidates, who have secured more than 60% marks were 64,912, i.e., 43.92%. In REET 2017, relaxation was provided to the candidates belonging to TSP area and out of successful candidates, 57455 candidates secured more than 60% marks, which comes to 31.30%.

When we compare with the data of the candidates, who qualified the REET 2015 vis-a-vis those of REET 2017, certainly



more number of candidates appear to have passed because 45.54% of the candidates qualified REET 2015 without any relaxation of the total number of 140589 candidates who appeared in non-TSP area that year because the total number of candidates who qualified the examination was 64035. The percentage of the total candidates who passed REET 2017 came down to 32.76, not only because of the fact that only 57053 candidates passed in REET 2017 as compared to 64035 in REET 2015 but also because the total number of candidates, who appeared in REET 2017 in non-TSP area, increased to 174167 as compared to 140589 candidates in REET 2015. This led to reduction in the overall percentage of the qualified candidates as against total number of candidates in REET 2017. Approximately 24000 more candidates appeared in REET 2017 as compared to those who appeared in REET 2015. It may have happened because while many of the candidates who appeared in REET 2015 also again appeared in REET 2017, many others, who acquired eligibility in between, were also added to that overall number. But there is no definite pattern to infer that difficulty level was higher in REET 2017 as compared to REET 2015 and that the candidates appearing in REET 2017 were therefore put to a disadvantageous position. Even if we go by the hypothesis that number of additional candidates who appeared in REET 2017 were those who acquired the eligibility to appear in REET later than 2015, we are also inclined to believe that substantial number of candidates from REET 2015 again appeared in REET 2017 to improve their marks. We cannot countenance the submission that none of them could improve the marks owing to difference in the difficulty level. In





fact, the respondents have given the details of at least four such candidates who appeared in RTET/REET in all four examinations under reference and secured more than 60% marks. The respondents have also given the particulars of 11 such candidates in their affidavit dated 16.01.2019, who, though appeared and qualified in REET 2015, but again appeared in REET 2017 and substantially improved upon their earlier performance.

Going by the total number of candidates in the bloc of every five percent commencing from 60 to 65, there were 24996 candidates in REET 2015, whereas this number was significantly high in corresponding bloc in REET 2017 being 27395. Although in every subsequent blocs of 5%, the number of candidates who qualified REET 2015 was higher as compared to those who qualified REET 2017, but this cannot be the basis to hold that extra number of candidates who passed in the bloc of every 5% above 65% in REET 2015 does not include those who again appeared in REET 2017. No generalization can be made and no definite pattern inferred. Difficulty level cannot therefore be ascertained by inferential process.

The criteria to judge a level of examination may depend on various factors, such as, (i) examining body is same or different, (ii) methodology adopted, i.e., objective/subjective type questions, (iii) number of questions and time allotted to candidates, (iv) negative marking in the comparing examinations, (v) syllabus of examination and standard/level of examination and (vi) allocation of marks for different subject heads. Despite the aforementioned data provided by the respondents, this court cannot judge the difficulty level in any one of two examinations,



viz., REET 2015 and REET 2017. Moreover, both these examinations by the same Examining Body – respondent-Board, were held on the basis of objective type questions where element of subjectivity was completely ruled out. The candidates were required to select one correct answer out of four options given.

While in the narrative type written examinations, the possibility of the subjectivity of the examiner cannot be ruled out and particularly when, in such large scale examinations the answer-sheets are distributed to various examiners, which is where the invocation of the formula of moderation may be justified. But we hardly see any justification for applying the method of moderation in objective type examinations. Even if the examinations of REET-2015 and REET 2017 were separately held, all the candidates were required to attempt equal number of 150 questions, each carrying one mark and were allocated equal time of three hours. There was no negative marking in both the examinations. The question papers were based on common syllabus with equal weightage being given to different subject heads, there being no tilt in favour of any particular subject. According to NCTE notification dated 11.02.2011, 30 marks were allotted to 'Child Development and Pedagogy' subject, 30 marks were allotted to 'Language I' subject, 30 marks were allotted to 'Language II' subject, 30 marks were allotted to 'Mathematics' subject and 30 marks were allotted to 'Environmental Studies' subject. We have therefore no basis to hold that level of difficulty of one examination differs from another. Whenever the results are declared, it is the tendency of every student/candidate appearing in an academic/competitive examination to make grievance because he believes that he





performed better than the assessment by the examiner. That cannot be a reason to decide by inferential process of reasoning that earlier examination was having greater difficulty level than the subsequent one and vice-versa. Even if the same candidates appeared in both the examinations or there were different candidates in different examinations, performance of a candidate will always depend on the level of his preparation. If in the earlier examination, a candidate has prepared better than the subsequent examination, obviously his performance would differ. If the questions were drawn from each subject as per syllabus, how can it be judged that the questions in a specific subject were more difficult than another subject. Only because 14 bonus marks were awarded in REET 2015, it cannot be held that difficulty level therein was easier than that of REET 2017, in which only 8 bonus marks were awarded. It would depend as to how many questions were incorrectly framed or had multiple number of correct answers or were out of syllabus, etc., on the basis of which the examining body decides to award particular number of bonus marks as per the opinion of the experts.

The claim for equalization cannot be based only on the tests being of different years and it also cannot be based on difference of evaluator Universities. It has to be more than that. Different yardsticks alleged to be adopted in evaluating the question-papers is wholly a matter based on mere assumption of the writ-petitioners. Level and standard of each paper is always different. All the candidates have the opportunity to appear in the same examination in the same year and therefore they have to compete against one another. The writ-petitioners have failed to make out a



case of discrimination so as to justify equalization. If this is allowed to happen, it would make every selection impossible as such situation would arise in every succeeding REET examination. Different evaluation for different years would not make the candidates of RTET/REET examinations 2011, 2012, 2015 any less or more suitable than the candidates of REET 2017. These factors cannot be regarded as substantial enough to attract the breach of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution. Comparable merit position of the recruitment of 2016 and 2018 also does not indicate any such disparity. In the recruitment of the year 2016, the cut-off marks of general category was 119 (79.33%), OBC 117 (77.33%), MBC 114 (75.33%), ST 110 (74%) and SC 107 (72%). In the recruitment of 2018 it was respectively 111 (74%), 108 (72%), 100 (70.67%), 102 (68%) and 98 (65.33%). There was thus no difference in difficulty level.

The contention that while the candidates who appeared in RTET 2011 and RTET 2012 had the opportunity to improve their marks in REET 2015 and the candidates who acquired the eligibility for the first time in REET 2017 did not have such opportunity, is also noted to be rejected for the simple reason that opportunity to improve the marks is not a right and is a concession by the competent authority on the basis of the NCTE guidelines, which one may or may not avail. Clause 11 of the NCTE guidelines provides that the qualifying certificate of REET would be valid for not more than seven years subject to any other duration fixed by the State Government but with a rider that a candidate who appeared in earlier TET can again appear in future examinations to improve his percentage. As far as the candidates



who qualified RTET 2011 and RTET 2012, their qualification certificate would be valid for seven years but the validity of the qualification of the candidates who appeared in REET 2015 and REET 2017 has been curtailed only to three years. The aforesaid Clause 11 also permits those candidates, validity of whose qualifying certificate has expired, to reappear in TET, there being no outer limit to the number of times a candidate can appear in such examination.

As far as Division Bench judgment of this court in **Sher Singh**, supra, is concerned, that was a case in which dispute pertained to appointment of Teacher Gr.III (Level-II) for Class VI to VIII, where the education is also imparted in language subject. The dispute in that case pertains to appointment of Teacher in English language. Clause 6.2(B) of the advertisement dated 12.04.2018 itself makes it clear that appointment of Teacher Gr.III (Level-II) for Class VI to VIII is required to be made subject-wise and this is evident even from what has been discussed in para 35 of the judgment of the Division Bench of this court in **Sher Singh**, supra. Such is not the position in the present case where appointments are being made on the post of Teachers Gr.III (Level-I), who are required to teach students of Class I to V, there being no requirement of subject-wise appointment.

True it is that the Supreme Court, in the relied judgment of **State of U.P. and Others Vs. Shiv Kumar Pathak**, supra, in para 2(b) formulated the question whether the marks obtained in the TET Examination is the sole criterion for filling up the vacancies but while answering the aforesaid question did not categorically held that the marks obtained in TET cannot be the



sole criteria for appointment. Although it held in para 14 that while TET was mandatory requirement for appointment is only a suggestion, but that is not the question which we are dealing in the present case. The issue that is raised before us in the present matter is whether the Government could make the appointment solely on the basis of the marks secured in TET and further that whether the appropriate Government should be mandatorily required to give weightage to the marks of the qualifying eligibility examination like Senior Secondary and BSTC, etc. What therefore emerges from the judgment of the Supreme Court in **State of U.P. and Others Vs. Shiv Kumar Pathak**, supra, is that the appropriate Government may on its own wisdom decide the eligibility of the candidates on the basis of the TET.

The Supreme Court in **Union of India Vs. Pushpa Rani and Others**, supra, held that in such like matters the judicial review comes into play only if the State action is contrary to the constitutional or statutory provision. The relevant discussion with regard to prescribed source and mode of recruitment, qualification and criteria of appointment, etc., has been made in para 37 of the report, which is reproduced here as under:-

"Before parting with this aspect of the case, we consider it necessary to reiterate the settled legal position that matters relating to creation and abolition of posts, formation and structuring/restructuring of cadres, prescribing the source/mode of recruitment and qualifications, criteria of selection, evaluation of service records of the employees fall within the exclusive domain of the employer. What steps should be taken for improving efficiency of the administration is also the preserve of the employer. The power of judicial review can be exercised in such matters only if it is shown that the action of the employer is contrary to any constitutional or statutory provision or is patently arbitrary or is vitiated due to mala fides. The Court cannot sit in appeal over the judgment of the employer



and ordain that a particular post be filled by direct recruitment or promotion or by transfer. The Court has no role in determining the methodology of recruitment or laying down the criteria of selection. It is also not open for the Court to make comparative evaluation of the merit of the candidates. The Court cannot suggest the manner in which the employer should structure or restructure the cadres for the purpose of improving efficiency of administration.”



The cited judgment of the Supreme Court in **Sanjay Singh**, supra, does not afford any help to the appellants because the facts situation obtaining in that case was entirely different. Moreover, that examination was entirely based on narrative type questions. Where answer-sheets were distributed to several examiners for evaluation as it was not possible to get them evaluated by any single examiner, which necessitated scaling of the marks to ensure uniformity and consistency in the evaluation of the answer-sheets.

The Supreme Court in **V. Lavanya**, supra, was primarily dealing with the question whether the State Government was competent to grant relaxation of five percent in Teachers Eligibility Test. It also considered the argument that while prescribing the marks for the purpose in Higher Secondary examination is the basis. Also the argument was that the State has failed to take into account that different educational boards conducting Higher Secondary examinations have different approach in their marks awarding pattern and have different streams of education while formulating the grading pattern. While rejecting the argument, the Supreme Court held that equivalence of academic qualifications is a matter for experts and courts normally do not interfere with the decisions of the Government based on the recommendations of the experts. It is the prerogative of State to formulate a system



whereby weightage marks is decided with reference to actual marks secured by each candidate. As no arbitrariness is proved on the part of the respondents in formulating the grading system, the court cannot interfere with the same.

The power to decide the issue of clubbing of TET of different years is a matter of policy, which lies within the domain of the State. No doubt, it is always open to the appointing authority to give weightage to the eligibility qualification of Senior Secondary and BSTC, etc., but this being the matter of policy and the State Government having decided not to give any such weightage and prepare the select list solely on the performance of the candidates in RTET/REET, this court cannot by a writ of mandamus command it to insert a provision like this in their Rules or frame the Rules in that fashion to give weightage to marks of the eligibility qualifications. The NCTE was fully cognizant of the fact that as per Clause 11 of its guidelines vide notification dated 11.02.2011, the validity of the period of TET qualifying certificate for appointment could be up to seven years or any lesser period as may be chosen by the State Government, which in the case of State of Rajasthan has been now prescribed as three years. TET examination would be held every year during this period of seven years. If while insisting upon giving weightage to the TET scores of different years in recruitment process, the NCTE has deliberately not required any kind of moderation or standardization in the marks secured in different RTET/REET examinations, this court would not be justified in directing so, particularly when there is no challenge to Clause 11, supra. Once the REET 2017 has been conducted on the basis of the pre-notified criteria and the Rules and that the



candidates were fully aware about the criteria of preparing the merit list on the basis of best of the marks of all the four examinations of RTET/REET 2011, 2012, 2015 and 2017, there cannot be any change in that criteria when the process of selection is over. Equivalence of academic qualification depends on the policy decision of the State Government and, as such, is not open to judicial review unless it is ex facie unconstitutional. The result or marks secured by the selected candidates of REET 2015 cannot be altered behind their back. Even if the Government were to change the criteria by introducing the provision with regard to giving weightage to the marks of the Senior Secondary and BSTC examination, this could be done only prospectively in any subsequent recruitment process. As far the present process of selection is concerned, the same has to be completed on the basis of criteria originally notified.

In view of the above discussion, we do not find any infirmity in the impugned judgment of the learned Single Judge warranting our interference in the appeals. All the appeals are accordingly dismissed with no order as to costs. This also disposes of all the pending applications.

The Registry is directed to place a copy of this judgment in each connected file.

(GOVERDHAN BARDHAR),J

(MOHAMMAD RAFIQ),J

//Jaiman//