



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

: O R D E R :

1. Surya Prakash Vs. State of Rajasthan & Others
(S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.2180/2012)
2. Veera Ram & Others Vs. State of Rajasthan & Others
(S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.2205/2012)

DATE OF ORDER :

May 19th, 2012

P R E S E N T

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GOPAL KRISHAN VYAS

Reportable

Mr. Mr. P.S. Bhati/Mr. Kailash Khatri for the petitioners.
Mr. G.R. Punia, Addl. Advocate General with
Mr. Mahendra Choudhary, Dy. Govt. Counsel.
Mr. Kuldeep Mathur for the NCTE.
Mr. Rakesh Arora for the Board of Secondary Education.

Advocates for petitioners in the writ petitions mentioned in
the appended Schedule :

Mr. A.K. Rajvanshi, Mr. H.S. Sidhu, Mr. Ashok Chhangani,
Mr. R.S. Choudhary, Mr. T.S. Tanwar, Mr. Kailash Jangid,
Mr. Rajesh Jangid, Mr. Rakesh Matoriya, Mr. V.N. Calla, Mr.
Bharat Dewasi, Mr. J.S. Bhaleria, Mr. A.R. Godara, Mr. Kan
Singh Oad, Mr. S.S. Jodha, Mr. Vinod Choudhary, Mr. D.L.
Rawla, Mr. Jog Singh, Mr. Amit Gaur, Mr. Rajesh Panwar,
Mr. C.R. Choudhary, Mr. Ramdev Potaliya, Mr. M.S. Godara,
Mr. O.P. Bishnoi, Mr. Shyam Khatri, Mr. Vijay Purohit, Mr.
Vikram Singh, Mr. Anuj Sahlot, Mr. Nishant Motsara, Mr.
Manish Dadhich, Mr. N.S. Rajpurohit, Mr. D.L. Mothsara, Mr.
B.S. Deora, Mr. V.K. Bhadu, Mr. B.L. Dudy, Mr. Vinit
Sanadhya, Mr. R.C. Joshi, Mr. L.K. Ramdhari, Mr. Mahaveer
Bishnoi, Mr. Girish Sankhla, Mr. J.D.S. Bhati, Mr. Sheetal
Kumbhat, Mr. V.R. Choudhary, Mr. Shardul Bishnoi, Ms
Pintu Pareek, Mr. B.K. Vyas, Mr. S.R. Choudhary, Mr. S.K.
Punia, Mr. Awardan Charan, Mr. Ankur Mathur, Mr. Gopal
Bose, Mr. S.K. Verma, Mr. Devesh Bohra, Mr. Ashwani
Swami, Mr. B.L. Bishnoi, Mr. Manoj Purohit, Mr. Trilok Joshi,
Mr. Sushil Kumar, Ms Aruna Negi, Mr. Gopal Acharya, Ms



Anjana Jawa, Mr. Narpat Singh, Mr. P.R. Mehta, Mr. Deepesh Beniwal, Mr. Rahul Sharma, Mr. P.S. Rathore, Mr. Dwarkesh Vyas, Mr. Om Rajpurohit, Mr. Moti Singh, Mr. R.D.S.S. Kharlia, Mr. N.R. Budhania, Mr. Mr. J.P. Swami, Mr. P.S. Chundawat, Mr. Arjun Purohit, Mr. Deepak Nehra, Mr. S.K. Verma, Mr. H.S. Choudhary, Mr. B.S. Tanwar, Mr. T.C. Sharma, Mr. Vikas Binjariya, Mr. S.N. Goswami, Mr. M.L. Khatri, Mr. N.A. Rajpurohit, Mr. Bharat Shrimali, Mr. Mahendra Prajapat, Mr. R.R. Bishnoi, Mr. H.S. Inda, Mr. K.L. Chauhan, Mr. Harish Purohit, Mr. K.L. Bishnoi, Mr. Kunal Paliwal, Mr. T.R. Choudhary, Mr. S.R. Godara, Mr. Vishal Jangid, Mr. Vishal Jangid, Mr. J.R. Bhardwaj, Ms Premlata Gaur, Mr. Rohitesh Singh, Mr. Mahaveer Singh, Mr. D.L.R. Vyas, Mr. M.P. Pareek, Mr. H.S. Bishnoi, Mr. S.S. Rathore, Mr. Balvinder Singh, Mr. V.K. Sharma, Mr. K.R. Bhati, Mr. Dishant Gaur, Mr. Parikshit Nayak, Mr. Laxman Bishnoi, Dr. Vinay Chhipa, Mr. Surendra Bachmaliani, Mr. Ajay Vyas, Mr. R. Bhatnagar, Mr. Sushil Bishnoi, Mr. S.S. Rathore and Mr. Sukesh Bhati, Mr. J.R. Anjana, Mr. R.L. Baloch, Mr. Govind Suthar.



BY THE COURT :

In the above writ petitions and the writ petitions mentioned in the Schedule appended to this judgment, common dispute and question of law is involved with regard to seeking direction to the respondent State for considering the candidature of those candidates who possess academic degree of graduation with B.Ed and have cleared Phase-I of the Rajasthan TET for the level Classes I to V for appointment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III of Level - I. Accordingly, all these writ petitions shall stand disposed of by this common order/judgment.

The Central Government enacted the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (Act No.35 of 2009), in which, under Section 23 (1) it is provided that



minimum qualification shall be laid down by an academic authority authorized by the Central Government. The Central Government authorised the National Council for Teacher Education ("the NCTE" hereinafter) to lay down the minimum qualification for appointment of Teachers. The NCTE, after authorization, laid down the qualifications for Teacher vide notification dated 23.08.2010 (which is subsequently amended vide notification dated 29.07.2011). In para 3 of the above notification those candidates possessing degree of graduation with at least 50% marks and B.Ed. qualification were also held eligible for appointment as Teacher Grade III for level – I for classes I to V up to 01.01.2012 along with the candidates possessing prescribed qualification provided they undergo, after appointment, an NCTE recognized 6 months' special programme in the elementary education.

The State Government vide notification dated 11.05.2011 inserted the qualification for appointment of Teacher in Rule 266 of the Rajasthan Panchayat Raj Rules, 1996. The main contention of the petitioners in the writ petitions is that they are possessing the qualification of graduation degree with B.Ed. and they have cleared the RTET 2011, therefore, as per para 3 of the notification dated 23.08.2010 they are eligible to be appointed on the





posts of Teacher Grade-III; but, the said qualification has not been prescribed in the advertisements issued by the Zila Parishads of all the districts in the State although the said qualification is incorporated in para 3 of the notification issued by the NCTE.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that as per the Government stand opportunity for appointment as Teacher Grade-III for the Level-I classes from class I to class V the candidates who possess B.A./B.Sc. with at least 50% marks and B.Ed. qualification was available up to 01.01.2012 provided the candidates undergo, after appointment, NCTE recognized 6 months' special programme in elementary education, therefore, in the advertisement issued by all the Zila Parishads of Rajasthan for recruitment on 24.02.2012, after the date prescribed by the NCTE, the State Government is not treating all those candidates who are possessing B.A./B.Sc. and B.Ed. with TET for the posts of Teacher Grade-III for classes from I to V. As per the petitioners, the denial of consideration is unconstitutional act of the State because the delay in recruitment is caused due to inaction on the part of the State Government only so much so in the State of Rajasthan since the year 2006 no recruitment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III took place and, now, after clubbing all





the vacancies occurring hitherto the State Government is going to make recruitment on 40000 posts of Teacher Grade-III through the Zila Parishad of each district of the State and, for that, on 11.05.2011 an amendment was made whereby the qualifications laid down by the NCTE in the notification dated 23.08.2010 and amendment notification dated 29.07.2011 are prescribed. In both the above notifications opportunity for all those candidates who possess B.A./B.Sc. with at least 50% marks and B.Ed. qualification was available up to 01.01.2012, however, rider was incorporation that the candidates shall undergo, after appointment, NCTE recognized 6 months' special programme in elementary education; meaning thereby, after thorough discussion and due deliberation the NCTE itself granted an opportunity to all those candidates who are possessing B.A./B.Sc. and B.Ed. qualification with TET Level-I for appointment as Teacher for classes I to V, however, said opportunity was not granted by the State Government because the State Government did not publish the vacancies and commence recruitment process prior to 01.01.2012. It is urged by the petitioners that if one-time right or benefit is extended to class of qualified candidates by the NCTE, then, it was the duty of the State Government to grant the said opportunity to all those eligible candidates





who were given one-time opportunity to compete for appointment; but, in this case, the State Government is responsible for denial of the opportunity due to their own inaction. Therefore, the petitioners and like persons possessing the qualification of graduation with B.Ed. cannot be denied the opportunity to compete for appointment as Teacher Grade-II for class I to class V level.

Learned counsel for the petitioners invited attention of this Court that there is relaxation in age has been given in Rule 265 (x) of the Rajasthan Panchayat Raj Rules, 1996 by which a candidate would have been entitled in any year in which such recruitment was not held he/she shall be deemed to be within age-limit in the subsequent recruitment provided such relaxation shall not be for more than 3 years. It is very strange that on the one hand relaxation in age is given for the reason that no such recruitment took place due to inaction on the part of the State but no such relaxation is given to the candidates possessing qualification prescribed in para 3 of the notification dated 23.08.2010 to appear in the selection process for appointment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III for class I to class V level in the present context. It is vehemently argued that on the one hand relaxation is given in age to compete but; at the same time, by denying





the opportunity on the basis of qualification the State Government is snatching the right of consideration for the reason that advertisement has been issued after 01.01.2012.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that once NCTE which is the expert body authorized under the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 to prescribe qualification under sub-section (1) of Section 23, then, obviously the fruits of said opportunity was to be given on or before 01.01.2012 by the State Government, therefore, candidates who were possessing degree of graduation with at least 50% marks and B.Ed. qualification with TET prior to 01.01.2012 are eligible for recruitment which is going to be held in pursuance of the advertisements issued on 24.02.2012 by the respondents. It is vehemently argued that for last six years no recruitment took place for the posts of Teacher Grade-III and this fact itself speaks that the State Government is playing game with the future of the qualified B.A./B.Sc. and B.Ed. candidates. On the one hand, the State Government gives permission for opening private B.Ed. colleges for acquiring the qualification and, on the other hand, for last six years no vacancy is advertised and, due to said reason, the qualified candidates did not get any opportunity for





recruitment. Now, new qualification has been laid down as per the Act of 2009 by the NCTE, in which, an opportunity was granted to the candidates possessing degree of graduation and B.Ed. with TET for appointment up to 01.01.2012 but, that, too, is denied to the candidates in the State of Rajasthan for the reason that no appointments are made by the State before 01.01.2012. Therefore, there is complete inaction and apathetic silence on the part of the State Government for providing opportunity to the qualified candidates for recruitment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III for class I to class V level, therefore, it is a fit case to issue direction to the State Government to grant an opportunity to the candidates possessing degree of graduation with B.Ed. and TET in pursuance of advertisements issued on 24.02.2012 for appointment as Teacher Grade-III for classes I to V level.

Learned counsel for the petitioners vehemently submit that as per para 3 of the notification dated 23.08.2010, a decision was taken by the statutory expert body NCTE to grant eligibility to the candidates possessing degree of graduation with at least 50% marks and B.Ed. and TET qualification for appointment on the post of teacher for teaching class I to V up to 01.01.2012, therefore, those qualification holders were allowed by the Board of





Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Ajmer to participate in the Rajasthan TET 2011 examination conducted by the Board for Level – I to teach students of Class I to V and, in pursuance of that, all eligible candidates including the petitioners appeared in the Rajasthan TET 2011 for Level – I also and declared successful. The State Government inserted the qualification prescribed by the NCTE by way of amendment in Rule 266 of the Rules of 1996. An opportunity was also given to the petitioners and other qualified eligible candidates to appear in the TET and acquire the said eligibility for appointment. The State Government now denied the opportunity to compete for appointment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III on the ground that date 01.01.2012 provided in para 3 has expired. It is submitted that on the basis of legitimate expectation from the welfare State the petitioners are very much eligible to compete for the posts of Teacher Grade-III (Level – I) to teach students of classes I to V. The petitioners have placed on record the marks-sheet-cum-Certificate issued by the Board of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Ajmer in which they were declared successful in the Level-I TET.

Learned counsel for the petitioners invited my attention towards the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble





Supreme Court in the case of Chandra Kala Trivedi Vs. State of Rajasthan & Others, reported in (2012) 3 SCC 129, in which, Hon'ble Supreme Court held that higher qualification which is graduation with B.Ed. can be considered for appointment as Primary School Teacher Grade-III to teach students of class I to class V level. Therefore, all the writ petitions may be allowed and necessary direction may be issued to the respondents to treat the candidates eligible for appointment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III for level I for primary classes on the basis of qualification of graduation with B.Ed. and TET.

Per contra, learned Addl. Advocate General Mr. G.R. Punia, appearing on behalf of the State Government, vehemently argued that the Central Government enacted the Act known as Right of Children to Free & Compulsory Education Act, 2009, in which, as per Section 23 the Central Government authorized the NCTE to lay down the qualification for appointment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III and while exercising the power under Section 23 (1) of the Act of 2009 the NCTE prescribed qualification by way of issuing notification on 23.08.2010 and the said notification was further amended on 29.07.2011.

It is contended on behalf of the State that in the notification dated 23.08.2010 it was specifically provided





that those candidates possessing qualification of B.A./B.Sc. with at least 50% marks and B.Ed. qualification will also be eligible for appointment for class I to class V level up to 01.01.2012 provided they undergo, after appointment, an NCTE recognized special programme in elementary education; but, no recruitment after making available the relaxed provision up to 01.01.2012 has been made in the State of Rajasthan though candidates possessing above qualification were eligible for appointment up to 01.01.2012, therefore, after expiry of 01.01.2012 no such candidate is eligible to compete for appointment as Teacher Grade-III for Level-I. The State Government has amended the rules and prescribed the qualification under Rule 266 of the Rajasthan Panchayat Raj Rules, 1996 vide notification dated 11.05.2011 and inserted all those qualifications as provided by the NCTE and, under the said qualification, one time relaxation was granted for appointment to the graduate with B.Ed. degree holders up to 01.01.2012. Therefore, in the recruitment process which is commenced vide advertisements issued on 24.02.2012 the petitioners are not eligible because they become ineligible after 01.01.2012, the date which is prescribed by the NCTE.

Learned Addl. Advocate General argued that due to subsistence of eligibility till 01.01.2012 the candidates





possessing B.A./B.Sc. or graduation with B.Ed. were granted opportunity to appear in the Rajasthan TET 2011 examination but mere passing the TET does not create any right to get eligibility for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III for Level - I meant for classes I to V because the said benefit was extended by the NCTE for appointment up to 01.01.2012; and, here, in this case, the State Government issued notification for recruitment on 24.02.2012, therefore, obviously the petitioners and those persons who were possessing graduation with B.Ed. qualification became ineligible after 01.01.2012 and as such there is no force in the contention of the petitioners that they are eligible for appointment.

While opposing the writ petitions on behalf of the State Government, learned Addl. Advocate General contended that the claim of the petitioners is totally unfounded because laying down specific criteria by the NCTE under the Act of 2009 for appointment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III does not mean that the petitioners are being deprived of their any right. The State Government is under obligation to follow the qualifications prescribed by the NCTE and, in the notifications of the NCTE, relaxation was granted for appointment up to 01.01.2012 for the candidates possessing B.A./B.Sc. with B.Ed. and TET,





therefore, no case is made out in favour of the petitioners. It is further argued that so far as the upper age limit is concerned, the relaxation is available maximum up to 3 years in case recruitment process does not take place in the preceding years to enable the candidates in the event of crossing upper age limit to compete in the ensuing examination as per provision of law, therefore, it cannot be said that on the one hand age relaxation has been granted and, on the other hand, the State Government has snatched the right of consideration which is in violation of the constitutional right of the petitioners.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State further argued that on 10.05.2012 clarification was sought from the NCTE for the grievance raised by the petitioners but it is specifically denied by the NCTE that in the light of the above notifications persons with B.Ed. were eligible only up to 01.01.2012 and, after that, they will not be eligible for class I to class V level. Therefore, all these writ petitions deserve to be dismissed.

In support of his arguments Mr. Punia invited attention of the Court towards judgments reported in 2005 WLC (UC) Raj. 138, Kailash Chandra Harijan & Others Vs. State of Rajasthan & Others, (2003) 3 SCC 548, Yogesh Kumar & Others Vs. Govt. of NCT, Delhi & Others for the purpose of





claim of the petitioners upon qualification and following judgments are cited for not interfering in the policy matters :

- (1) (2011) 6 SCC p. 597,
- (2) 2010 (2) WLC (Raj.) p.220
- (3) AIR 1993 SC p. 2285
- (4) (2008) 3 SCC p. 512

and submits that there is power left with the State Government to prescribe qualification to maintain education standard in the State, therefore, these writ petitions may be dismissed.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the NCTE reiterated the stand taken by the State Government and submits that the issue of persons possessing graduation with B.Ed. qualification was considered to teach the class I to class V level and after due deliberation by the Council a decision was taken to allow the candidates possessing graduation with B.Ed. qualification as an eligible qualification for appointment as Teacher upto specified time period which is up to 01.01.2012 and this decision was taken as temporary measure. However, in order to ensure that persons with B.Ed. qualification are equipped and prepared to teach in class I to V it is provided that such persons after appointment shall have to undergo a six





month special course on elementary education which is expected to provide adequate orientation and preparedness to such teachers to teach in classes I to V. Therefore, one time relaxation was available for appointment up to 01.01.2012 and not thereafter. Therefore, the claim of the petitioners to consider them eligible even after 01.01.2012 is not tenable and, accordingly, these writ petitions may be dismissed.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties I have perused entire record of the case and considered the arguments advanced by the parties for deciding this controversy.

It is admitted position of the case that post of Teacher Grade-III is governed under the Rajasthan Panchayat Raj Rules, 1996 in which complete process of selection and eligibility qualifications are provided. Before 11.05.2011, B.A. B.Ed. qualification holders were entitled to be appointed as primary teachers or upper primary teachers but, after enactment of the Act of 2009, the Central Government authorized the NCTE being recognized authority to lay down the minimum qualification for the post of Teacher grade-III. The NCTE after due deliberation issued notification dated 23.08.2010 and subsequent amendment notification dated 29.07.2011 which are as





follows :

"NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
NOTIFICATION
New Delhi, the 23rd August, 2010

F.No.61-3/20/2010/NCTE/(N&S).-In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of the Section 23 of Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (35 of 2009) and in pursuance of the Notification No.S.O. 750(E) dated 31st March, 2010 issued by the Department of School Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) hereby lays down the following minimum qualifications for a person to be eligible for appointment as a teacher in class I to VIII in a school referred to in clause (n) of Section 2 of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, with effect from the date of this Notification :-

1. Minimum Qualifications.-

(i) **Classes I-V**

(a) Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 2 – year Diploma in Elementary Education (by whatever name known)

OR

Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 45% marks and 2 – year Diploma in Elementary Education (by whatever name known), in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure), Regulations 2002

OR





Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 4-year Bachelor of Elementary Education (B.El.Ed.)

OR

Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 2 – year Diploma in Education (Special Education)

AND

(b) Pass in the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET), to be conducted by the appropriate Government in accordance with the Guidelines framed by the NCTE for the purpose.

(ii) Classes VI-VIII

(a) B.A./B.Sc and 2 – year Diploma in Elementary Education (by whatever name known)

OR

B.A./B.Sc. with at least 50% marks and 1 – year Bachelor in Education (B.Ed)

OR

B.A./B.Sc. with at least 45% marks and 1 – year Bachelor in Education (B.Ed.), in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations issued from time to time in this regard

OR

Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 4-year Bachelor in Elementary Education (B.El.Ed.)

OR

Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 4-year BA/B.Sc. Ed or B.A. Ed./BSc.Ed.





18

OR

B.A./B.Sc. with at least 50% marks and 1 – year B.Ed. (Special Education)

AND

(b) Pass in the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET), to be conducted by the appropriate Government in accordance with the Guidelines framed by the NCTE for the purpose.

2 Diploma/Degree Course in Teacher Education.-For the purposes of this Notification, a diploma/degree course in teacher education recognized by the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) only shall be considered. However, in case of Diploma in Education (Special Education) and B.Ed (Special Education), a course recognized by the Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI) only shall be considered.

3. Training to be undergone.- A person –

(a) with BA/B.Sc. with at least 50% marks and B.Ed qualification shall also be eligible for appointment for class I to V upto 1st January, 2012, provided he undergoes, after appointment, an NCTE recognized 6-month special programme in Elementary Education.

(b) with D.Ed. (Special Education) or B.Ed (Special Education) qualification shall undergo, after appointment, an NCTE recognized 6-month special programme in Elementary Education.

4 Teacher appointed before the date of this Notification.-The following categories of teachers appointed for classes I to VIII prior to date of this Notification need not acquire





the minimum qualifications specified in Para (1) above:

(a) A teacher appointed on or after the 3rd September, 2001 i.e. the date on which the NCTE (Determination of Minimum Qualifications for Recruitment of Teachers in Schools) Regulations, 2001 (as amended from time to time) came into force, in accordance with that Regulation.

Provided that a teacher of class I to V possessing B.Ed qualification, or a teacher possessing B.Ed (Special Education) or D.Ed (Special Education) qualification shall undergo an NCTE recognized 6 - month special programme on elementary education.

(b) A teacher of class I to V with B.Ed qualification who has completed a 6-month Special Basic Teacher Course (Special BTC) approved by the NCTE;

(c) A teacher appointed before the 3rd September, 2001, in accordance with the prevalent Recruitment Rules.

5 Teacher appointed after the date of this Notification in certain cases.-Where an appropriate Government, or local authority or a school has issued an advertisement to initiate the process of appointment of teachers prior to the date of this Notification, such appointments may be made in accordance with the NCTE (Determination of Minimum Qualifications for Recruitment of Teachers in Schools) Regulations, 2001 (as amended from time to time.)

"NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
NOTIFICATION





New Delhi, the 29th July, 2011

F.No.61-1/2011/NCTE/N&S).-In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 23 of Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (35 of 2009) and in pursuance of the Notification No.S.O. 750(E) dated 31st March, 2010 issued by the Department of School Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) hereby makes the following amendments to the Notification No.215 dated 25th August, 2010 published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part-III, Section-4, vide F.No.61-1/2011-NCTE (N&S), dated the 23rd August, 2010, laying down the minimum qualifications for a person to be eligible for appointment as a teacher (hereby referred to as the Principal Notification), namely :-

(I) For sub-para (i) of para 1 of the Principal Notification, the following shall be substituted, namely:-

1. Minimum Qualifications:-

(i) Classes I-V

(a) Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 2-year Diploma in Elementary Education (by whatever name known)

OR

Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 45% marks and 2-year Diploma in Elementary Education (by whatever name known), in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and





Procedure), Regulations, 2002.

OR

Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 4-year Bachelor of Elementary Education (B.El.Ed.)

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 (by whatever name known)

AND

(b) pass in the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET), to be conducted by the appropriate Government in accordance with the Guidelines framed by the NCTE for the purpose.

(II) For sub-para (ii) of para 1 of the Principal Notification, the following shall be substituted, namely :-

1 (ii) Classes VI – VIII

(a) Graduation and 2-year Diploma in Elementary Education (by whatever name known)

OR

Graduation with at 50% marks and 1-year Bachelor ion Education (B.Ed.)

OR

Graduation with at least 45% marks and 1-year Bachelor in Education (B.Ed.), in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition





Norms and Procedure) Regulations issued from time to time in this regard.

OR

Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 4-year Bachelor in Elementary Education (B.El.Ed.)

OR

Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 4-year B.A./B.Sc.Ed. or B.A. Ed./B.Sc.Ed.

OR

Graduation with at least 50% marks and 1-year B.Ed. (Special Education)

AND

(b) Pass in Teacher Eligibility Test (TET), to be conducted by the appropriate Government in accordance with the Guidelines framed by the NCTE for the purpose.

(III) For para 3 of the Principal Notification the following shall be substituted, namely:-

(i) Training to be undergone:-A person –

(a) with Graduation with at least 50% marks and B.Ed. qualification or with at least 45% marks and 1-year Bachelor in Education (B.Ed.), in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations issued from time to time in this regard shall also be eligible for appointment to Class I to V up to 1st January, 2012, provided he/she undergoes, after appointment, an NCTE recognized 6-month Special Programme in Elementary Education;





(b) with D.Ed. (Special Education) or B.Ed. (Special Education) qualification shall undergo, after appointment an NCTE recognized 6-month Special Programme in Elementary Education.

(ii) Reservation Policy :

Relaxation up to 5% in the qualifying marks shall be allowed to the candidates belonging to reserved categories, such as ST/ST/OBC/PH.

(IV) For para 5 of the Principal Notification, the following shall be substituted, namely:-

5.(a) Teacher appointed after the date of this notification in certain cases:-Where an appropriate Government or local authority or a school has issued an advertisement to initiate the process of appointment of teachers prior to the date of this Notification, such appointments may be made in accordance with the NCTE (Determination of Minimum Qualifications for Recruitment of Teachers in Schools) Regulations, 2001 (as amended from time to time).

(b)The minimum qualification norms referred to in this Notification apply to teachers of Languages, Social Studies, Mathematics, Science, etc. In respect of teachers for Physical Education, the minimum qualification norms for Physical Education teachers referred to in NCTE Regulation dated 3rd November, 2001 (as amended from time to time) shall be applicable. For teachers of Art Education, Craft Education, Home Science, Work Education, etc. the existing eligibility norms





prescribed by the State Governments and other school managements shall be applicable till such time the NCTE lays down the minimum qualifications in respect of such teachers.”

Upon perusal of notification dated 23.08.2010, it will be revealed that in the first level of the Teachers, qualification of B.A./B.Sc. and 2 – year Diploma in Elementary Education (by whatever name known) was not prescribed but, later on, in the subsequent notification dated 29.07.2011 the said qualification was included within the minimum qualification for appointment as teacher for the first level classes from I to V. In the notification dated 23.08.2010, following para 3 was inserted :

**“3.Training to be undergone.- A person –
(a) with BA/B.Sc. with at least 50% marks and B.Ed qualification shall also be eligible for appointment for class I to V upto 1st January, 2012, provided he undergoes, after appointment, an NCTE recognized 6-month special programme in Elementary Education.
(b) with D.Ed. (Special Education) or B.Ed (Special Education) qualification shall undergo, after appointment, an NCTE recognized 6-month special programme in Elementary Education.”**

Admittedly, the said qualification prescribed by the NCTE was not inserted in Rule 266 of the Rajasthan Panchayat Raj Rules, 1996 till 11.05.2011. Thereafter, a notification was issued on 11.05.2011 whereby following qualifications were inserted under Rule 266 of the Rules of





1996 :

**“(3) Primary and Upper Primary School Teacher
(100% by direct recruitment)**

(a) General Education

**Level – (i) Classes I to V
Qualifications as laid
down by National
Council for Teacher
Education (NCTE)
under the provisions
of sub-section (1) of
Section 23 of the Right
of Children to Free and
Compulsory Education
Act, 2009 (Central Act
No.35 of 2009) from
time to time.**

Level – (ii) Classes VI to VIII

**Qualifications as laid
down by National
Council for Teacher
Education (NCTE)
under the provisions
of sub-section (1) of
Section 23 of the Right
of Children to Free and
Compulsory Education
Act, 2009 (Central Act
No.35 of 2009) from
time to time.**

(b) Special Education

Level – (i) Classes I to V

**Qualifications as laid
down by National
Council for Teacher
Education (NCTE)
under the provisions
of sub-section (1) of
Section 23 of the Right
of Children to Free and
Compulsory Education**





Act, 2009 (Central Act No.35 of 2009) from time to time.

Level – (ii) Classes VI to VIII

Qualifications as laid down by National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) under the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section 23 of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (Central Act No.35 of 2009) from time to time.”



Upon perusal of the above qualifications laid down under Rule 266 of the Rules of 1996 for Level – i it is specifically provided that qualification as laid down by the NCTE under the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section 23 of the Right of Children to Free & Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (Act No.35 of 2009) from time to time shall be applicable. The NCTE after due deliberations inserted para 3 in the notification dated 23.08.2010 but, unfortunately, the said qualification was not inserted in the Rules of 1996 till 11.05.2011, so also, no recruitment took place in the State of Rajasthan for the posts of Teacher Grade-III since the year 2006.

Further, after inserting the qualification laid down by the NCTE no process of selection commenced till 24.02.2012 and, during this period, due to apathetic



inaction on the part of the State Government in not making recruitment prior to 01.01.2012 all the candidates who were possessing graduation with B.Ed. and TET eligibility became ineligible. In my opinion, although on the one hand, it is found necessary by the NCTE to grant one opportunity to all those candidates who were possessing graduation with B.Ed. and TET eligibility to compete for the Level-I post of Teacher Grade-III by inserting para 3 in the notification but the doleful aspect of the matter is that the opportunity provided by the NCTE is snatched from those candidates in the State of Rajasthan who would have otherwise been eligible had it not been on account of the lethargic attitude for inaction on the part of the State Government for initiating the recruitment process. Therefore, an accrued right of those candidates who are possessing graduation with B.Ed. and TET eligibility, granted under para 3 of the notification dated 23.08.2010, cannot be washed away to waste by the State Government for their own lapses so as to thwart the decision of the NCTE taken after due deliberation.

The above position further gathers emphasis by the fact that on the one hand the State Government prescribed the qualification laid down by the NCTE in the Rules of 1996 vide notification dated 11.05.2011 under Rule 266





and granted an opportunity to appear in the Rajasthan TET 2011 for acquiring the eligibility for appointment as Teacher Grade-III Level-I to teach students of classes I to V; but, after acquiring the said eligibility, now, the State Government is not allowing the fruits of their qualification acquired during the currency of the eligibility, therefore, once right is given to the candidates to acquire the qualification, then, obviously the said benefit cannot be refused by the State Government while saying that the date mentioned in the notification of the NCTE which is 01.01.2012 has expired. The State Government has failed to perform obligatory duty to conduct the examination before 01.01.2012 for the post of Teacher Grade-III Level-I therefore the stand taken by the State Government that the petitioners and like persons became ineligible is totally baseless and against the basic principles of law.

The judgments cited by the learned Addl. Advocate General rendered in the cases of Kailash Chandra Harijan and Yogesh Kumar's cases are not even applicable upon the facts of the present case because NCTE considered appropriate after due deliberation that one opportunity is required to be granted to all those candidates who are possessing B.A./B.Sc. with B.Ed. qualification and TET eligibility, therefore, for deciding the instant controversy





both the cited judgments are totally inapplicable.

With regard to other judgments cited by learned Addl. Advocate in support of the case of the respondent State that interference of the Court in policy matters would be struck by a lawful bar, in my opinion, those judgments are not applicable in the present case because the agency of the Central Government which is the expert body known as the NCTE decided to grant opportunity to B.A./B.Sc. and B.Ed. qualification with TET eligibility holders to get appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level – I for classes I to V; but, that right has not been made available by the State Government due to their inaction, therefore, the denial of opportunity envisaged after due deliberation by the NCTE as one time measure which was available prior to 01.01.2012 to the candidates possessing B.A./B.Sc. with B.Ed. and TET eligibility against the existing vacancies is totally unconstitutional and against the fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution of India.

I am unable to accept the contention of the Addl. Advocate General that date viz., 01.01.2012 is expired therefore that right of consideration cannot be given to holders of the qualification because it is expected from the welfare State that fruits of certain provision inserted after due deliberation of the facts and circumstances should be





made available to the candidates who are possessing qualification as per para 3 of the notification dated 23.08.2010. The state Government, however, in a very casual manner, put forth childish plea that as per the notification the petitioners are not entitled after 01.01.2012 knowing well that no efforts have been made nor occasion is afforded to provide the opportunity envisaged by the statutory body after due deliberation in this State. The entire scenario only pricks the conscience of this Court that fruits of specific provision made available by the NCTE is snatched by the State Government by its own inaction and, now, they are denying the fruits of that measure which is prescribed by the NCTE after due deliberation.

In this case, the stand of the State Government is that after enactment of the Act of 2009 the expert body which is the NCTE was authorized to prescribe qualification for the post of Teacher Grade-III under sub-section (1) of Section 23 of the Act of 2009 and State Government issued notification on 11.05.2011 whereby an amendment was made in Rule 266 of the Rules of 1996 and qualification prescribed by the NCTE vide notification dated 23.08.2010 was inserted; meaning thereby, for recruitment on the post of Teacher Grade-III there is complete process in the Rules of 1996 in Chapter-XII. Under Rule 263 of the Rules of





1996 there is provision for determination of the vacancies and vacancies occurred since 2006 were determined and communicated to the Zila Parishads district-wise for recruitment and, in pursuance of that, advertisements have been issued on 24.02.2012 by all the Zila Parishads of the State, in which, age relaxation has been granted as provided under sub-rule (X) of Rule 265, by which, those candidates who would have been entitled in respect of his/her age for direct recruitment in a year, in which, no such recruitment was held they were granted relaxation of 3 years; meaning thereby, the legislature has taken note of the fact that in the event of not filling in the vacancies in a particular year no candidate should be deprived to compete if he was otherwise eligible for the post of Teacher Grade-III. In this case, Admittedly 40000 vacancies are advertised which were determined in the year 2011 of the previous years since 2006 because for last 6 years no recruitment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III took place in the State of Rajasthan.

Admittedly, as per the respondents themselves the candidates possessing graduation with B.Ed. and TET qualification were held entitled for appointment up to 01.01.2012; meaning thereby, all the petitioners and those candidates who were possessing graduation with B.Ed. and





TET were held eligible for appointment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III Level – I to teach students of classes I to V; but, that right is not made available to the candidates only for the reason that date 01.01.2012 expired.

In the Rules there is power of relaxation in any of the rule under Rule 296. Rule 296 of the Rules of 1996 reads as under :

“Rule 296. “Power to relax rules.”- The State Government on a reference by the Panchayat Samiti/Zila Parishad concerned or on its own motion, in an exceptional case where the Administrative Department is satisfied that the operation of the rules relating to any provision for recruitment, if any, causes undue hardship or where the Government is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient to relax any of the provisions of these rules may with the concurrence of Department of Personnel, relax the relevant provisions of these rules to such extent and subject to such conditions as it may consider necessary for dealing with the case in a just and equitable manner.”

I have examined Rule 265 and Rule 296 in which power of relaxation is prescribed. In the advertisement dated 24.02.2012 issued by all the Zila Parishads age relaxation has been granted under sub-rule (X) of Rule 265 of the Rules of 1996, whereby, all those candidates who were eligible in last three years but crossed the age limit are held entitled to compete for recruitment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III. Therefore, if such relaxation in age is provided under sub-rule (X) of Rule 265 by the State to the





candidates who become over-age for recruitment in pursuance of advertisements issued on 24.02.2012, but the State Government did not exercise its power to grant eligibility to the candidates who are possessing qualification of graduation with B.Ed. and TET after 01.01.2012 under Rule 296 of the Rules of 1996, in which, the legislature while conferring power has cast duty upon the State Government **in an exceptional case** where the Administrative Department is satisfied that the **operation of the rules relating to any provision for recruitment, if any, causes undue hardship** or where the Government is of the opinion that it is **necessary or expedient to relax any of the provisions** of these rules may with the concurrence of Department of Personnel, on its own motion, relax the relevant provisions of these rules to such extent and subject to such conditions as it may consider necessary **for dealing with the case in a just and equitable manner.** The case of the petitioners, therefore, falls under Rule 296 for the reasons that (i) case is an exceptional case, (ii) operation of the provision causes undue hardship, (iii) it is a case in which it is necessary or expedient to relax a provision of the rules, and (iv) it is necessary for dealing with the present case in just and equitable manner. Therefore, for the welfare of large





number of candidates it is duty of the State legislature to grant, as a one-time measure, an opportunity to those candidates who were held eligible by the NCTE itself for appointment up to 01.01.2012.

Admittedly, none of the candidates possessing graduation with B.Ed. and TET qualification was given opportunity for appointment inspite of clear provision inserted by the NCTE up to 01.01.2012. More so, after inserting the said qualification by amendment in the Rules of 1996 vide notification dated 11.05.2011, an opportunity was granted to candidates possessing graduation with B.Ed. qualification to appear in the TET examination by the Board of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Ajmer and they were given certificate after passing the said examination for Level – I and Level – II, both. Therefore, it is abundantly clear that all those candidates who were possessing the qualification of graduation with B.Ed. and TET were held eligible by the NCTE for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III but the said benefit is not made available to those candidates by the State legislature because delay in recruitment is caused due to apathetic and indifferent attitude of the State authorities.

In my considered opinion, it is settled law that a particular vacancy arisen in a particular year should be filled





in in accordance with the existing rules. Here, in this case, 40000 vacancies were determined up to the year 2011 and, at that time, as per notification dated 23.08.2010, the qualification prescribed by the NCTE was inserted in Rule 266 of the Rules of 1996, in which, para 3 was in existence whereby it was specifically provided that a candidate with Graduation with at least 50% marks and B.Ed. qualification or with at least 45% marks and 1-year Bachelor in Education (B.Ed.), in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations issued from time to time in this regard shall also be eligible for appointment to Class I to V up to 1st January, 2012, provided he/she undergoes, after appointment, an NCTE recognized 6-month Special Programme in Elementary Education; but, the benefit of the said eligibility is not extended to any of the candidates possessing the said qualification for the reason that the vacancies are advertised on 24.02.2012. In my considered opinion, the right accrued to the candidates as per para 3 of the notification dated 23.08.2010 cannot be snatched merely on the ground that the process of selection for already determined vacancies commenced on 24.02.2012.

If such type of action of the State Government is countenanced, then, obviously the scope of selection will be





narrowed down and only those candidates will get opportunity for appointment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III Level – I who are possessing qualifications other than the qualification possessed by the petitioners. Therefore, it is the duty of the State to expand the scope of opportunity to the candidates instead of narrowing down the scope of recruitment.

As per Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, the intention of the welfare State must be in favour of the larger number of citizens and it must not be restricted to class of persons. But, here, in this case, the State Government is snatching the right of consideration from the petitioners on hyper-technical ground, that too, due to their own inaction. The State Government is answerable for the reasons why the recruitment on the posts of Teacher Grade-III is not made since 2006 and, now, if they are initiating the process of selection, then, how the State can curtail the right of consideration of those candidates who were held eligible by the NCTE for the simple reason that the State Government did not initiate the process of selection prior to the date 01.01.2012.

When there is power left with the State under Rule 296 of the Rules of 1996 to relax any of the provisions of the Rules, then, obviously a proper decision was to be taken





to enlarge the scope of selection by granting opportunity to all the candidates who were declared eligible by the NCTE and who were allowed by the Board of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Ajmer to appear and pass the TET examination even after possessing graduation with B.Ed. qualification. I am unable to understand why the State Government is not extending opportunity to the candidates possessing qualification of graduation with B.Ed. and TET for participating in the selection process for the posts of Teacher Grade-III Level – I to teach students of classes I to V when the NCTE itself gave opinion that as a one-time measure said opportunity should be given to the candidates possessing graduation with B.Ed. and TET with a rider that they shall acquire training after their appointment.

It is very important to observe that the NCTE has been authorized by the Central Government to prescribe the qualification but the NCTE cannot compel the State Government to strictly follow their opinion to apply the said qualification up to particular date because under Article 309 of the Constitution of India the State Government has power to frame service rules.

In the case of Chandra Kala Trivedi Vs. State of Rajasthan & Others, (2012) 3 SCC 129, recently Hon'ble Supreme Court made following adjudication in para 7 and 8





of the judgment while considering similar controversy :

“7. In the impugned judgment, the High Court has given a finding that the higher qualification is not the substitute for the qualification of Senior Secondary or Intermediate. In the instant case, we fail to appreciate the reasoning of the High Court to the extent that it does not consider higher qualification as equivalent to the qualification of passing Senior Secondary Examination even in respect of a candidate who was provisionally selected.

8. The word “equivalent” must be given a reasonable meaning. By using the expression “equivalent” one means that there are some degrees of flexibility or adjustment which do not lower the stated requirement. There has to be some difference between what is equivalent and what is exact. Apart from that, after a person is provisionally selected, a certain degree of reasonable expectation of the selection being continued also come into existence.”

While considering the above adjudication, I once again applied my mind with reference to the present controversy. It emerges from the facts that the expert body which the NCTE expressly inserted para 3 in the notification dated 23.08.2010 and held that graduate with B.Ed. and TET can be treated equivalent and one-time opportunity should be given to them to participate in the selection process for appointment as Teacher Grade-III Level – I to teach students of classes I to V. Therefore, from any angle, it cannot be said that the petitioners were not treated eligible by the NCTE for appointment against the vacancies of Level – I. More so, the NCTE after due deliberation





incorporated para 3 in the notification dated 23.08.2010 that those candidates possessing qualification of graduation with B.Ed. will be eligible for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level – I and, at the time of issuance of notification dated 23.08.2010, it was felt necessary to provide one opportunity to those candidates. Therefore, obviously with a view to granting opportunity the date 01.01.2012 was inserted and it was expected from the State Government to make recruitment while providing opportunity to them; but, it was not provided by the State of Rajasthan even though with open eyes the NCTE held the above qualification holders eligible for appointment.

It is also worthwhile to observe that no restriction was imposed by the NCTE, therefore, obviously the power left with the State Government under Rule 296 of the Rules of 1996 to relax any of the provisions of the rules was to be exercised; but, it was not exercised though the same power was exercised in relation to relaxation in upper age-limit. Therefore, the action of the State Government in refusing all those candidates possessing graduation with B.Ed. to compete for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade-III Level – I to teach students of classes I to V is totally unfounded and contrary to the principle of legitimate expectation. The duty of the welfare State is not to curtail





the envisaged opportunity for the candidates but to enlarge the scope and opportunity in view of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

I have examined para 3 of the notification dated 23.08.2010 from all angles. It emerges from the language used by the NCTE that the date of 01.01.2012 is inserted to grant one opportunity to the candidates who are pursuing B.Ed. and not to put restriction upon the State Government because the NCTE is having jurisdiction to lay down the qualification under the Act of 2009 but cannot put restriction upon the State Government to declare any candidate ineligible for appointment. In these circumstances, the denial of opportunity to the petitioners holding the qualification of graduation with B.Ed. and who acquired TET qualification after issuance of notification dated 23.08.2010 and prior to 01.01.2012 is against the constitutional rights guaranteed to the petitioners under Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

Therefore, the above writ petitions as well as writ petitions enumerated in the Schedule appended to this judgment are hereby allowed. Respondent State is directed to grant one opportunity to all those candidates who acquired qualification of graduation with B.Ed. and TET qualification before 01.01.2012 in the selection process





commenced in pursuance of advertisements issued by the Zila Parishads of all the districts on 24.02.2012 for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade III Level - I.

There shall however be no order as to costs.

(Gopal Krishan Vyas) J.

Ojha, a.





SCHEDULE
APPENDED TO THE
JUDGMENT
DATED 19.05.2012 IN
S.B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION
NO.2180/2012
&
S.B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION
NO.2205/2012



- 1 SBCWP No. 2161/2012 CHANDRA BHAN DUDY & ANR.
Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE. PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 2 SBCWP No. 3100/2012 PUNITA VYAS & ORS Vs. STATE
OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 3 SBCWP No. 3152/2012 TARA KANWAR & ANR Vs. STATE
OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 4 SBCWP No. 3156/2012 SANTOSH KUMAR & ORS Vs.
STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 5 SBCWP No. 3157/2012 NARENDRA KUMAR & ORS Vs.
STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 6 SBCWP No. 3158/2012 MANI RAM & ORS Vs. STATE
(EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 7 SBCWP No. 3159/2012 JAI RAJ & ORS Vs. STATE
(EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 8 SBCWP No. 3163/2012 ANIL TAILOR & ORS Vs. STATE
OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 9 SBCWP No. 3164/2012 DINESH KUMAR SEN Vs. STATE
OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 10 SBCWP No. 3165/2012 BEERAM RAM CHOUDHARY &
ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 11 SBCWP No. 3166/2012 SHARVAN KUMAR PARNGI & ORS
Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 12 SBCWP No. 3167/2012 SUJAN DAN & ORS Vs. STATE
(EDUCATION) & ORS
- 13 SBCWP No. 3168/2012 SARITA Vs. STATE OF RAJ. &
ORS.





- 14 SBCWP No. 3171/2012 MAHESH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 15 SBCWP No. 3180/2012 RAJU RAM JAIPAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 16 SBCWP No. 3181/2012 AMRIT PAL SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS
- 17 SBCWP No. 3182/2012 RAJ KUMAR Vs. STATE & ORS
- 18 SBCWP No. 3183/2012 SAWAI RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS
- 19 SBCWP No. 3187/2012 PRAKASH CHAND BARWAR Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 20 SBCWP No. 3188/2012 SHRAWAN Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 21 SBCWP No. 3189/2012 VINITA KUMARI & ANR. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 22 SBCWP No. 3191/2012 RAMESH PAREEK & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS
- 23 SBCWP No. 3195/2012 HAPU RAM @ ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 24 SBCWP No. 3196/2012 SHAITAN RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 25 SBCWP No. 3198/2012 PUKH RAJ & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 26 SBCWP No. 3199/2012 BHAGWAN SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 27 SBCWP No. 2178/2012 DHARMENDER KUMAR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE. PAN. RAJ.) & ORS





- 28 SBCWP No. 2179/2012 PRIYANKA SHARMA Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE. PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 29 SBCWP No. 2205/2012 VEERA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 30 SBCWP No. 2875/2012 DINESH KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 31 SBCWP No. 2876/2012 GULAB KANWAR CHUNDAWAT & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 32 SBCWP No. 2877/2012 OM PRAKASH BHADU & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 33 SBCWP No. 2879/2012 LAXMAN SINGH RAJOT & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 34 SBCWP No. 2895/2012 NIMBA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 35 SBCWP No. 2988/2012 VEERAMA RAM GODARA & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 36 SBCWP No. 3372/2012 BHANWAR LAL & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 37 SBCWP No. 3476/2012 VARSHA JAIN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 38 SBCWP No. 3621/2012 MOHAN RAM Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 39 SBCWP No. 3691/2012 MEKA RAM KHOT & ANR. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 40 SBCWP No. 3701/2012 MALU RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 41 SBCWP No. 3737/2012 SOHANLAL SUNAR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS





- 42 SBCWP No. 3748/2012 BHERULAL NAYAK & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 43 SBCWP No. 3760/2012 ARUN VYAS & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 44 SBCWP No. 3769/2012 KAMAL PRAKASH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 45 SBCWP No. 3776/2012 SHYAM SUNDER PRAJAPAT & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 46 SBCWP No. 3778/2012 BHARTI CHOUHAN & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 47 SBCWP No. 3788/2012 NARAYAN LAL MEENA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 48 SBCWP No. 3789/2012 SURESH KUMAR MEENA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 49 SBCWP No. 3796/2012 MANGI LAL JOGI & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 50 SBCWP No. 3798/2012 ANUSUYA DEVAL & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ANR.
- 51 SBCWP No. 3810/2012 VIJAY SINGH RAIKA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 52 SBCWP No. 3828/2012 MADAN LAL BERWA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 53 SBCWP No. 3872/2012 JOITA RAM PATEL & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 54 SBCWP No. 3882/2012 GANPAT LAL VISHNOI & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 55 SBCWP No. 3901/2012 GANPAT RAM MALI & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.





- 56 SBCWP No. 3905/2012 CHANAN SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 57 SBCWP No. 3908/2012 ANDA RAM MEGHWAL & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 58 SBCWP No. 3939/2012 KAMLESH BUNKAR & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 59 SBCWP No. 3974/2012 HANUMAN PRASAD & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ANR
- 60 SBCWP No. 3976/2012 INDRAPAL & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ANR
- 61 SBCWP No. 3978/2012 SUMAN PAYAL & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ANR
- 62 SBCWP No. 3986/2012 BABU LAL MAKAD & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 63 SBCWP No. 3987/2012 SUMAN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ANR
- 64 SBCWP No. 3995/2012 SMT. INDIRA & ORS. Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 65 SBCWP No. 4014/2012 MANGESH KANWAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ANR
- 66 SBCWP No. 4018/2012 MAHESH KUMAR AMETA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 67 SBCWP No. 4055/2012 PRAMOD KUMAR BHARGAW & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ANR.
- 68 SBCWP No. 4057/2012 ANKITA POONIA & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ANR
- 69 SBCWP No. 4063/2012 RAJENDRA KUMAR PARIHAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 70 SBCWP No. 4067/2012 RAM LAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 71 SBCWP No. 4089/2012 PRAKASH CHAND & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 72 SBCWP No. 4091/2012 MS SALMA SAMEJA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 73 SBCWP No. 4092/2012 JAI KISHAN SAHARAN & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 74 SBCWP No. 4093/2012 JAGDISH CHANDRA Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 75 SBCWP No. 4098/2012 DASHARATH KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 76 SBCWP No. 4101/2012 MAHADEV & ORS. Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 77 SBCWP No. 4131/2012 BHAJAN LAL BERWAL & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 78 SBCWP No. 4141/2012 HETRAM BENIWAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 79 SBCWP No. 2374/2012 MANOJ SONI & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 80 SBCWP No. 2431/2012 JABAR SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 81 SBCWP No. 2647/2012 IMRAN B. KHAN Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 82 SBCWP No. 2692/2012 GANPAT RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 83 SBCWP No. 2762/2012 ARJUN RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS





- 84 SBCWP No. 2761/2012 AMRIT KUMAR JAT & ORS. Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 85 SBCWP No. 2789/2012 JOG SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ANR
- 86 SBCWP No. 2800/2012 MINASH KUMAR RANGA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 87 SBCWP No. 2801/2012 SMT. KUSUMLATA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 88 SBCWP No. 2803/2012 RAM CHANDRA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 89 SBCWP No. 2807/2012 JYOTI SHARMA & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 90 SBCWP No. 2808/2012 KISHNA RAM MEGHWAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 91 SBCWP No. 2809/2012 PURSHOTTAM KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 92 SBCWP No. 2811/2012 ASHOK KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 93 SBCWP No. 2812/2012 VYANJANA SHARMA & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ANR
- 94 SBCWP No. 2813/2012 RAKESH SHARMA Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 95 SBCWP No. 2821/2012 PUNAMA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 96 SBCWP No. 2822/2012 SURESH KUMAR PAREEK & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 97 SBCWP No. 2824/2012 MAHAVEER RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS





- 98 SBCWP No. 2825/2012 MADAN LAL SANKHLA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 99 SBCWP No. 2827/2012 RANCHHOD LAL MEGHWAL & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 100 SBCWP No. 2828/2012 DUDARAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 101 SBCWP No. 2829/2012 KAMLA BISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 102 SBCWP No. 2830/2012 RAJESH & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 103 SBCWP No. 2831/2012 SURENDRA SINGH UADAWAT & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 104 SBCWP No. 2832/2012 NIMBA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 105 SBCWP No. 2834/2012 TANERAW SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 106 SBCWP No. 2835/2012 VIKASH KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 107 SBCWP No. 2836/2012 SOHAN LAL GARG & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 108 SBCWP No. 2837/2012 JASWANT KANWAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 109 SBCWP No. 2838/2012 RAMAVATAR PRAJAPAT & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 110 SBCWP No. 2839/2012 PRAVEEN JANI & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 111 SBCWP No. 2840/2012 KESHA RAM CHOUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 112 SBCWP No. 2841/2012 KANHAIYA LAL & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 113 SBCWP No. 2842/2012 ASHOK KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 114 SBCWP No. 2843/2012 RAJENDRA YADAV & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 115 SBCWP No. 3839/2012 SANDEEP KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 116 SBCWP No. 3843/2012 BAJRANG LAL & ANR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ANR
- 117 SBCWP No. 2852/2012 HAPU RAM Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 118 SBCWP No. 2851/2012 SMT. KESARI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 119 SBCWP No. 2853/2012 KAILASH DAS & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 120 SBCWP No. 2854/2012 HEMA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 121 SBCWP No. 2862/2012 MOHD. AKHTAR BHATI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 122 SBCWP No. 2878/2012 SHANKER LAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 123 SBCWP No. 2880/2012 MANOHAR LAL & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS
- 124 SBCWP No. 2881/2012 CHENA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS
- 125 SBCWP No. 2883/2012 LEELAWATI SWAMI Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 126 SBCWP No. 2886/2012 POONAMA RAM & ANR. Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 127 SBCWP No. 2887/2012 GOPI CHAND JANGID & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 128 SBCWP No. 2888/2012 OM PRAKASH & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 129 SBCWP No. 2896/2012 DILEEP SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 130 SBCWP No. 2899/2012 VINOD KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 131 SBCWP No. 3874/2012 PRAKASH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 132 SBCWP No. 3875/2012 NARENDRA SUTHAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 133 SBCWP No. 3877/2012 REPUDAMAN SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 134 SBCWP No. 2910/2012 SURESH KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 135 SBCWP No. 2911/2012 KUMARI KANTA & ANR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 136 SBCWP No. 2912/2012 SUNITA KATARA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ANR.
- 137 SBCWP No. 2900/2012 MANOJ KUMAR CHAHAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 138 SBCWP No. 2902/2012 ASHA RAM & ANR. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 139 SBCWP No. 2909/2012 VIKRAM KASWAN & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS





- 140 SBCWP No. 2935/2012 SMT. MANJU & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 141 SBCWP No. 2937/2012 DEVENG PATEL & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 142 SBCWP No. 2938/2012 RAYMAL CHOUDHARY & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 143 SBCWP No. 2944/2012 MOHD. YASIN & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS
- 144 SBCWP No. 2918/2012 KHIYA RAM & ANR. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 145 SBCWP No. 2932/2012 SATPAL DUDI & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 146 SBCWP No. 2936/2012 TARA SALVI & ANR. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 147 SBCWP No. 2915/2012 SURENDRA SINGH FAGERIYA & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 148 SBCWP No. 2916/2012 BHAGAT RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 149 SBCWP No. 2917/2012 RAM NARAYAN Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 150 SBCWP No. 2922/2012 CHETAN RAM KARWASRA Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 151 SBCWP No. 2923/2012 NEHA SHARMA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 152 SBCWP No. 2925/2012 ASHOK KUMAR MEGHWAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ANR.
- 153 SBCWP No. 2926/2012 DEVENDRA SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS





- 154 SBCWP No. 2927/2012 SHARWAN KUMAR
PHOOLPHAGAR & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 155 SBCWP No. 2929/2012 MOHAMMAD FAROOKH & ORS Vs.
STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 156 SBCWP No. 2933/2012 KAMAL NARESH & ORS. Vs.
STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 157 SBCWP No. 2941/2012 HEM SINGH SOLANKI & ORS Vs.
STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 158 SBCWP No. 2957/2012 IKRAM KHAN & ORS Vs. STATE
(RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 159 SBCWP No. 2962/2012 RATANLAL MEENA & ORS Vs.
STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 160 SBCWP No. 2963/2012 JYOTI DUTTA & ORS. Vs. STATE
(RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 161 SBCWP No. 2965/2012 RAJENDRA PRASAD & ORS. Vs.
STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 162 SBCWP No. 2966/2012 INDU OJHA & ORS. Vs. STATE
(EDUCATION) & ORS
- 163 SBCWP No. 2967/2012 AJA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE
(EDUCATION) & ORS
- 164 SBCWP No. 2969/2012 IDAN SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE
(EDUCATION) & ORS
- 165 SBCWP No. 2970/2012 SHARMILA RANI Vs. STATE
(EDUCATION) & ORS
- 166 SBCWP No. 2971/2012 MAHAVEER & ORS. Vs. STATE
(EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 167 SBCWP No. 2972/2012 RAM LAL BISHNOI & ORS. Vs.
STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 168 SBCWP No. 2973/2012 HEERA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 169 SBCWP No. 2974/2012 RADHA KISHAN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 170 SBCWP No. 2976/2012 SUKH RAM LABANA & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 171 SBCWP No. 2977/2012 BHOMA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 172 SBCWP No. 2978/2012 NARENDRA KUMAR CHOUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 173 SBCWP No. 2979/2012 CHAUTHA RAM VISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 174 SBCWP No. 2980/2012 ANITA SEERVI & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 175 SBCWP No. 2981/2012 JITENDRA KUMAR PARIHAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 176 SBCWP No. 2982/2012 BHANWAR SINGH BHATI & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 177 SBCWP No. 2983/2012 LALITA SWAMI & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 178 SBCWP No. 2984/2012 RAMSWAROOP & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 179 SBCWP No. 2985/2012 BHOPAL SINGH MEENA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 180 SBCWP No. 2986/2012 ARJUN LAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 181 SBCWP No. 2989/2012 SUKH RAM VISHNOI & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 182 SBCWP No. 2990/2012 GAJE SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 183 SBCWP No. 2991/2012 SANTOSH KUMAR LOMAROR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 184 SBCWP No. 2993/2012 OM PRAKASH DUDI & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 185 SBCWP No. 2994/2012 KISHORE SINGH RAO & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 186 SBCWP No. 3001/2012 RANJEET KUMAR & ANR Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 187 SBCWP No. 3009/2012 REKHA KHANT Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 188 SBCWP No. 3011/2012 ARVINDER KAUR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 189 SBCWP No. 3012/2012 PRERNA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 190 SBCWP No. 3013/2012 RAM RATAN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 191 SBCWP No. 3014/2012 RAM LAL BANJARA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 192 SBCWP No. 3019/2012 SHARMILA BISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 193 SBCWP No. 3020/2012 BIRBAL RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 194 SBCWP No. 3026/2012 GOPAL SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 195 SBCWP No. 3035/2012 HARICHAND RAM BISHNOI & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 196 SBCWP No. 3036/2012 RAM CHANDRA Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 197 SBCWP No. 3045/2012 YAMINI BHARTI & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 198 SBCWP No. 3046/2012 SMT. GEETA BISHNOI Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 199 SBCWP No. 3047/2012 POOJA MEENA Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 200 SBCWP No. 3050/2012 BRIJ RAJ CHARAN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 201 SBCWP No. 3051/2012 MONIKA VYAS & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 202 SBCWP No. 3052/2012 BHARAT PRAKASH SHARMA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 203 SBCWP No. 3053/2012 BADRI NARAYAN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 204 SBCWP No. 3054/2012 BUDHA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 205 SBCWP No. 3055/2012 PREM PRAKASH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 206 SBCWP No. 3056/2012 CHANDAN SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 207 SBCWP No. 3058/2012 JOGA RAM INKHIYA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 208 SBCWP No. 3059/2012 RAMESH KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 209 SBCWP No. 3060/2012 HARI SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 210 SBCWP No. 3061/2012 PRAVEEN KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 211 SBCWP No. 3063/2012 MANCHHA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 212 SBCWP No. 3064/2012 MANISH GUPTA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 213 SBCWP No. 3065/2012 VIJAY PAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 214 SBCWP No. 3066/2012 SHANKAR LAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 215 SBCWP No. 3067/2012 SANTOSH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 216 SBCWP No. 3073/2012 RAJU RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 217 SBCWP No. 3075/2012 ASHA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 218 SBCWP No. 3076/2012 MONIKA BAGRA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 219 SBCWP No. 3078/2012 REKHA CHOUHAN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 220 SBCWP No. 3079/2012 SURESH MARU & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 221 SBCWP No. 3082/2012 ASHOK KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 222 SBCWP No. 3083/2012 SURENDRA KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 223 SBCWP No. 3084/2012 REKHA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS





- 224 SBCWP No. 3092/2012 MAHENDRA JAKHAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 225 SBCWP No. 3093/2012 JEEVAT RAM KATARA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 226 SBCWP No. 3097/2012 RAJESHWARI CHOUHAN & ANR Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 227 SBCWP No. 3098/2012 ARUNA VYAS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 228 SBCWP No. 3081/2012 KESHAR GAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 229 SBCWP No. 3144/2012 GOPI LAL VISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 230 SBCWP No. 3104/2012 VISHNU KINJA & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 231 SBCWP No. 3106/2012 ARVIND KUMAR ARHA & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 232 SBCWP No. 3108/2012 BHAGWAN SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 233 SBCWP No. 3112/2012 GOUTAM SHARMA & ORS. Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 234 SBCWP No. 3113/2012 PREETI KALWANI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 235 SBCWP No. 3115/2012 BIRENDRA SINGH & ANR Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 236 SBCWP No. 3117/2012 CHANDRA SHEKHAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 237 SBCWP No. 3118/2012 SATRAM BISHNOI & ORS. Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.





- 238 SBCWP No. 3119/2012 HARI RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 239 SBCWP No. 3120/2012 RAJA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 240 SBCWP No. 3121/2012 ANITA RATHORE & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 241 SBCWP No. 3124/2012 MEENAKSHI SWAMI & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 242 SBCWP No. 3125/2012 PAPPULAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 243 SBCWP No. 3127/2012 MITHOO SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 244 SBCWP No. 3128/2012 BALWAN SINGH PUNIA & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 245 SBCWP No. 3130/2012 ANIRUDH Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 246 SBCWP No. 3133/2012 BANNA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 247 SBCWP No. 3134/2012 KAILASH CHAUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 248 SBCWP No. 3135/2012 PRAMENDER KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 249 SBCWP No. 3138/2012 PRAKASH CHANDRA VAISHANV & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 250 SBCWP No. 3142/2012 BHAGWATI DAS VAISHANV & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 251 SBCWP No. 3143/2012 DOONGARA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.





- 252 SBCWP No. 3145/2012 SHYAM SINGH & ANR. Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 253 SBCWP No. 3146/2012 SHER SINGH GOUD & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 254 SBCWP No. 3148/2012 DINESH KUMAR MEHLA & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 255 SBCWP No. 3184/2012 NAVITA SWAMI & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 256 SBCWP No. 3185/2012 RITU SWAMI & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 257 SBCWP No. 3186/2012 ASHISH ACHARYA Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 258 SBCWP No. 3193/2012 CHANDRA PAL SINGH & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 259 SBCWP No. 3202/2012 RAJENDRA PRASAD BHADU & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 260 SBCWP No. 3200/2012 SMT. KALPANA SHARMA & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 261 SBCWP No. 3208/2012 PEER CHAND KASNIYA & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 262 SBCWP No. 3210/2012 DEEWAN SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 263 SBCWP No. 3212/2012 MS. AKANSHA CHOUDHARY & ANR Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 264 SBCWP No. 3213/2012 SMT. SANTOSH KUMARI Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 265 SBCWP No. 3214/2012 BHANWARA RAM Vs. STATE & ORS.





- 266 SBCWP No. 3219/2012 RAMKISHORE CHOUDHARY & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 267 SBCWP No. 3220/2012 MEGHA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 268 SBCWP No. 3221/2012 KRISHNA KANWAR & ANR. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 269 SBCWP No. 3227/2012 RAVINDRA KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 270 SBCWP No. 3228/2012 SHOBHA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 271 SBCWP No. 3252/2012 MANGE LAL & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 272 SBCWP No. 3280/2012 LAL CHAND GOSWAMI & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 273 SBCWP No. 3217/2012 SURESH PATEL Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 274 SBCWP No. 3201/2012 UGAM KANWAR Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 275 SBCWP No. 3203/2012 MAHAVIR SINGH @ ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 276 SBCWP No. 3204/2012 SHARWAN KUMAR Vs. STATE & ORS
- 277 SBCWP No. 3205/2012 BHANWAR LAL & ANR. Vs. STATE & ORS
- 278 SBCWP No. 3209/2012 KIRAN KUMARI @ ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 279 SBCWP No. 3211/2012 SUMER SINGH POONIA Vs. STATE & ORS.





- 280 SBCWP No. 3216/2012 NAND KISHORE & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 281 SBCWP No. 3222/2012 NANK CHAND & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 282 SBCWP No. 3223/2012 RANJANA SISODIYA & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 283 SBCWP No. 3230/2012 MOHAN LAL & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 284 SBCWP No. 3231/2012 RAM GOPAL SAINI Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 285 SBCWP No. 3237/2012 MAHENDRA SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 286 SBCWP No. 3238/2012 BHUPENDRA KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 287 SBCWP No. 3239/2012 LALIT SINGH PARMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 288 SBCWP No. 3240/2012 HEERA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 289 SBCWP No. 3241/2012 CHANDRA RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 290 SBCWP No. 3242/2012 NAVIN KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 291 SBCWP No. 3243/2012 KAMAL KISHORE DEVARA & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 292 SBCWP No. 3244/2012 RAM DAS MEGHWAL & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 293 SBCWP No. 3282/2012 SHRAWAN RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.





- 294 SBCWP No. 3323/2012 SUMAN PRAJAPAT & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 295 SBCWP No. 3305/2012 PRAVEEN KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 296 SBCWP No. 3306/2012 ASHOK KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 297 SBCWP No. 3310/2012 MUKHRAM DUDI & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 298 SBCWP No. 3311/2012 INDRAJ KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 299 SBCWP No. 3312/2012 KRISHNA KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 300 SBCWP No. 3313/2012 HANS RAJ SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 301 SBCWP No. 3316/2012 DINESH POONIA & ANR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 302 SBCWP No. 3318/2012 MAHAVIR PRASAD & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 303 SBCWP No. 3319/2012 CHUNI LAL & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 304 SBCWP No. 3320/2012 VINOD KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 305 SBCWP No. 3321/2012 DEVI SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 306 SBCWP No. 3322/2012 OM PRAKASH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 307 SBCWP No. 3327/2012 MANGILAL POONIA & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.





- 308 SBCWP No. 3329/2012 MAHENDRA SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 309 SBCWP No. 3330/2012 RAM NARAYAN KUMHAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 310 SBCWP No. 3337/2012 YESHPAL SINGH CHOUHAN & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 311 SBCWP No. 3339/2012 MANA RAM CHOUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 312 SBCWP No. 3342/2012 OM PRAKASH MEENA & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 313 SBCWP No. 3344/2012 ANSHU TAK & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 314 SBCWP No. 3336/2012 KHIMA RAM RABARI & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 315 SBCWP No. 3307/2012 VINOD KUMAR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 316 SBCWP No. 3314/2012 PRABHU RAM GODARA & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 317 SBCWP No. 3324/2012 BHOPAL SINGH JHALA & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 318 SBCWP No. 3325/2012 PINKI SHEKHAWAT & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 319 SBCWP No. 3326/2012 JASSA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 320 SBCWP No. 3328/2012 MAMTA DEVI & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 321 SBCWP No. 3331/2012 GOPAL LAL LABANA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 322 SBCWP No. 3332/2012 SHOBH SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 323 SBCWP No. 3333/2012 JYOTI CHOUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 324 SBCWP No. 3334/2012 NARENDRA KUMAR SONAWAT & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 325 SBCWP No. 3335/2012 RUPA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 326 SBCWP No. 3338/2012 SMT. IMARTA Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 327 SBCWP No. 3340/2012 POONAM KANSARA & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 328 SBCWP No. 3341/2012 DINESH KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 329 SBCWP No. 3343/2012 LALIT NATH YOGI & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 330 SBCWP No. 3345/2012 MEENA KUMARI & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 331 SBCWP No. 3346/2012 KAILASH CHANDRA KHATEEK & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 332 SBCWP No. 3347/2012 MAMTA DEVI & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 333 SBCWP No. 3349/2012 ROOP LAL DENDOR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 334 SBCWP No. 3350/2012 DHARAMPAL & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 335 SBCWP No. 3393/2012 ARJUN SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.





- 336 SBCWP No. 2359/2012 SHANKAR LAL & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 337 SBCWP No. 3351/2012 HANSRAJ & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 338 SBCWP No. 3357/2012 PUJA & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 339 SBCWP No. 3358/2012 NANDRAM & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 340 SBCWP No. 3359/2012 OM PRAKASH & ORS. Vs. STATE
- 341 SBCWP No. 3362/2012 BHAGIRATH KARWASRA & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 342 SBCWP No. 3366/2012 RAKESH & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 343 SBCWP No. 3368/2012 RAM KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 344 SBCWP No. 3369/2012 GAJENDRA SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 345 SBCWP No. 3370/2012 SHANKAR LAL JAKHAR & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 346 SBCWP No. 3379/2012 PRABHUDAYAL GODARA & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 347 SBCWP No. 3380/2012 RAJESH KUMAR BIJARANIYA & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 348 SBCWP No. 3381/2012 NAND KISHORE & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 349 SBCWP No. 3386/2012 GOPAL GIRI & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.





- 350 SBCWP No. 3387/2012 AMRIT LAL NANOMA & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 351 SBCWP No. 3388/2012 KISHAN LAL MEENA & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 352 SBCWP No. 3390/2012 NARENDRA PANWAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 353 SBCWP No. 3391/2012 ASHOK KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 354 SBCWP No. 3401/2012 REKHA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 355 SBCWP No. 3405/2012 DEEPNANDINI & ANR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 356 SBCWP No. 3410/2012 KISHAN GOPAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 357 SBCWP No. 3411/2012 HINGLAJ SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 358 SBCWP No. 3412/2012 ALPANA NAGOURI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 359 SBCWP No. 3413/2012 RAJARAM & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 360 SBCWP No. 3414/2012 MANOJ KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 361 SBCWP No. 3415/2012 ANIL KUMAR MEENA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 362 SBCWP No. 3418/2012 NARSINGA RAM KARWASRA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 363 SBCWP No. 3420/2012 LALIT KUMAR DAVE & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 364 SBCWP No. 3421/2012 HARCHARAN SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 365 SBCWP No. 3422/2012 TARUN KUMAR TRIVEDI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 366 SBCWP No. 3423/2012 BHANWAR LAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 367 SBCWP No. 3424/2012 RAMESH KUMAR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 368 SBCWP No. 3425/2012 RAJENDRA KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 369 SBCWP No. 3426/2012 JAS RAJ CHOUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 370 SBCWP No. 3427/2012 RAJESH KUMAR GARG Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 371 SBCWP No. 3429/2012 BINDU & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 372 SBCWP No. 3430/2012 NAGA RAM & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 373 SBCWP No. 3431/2012 KULDEEP KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 374 SBCWP No. 3432/2012 RAMESH CHANDRA MEENA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 375 SBCWP No. 3433/2012 ARVIND KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 376 SBCWP No. 3434/2012 BALBIR SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 377 SBCWP No. 3435/2012 SUNIL KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 378 SBCWP No. 3436/2012 KAMAL KISHORE PARGAR & ORS
Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 379 SBCWP No. 3437/2012 SARWAN KUMAR YADAV Vs.
STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 380 SBCWP No. 3438/2012 PRAVEEN KUMAR SWAMI & ORS
Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 381 SBCWP No. 3439/2012 YASHWANTI DEVI & ORS Vs.
STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 382 SBCWP No. 3440/2012 ANITA BAI MEENA Vs. STATE
(RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 383 SBCWP No. 3441/2012 GURDEEP SINGH Vs. STATE
(RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 384 SBCWP No. 3442/2012 GURPREET KAUR & ORS Vs.
STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 385 SBCWP No. 3443/2012 SADEEK MOHAMMAD & ORS Vs.
STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 386 SBCWP No. 3445/2012 MANOJ KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE
(RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 387 SBCWP No. 3446/2012 VINOD KUMAR PUNIYA & ORS Vs.
STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 388 SBCWP No. 3447/2012 RAMESH KUMAR SUTHAR & ORS
& ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 389 SBCWP No. 3448/2012 SUBHASH CHANDER & ORS Vs.
STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 390 SBCWP No. 3428/2012 JYOTI GIRDHAR Vs. STATE (PAN.
RAJ.) & ORS
- 391 SBCWP No. 3449/2012 MS. KRISHNA BHAKAR & ORS Vs.
STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 392 SBCWP No. 3452/2012 SHAILINI VYAS & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 393 SBCWP No. 3454/2012 POONAMA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 394 SBCWP No. 3456/2012 DALPAT PURI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 395 SBCWP No. 3457/2012 ASHOK KUMAR RAWAT & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 396 SBCWP No. 3458/2012 MANMOHAN SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 397 SBCWP No. 3459/2012 GAYATRI CHOUHAN Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 398 SBCWP No. 3464/2012 MISS REKHA PANWAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 399 SBCWP No. 3465/2012 MOTA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 400 SBCWP No. 3467/2012 SHYAM SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 401 SBCWP No. 3469/2012 SAROJ CHOUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 402 SBCWP No. 3470/2012 MADAN LAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 403 SBCWP No. 3474/2012 ANAND PURI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 404 SBCWP No. 3477/2012 JOHAN SINGH DEVDA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 405 SBCWP No. 3478/2012 VINOD KUMAR PATIDAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS





- 406 SBCWP No. 3479/2012 HASEENA BANO & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 407 SBCWP No. 3481/2012 SANJAY KUMAR TANWAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 408 SBCWP No. 3484/2012 RADHA KRISHAN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 409 SBCWP No. 3485/2012 NAND SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 410 SBCWP No. 3486/2012 ARJUN LAL CHOUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 411 SBCWP No. 3487/2012 ASHA AMETA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 412 SBCWP No. 3489/2012 LAL CHAND & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 413 SBCWP No. 3490/2012 PANKAJ SHARMA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 414 SBCWP No. 3492/2012 HANUMAN RAM & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 415 SBCWP No. 3493/2012 SURYA KANT BHATI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 416 SBCWP No. 3494/2012 RAM KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 417 SBCWP No. 3495/2012 JAI NARAYAN & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 418 SBCWP No. 3496/2012 RAJA RAM GILA BISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 419 SBCWP No. 3508/2012 TARA CHAND & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 420 SBCWP No. 3528/2012 RAHUL GOSWAMI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 421 SBCWP No. 3534/2012 SUSHILA PANWAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 422 SBCWP No. 3562/2012 PADAM SINGH RATNU & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ANR
- 423 SBCWP No. 3582/2012 HARI RAM NAI & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 424 SBCWP No. 2558/2012 SMT. SHIWANI ACHARAYA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 425 SBCWP No. 2566/2012 SMT. PARIKSHA Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 426 SBCWP No. 3559/2012 MAHAVEER SINGH BHATI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 427 SBCWP No. 3563/2012 RAMNARAYAN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ANR
- 428 SBCWP No. 3564/2012 SAJJAN KUMAR BISSU & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 429 SBCWP No. 3565/2012 BABULAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 430 SBCWP No. 3567/2012 RAMESH KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 431 SBCWP No. 3569/2012 DHARMVEER & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 432 SBCWP No. 3578/2012 SUKH DEV & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 433 SBCWP No. 3579/2012 MANISHA SHARMA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 434 SBCWP No. 3580/2012 SMT. MEENA SWAMI & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 435 SBCWP No. 3583/2012 RAMKARAN GODARA & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ANR.
- 436 SBCWP No. 3584/2012 BHANWANA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 437 SBCWP No. 3586/2012 MISS KOSHALYA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 438 SBCWP No. 3592/2012 DEVENDRA KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 439 SBCWP No. 3593/2012 KALU RAM JAKHAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 440 SBCWP No. 3595/2012 SURYA PRAKASH MEENA & ANR Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ANR.
- 441 SBCWP No. 3601/2012 SHYAM SUNDER BISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 442 SBCWP No. 3602/2012 KISHAN LAL JANI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 443 SBCWP No. 3603/2012 VISHNU DEV BISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 444 SBCWP No. 3607/2012 SANJHU LATA BISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 445 SBCWP No. 3626/2012 SATYA PRAKASH SAHARAN & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 446 SBCWP No. 3628/2012 BHAGWATI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 447 SBCWP No. 3643/2012 NARESH KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS





- 448 SBCWP No. 3699/2012 BALVINDER SHARMA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 449 SBCWP No. 3741/2012 ABHISHEK GODA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 450 SBCWP No. 2716/2012 RAVINDRA KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 451 SBCWP No. 2719/2012 BHUPESH CHARAN & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 452 SBCWP No. 2723/2012 SHEETAL JAGGA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 453 SBCWP No. 2724/2012 SANDEEP KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 454 SBCWP No. 2725/2012 RAM DAYAL & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS.
- 455 SBCWP No. 2730/2012 JITENDRA VERMA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 456 SBCWP No. 2735/2012 VISHAL GURJAR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 457 SBCWP No. 2738/2012 SHANTI CHOUDHARY Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 458 SBCWP No. 2746/2012 MUKESH BERA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 459 SBCWP No. 3738/2012 ASHOK KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 460 SBCWP No. 3745/2012 RAJU SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ANR
- 461 SBCWP No. 3749/2012 SHAMSHAD BANO & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ANR





- 462 SBCWP No. 3755/2012 PAWAN KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 463 SBCWP No. 2752/2012 MOHAN RAM MEGHWAL & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 464 SBCWP No. 2754/2012 SUNITA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 465 SBCWP No. 2755/2012 JITENDRA KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 466 SBCWP No. 2756/2012 MUKESH DAVE Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 467 SBCWP No. 2769/2012 VEERAM RAM PATEL Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ANR
- 468 SBCWP No. 2779/2012 SOMVEER SINGH & ANR. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 469 SBCWP No. 2781/2012 CHANDRA SHEKHAR DANTLA Vs. STATE & ORS
- 470 SBCWP No. 2782/2012 SHYAM LAL SUTHAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 471 SBCWP No. 2783/2012 CHHAGAN SINGH Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 472 SBCWP No. 2785/2012 SATPAL BHAMBHU & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 473 SBCWP No. 2786/2012 BAJRANG PRASAD & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 474 SBCWP No. 2787/2012 ASHOK KUMAR RAJPUROHIT & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 475 SBCWP No. 2790/2012 DR. RAKESH KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 476 SBCWP No. 2793/2012 RAKESH KUMAR DAVE & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 477 SBCWP No. 2795/2012 LEELA RAM DEVASEE & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 478 SBCWP No. 2796/2012 BALDEV CHAUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 479 SBCWP No. 2797/2012 BHAGIRATH JAKHAR & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 480 SBCWP No. 2798/2012 PREM KUMAR BISHNOI & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 481 SBCWP No. 2799/2012 RAJ KUMAR JAIN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 482 SBCWP No. 3780/2012 UTTAM KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 483 SBCWP No. 3865/2012 NIDHI SHARMA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 484 SBCWP No. 3873/2012 KABEERA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 485 SBCWP No. 3945/2012 SMT. KALPANA SWAMI & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 486 SBCWP No. 3946/2012 RAJENDRA KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 487 SBCWP No. 3955/2012 HEMLATA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 488 SBCWP No. 3966/2012 BHADAR SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 489 SBCWP No. 4007/2012 CHAIN SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS





- 490 SBCWP No. 4043/2012 MAHESH KUMAR HARSWAL & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 491 SBCWP No. 4044/2012 RAMNARAYAN CHOYAL & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 492 SBCWP No. 4047/2012 SANDEEP OLA & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 493 SBCWP No. 4048/2012 MEGH SINGH RATHORE & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 494 SBCWP No. 4060/2012 PRABHU LAL TELI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 495 SBCWP No. 4077/2012 MAAN SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 496 SBCWP No. 4094/2012 MUKESH KUMAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 497 SBCWP No. 4095/2012 BHAGIRATH SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 498 SBCWP No. 4100/2012 RAJMAL BUJH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 499 SBCWP No. 4104/2012 HAPU RAM CHOUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 500 SBCWP No. 4118/2012 SATYA PRASNN SINGH & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 501 SBCWP No. 4119/2012 AJIT SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 502 SBCWP No. 4176/2012 SAROJ SAHARAN & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ANR
- 503 SBCWP No. 4177/2012 NAND LAL & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 504 SBCWP No. 4185/2012 RAJ KUMAR MEGHWAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 505 SBCWP No. 4186/2012 PRAMILA CHOUDHARY & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 506 SBCWP No. 4189/2012 NEETI SANADHYA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 507 SBCWP No. 4190/2012 MAMTA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 508 SBCWP No. 4196/2012 SURENDRA SINGH CHARAN & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 509 SBCWP No. 4254/2012 DAYA KANWAR & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 510 SBCWP No. 4260/2012 MANJU KADWASARA Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 511 SBCWP No. 4261/2012 DULA RAM Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 512 SBCWP No. 4271/2012 BANKA RAM Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 513 SBCWP No. 4290/2012 LEELA Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 514 SBCWP No. 4291/2012 ROOPA Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 515 SBCWP No. 4292/2012 DEEPAK & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 516 SBCWP No. 4293/2012 KUSUM LATA Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 517 SBCWP No. 4294/2012 BHANWARI Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.





- 518 SBCWP No. 4313/2012 ARUN KUMAR SHARMA & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ANR
- 519 SBCWP No. 4328/2012 RAJU VAISHNAV & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 520 SBCWP No. 4340/2012 SUMAN BERWAL & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 521 SBCWP No. 4342/2012 NARENDRA KUMAR DELU & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 522 SBCWP No. 4346/2012 ARUN PAREEK & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 523 SBCWP No. 4348/2012 ANIRUDH SHRIMALI Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 524 SBCWP No. 4351/2012 RAM RATAN LAKHERA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 525 SBCWP No. 4352/2012 CHET RAM SERADIA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 526 SBCWP No. 4353/2012 SANWAR RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 527 SBCWP No. 4361/2012 REKHA SHARMA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 528 SBCWP No. 4395/2012 PUSHPA KHATRI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 529 SBCWP No. 4405/2012 SUMAN BISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 530 SBCWP No. 4406/2012 KAMLA Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 531 SBCWP No. 4425/2012 KIRAN & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS





- 532 SBCWP No. 4465/2012 SMT. DURGA RAIDAS & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 533 SBCWP No. 4471/2012 SUBHASH CHANDRA & ORS Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 534 SBCWP No.4491/2012 KISHNA RAM Vs. STATE OF RAJ. & ORS.
- 535 SBCWP No. 4509/2012 MAHENDER KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 536 SBCWP No. 4535/2012 SHAILENDRA MIRDHA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 537 SBCWP No. 4569/2012 RAMESHWAR LAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 538 SBCWP No. 4589/2012 PRADEEP KUMAR YADAV & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 539 SBCWP No. 4601/2012 SHALU MEENA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 540 SBCWP No. 4603/2012 BIRU RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 541 SBCWP No. 4604/2012 SANJAY GODARA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 542 SBCWP No. 4610/2012 SOHAN LAL BERA & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 543 SBCWP No. 4978/2012 SOHAN LAL BISHNOI & ORS Vs. STATE & ANR
- 544 SBCWP No. 4622/2012 NIRMALA KUMARI Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 545 SBCWP No. 4623/2012 PAWAN SHARMA & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ANR





- 546 SBCWP No. 4625/2012 POOJA SHARMA & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 547 SBCWP No. 4629/2012 INDER KUMAR Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 548 SBCWP No. 4637/2012 SAPNA CHAWLA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 549 SBCWP No. 4645/2012 SMT. PRAMILA PALIWAL & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 550 SBCWP No. 4650/2012 BHERU SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 551 SBCWP No. 4656/2012 MUKESH & ORS Vs. STATE & ANR
- 552 SBCWP No. 4661/2012 JONI SHEKHAWAT & ORS. Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 553 SBCWP No. 4710/2012 MADAN LAL AHEER & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 554 SBCWP No. 4714/2012 ROHITASH KUMAR MEENA & ANR Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 555 SBCWP No. 4719/2012 SANTOSH KUMARI & ANR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 556 SBCWP No. 4720/2012 SURESH KUMAR BADARIA & ANR. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 557 SBCWP No. 4721/2012 RAJENDRA KUMAR SONKARIYA & ANR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 558 SBCWP No. 4723/2012 MAHENDRA SINGH GODARA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 559 SBCWP No. 4726/2012 TINA PARIHAR Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ANR





- 560 SBCWP No. 4730/2012 ASHA GAUR & ANR Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 561 SBCWP No. 4731/2012 LOKESH PALIWAL & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 562 SBCWP No. 4732/2012 VIRENDRA SINGH SHEKHAWAT & ORS Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 563 SBCWP No. 4748/2012 KISHAN SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 564 SBCWP No. 4750/2012 PRIYA RAJ & ORS. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 565 SBCWP No. 4755/2012 BHANWAR LAL Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 566 SBCWP No. 4756/2012 ASHOK & ANR. Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 567 SBCWP No. 4757/2012 SANTOSH KUMAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 568 SBCWP No. 4758/2012 POOJA KANWAR & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 569 SBCWP No. 4759/2012 SMT. PUSHPA Vs. STATE (PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 570 SBCWP No. 4760/2012 ANKITA VAGARECHA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 571 SBCWP No. 4761/2012 MAHESH CHANDRA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS
- 572 SBCWP No. 4762/2012 MULA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE.& PAN. RAJ.) & ORS
- 573 SBCWP No. 4766/2012 SURJA RAM & ORS Vs. STATE (RURAL DEVE. & PAN. RAJ.) & ORS





- 574 SBCWP No. 4777/2012 MUKESH VARHAT & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 575 SBCWP No. 4790/2012 RAMPHAL & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS
- 576 SBCWP No. 4791/2012 BABU LAL & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 577 SBCWP No. 4795/2012 RAMDEV BORANA & ORS Vs. STATE (EDUCATION) & ORS.
- 578 SBCWP No. 4797/2012 MANI RAM & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 579 SBCWP No. 4856/2012 PUKH RAJ MALI & ORS. Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 580 SBCWP No. 5022/2012 SOMVEER SINGH & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 581 SBCWP No. 5120/2012 RAJU KUMARI MEGHWAL Vs. STATE & ORS.
- 582 SBCWP No. 5124/2012 MANDEEP KAUR & ORS Vs. STATE & ORS.

