

(2018) 10 RAJ CK 0011
In the Rajasthan High Court
Case No : Civil Writ No. 15276 of 2018

Anada Ram @APPELLANT@Hash State Of Rajasthan

Date of Decision : 04-10-2018

Acts Referred:

Rajasthan Education Subordinate Service Rules, 1971 — Rule 20, 21

Citation : (2018) 10 RAJ CK 0011

Hon'ble Judges : Arun Bhansali, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Surendra Singh

Final Decision : Disposed Off

Judgement

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the issue involved in present writ petition is squarely covered by the judgment rendered by Jaipur

Bench of this Honâ??ble Court in case of Surja Ram & Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors. â?? SBCW No.3082/2018, decided on 09.02.2018. The

judgment reads as under:-

â??The controversy raised in the instant writ application is no more res-integra in view of the adjudication made in the case of Suman Bai & Anr. Vs.

State of Rajasthan & Ors.: 2009 (1) WLC (Raj.) 381, wherein the Coordinate Bench of this Court observed thus: â??5. Upon consideration of the

arguments aforesaid and the judgment of the Divisionm Bench in Hari Ram and the subsequent order dated 21.7.2001 whereby clarification

mapplication of the State Government was dismissed, I find that the entitlement of the petitioner for appointment on the basis of originally prepared

merit list cannot be denied. If admittedly the candidates, who are lower in merit, have been granted appointment, those who are above them in the

merit cannot be denied such right of appointment. Seniority as per the rules in

the case of direct recruitment on the post in question is required to be assigned on the basis of placement of candidates in the select list and when the selection is common and the merit list on the basis of which appointments were made is also common, right to secure appointment to both the set of employees thus flows from their selection which in turn is based on merit. Regard being had to all these facts, merely because one batch of employee approached this Court later and another earlier, and both of them having been appointed, the candidates who appeared 6 lower in merit cannot certainly be placed at a higher place in seniority. It was on this legal analogy that Division Bench of this Court in Niyaz Mohd.Khan (supra) held that the petitioner therein entitled to be placed in seniority in order of merit of common selection amongst persons appointed in pursuance of the same selection with effect from the date person lower in order of merit than the petitioner was appointed with consequential benefits.

6. I am not inclined to accept the argument of the learned counsel for the respondents No.4 to 8 that the judgment of the learned Single Judge should be so read so as to infer therefrom that though the petitioners would be entitled to claim appointment but not seniority above the candidates who are already appointed even though they admittedly are above them in the merit list. Infact, the judgment of the learned Single Judge merely reiterated the direction of the Division Bench in Hari Ram (supra) in favour of the petitioners. But construction of that judgment in the manner in which the respondents want this Court to do, would negat the mandate of the Rules 20 and 21 of the Rajasthan Education Subordinate Service Rules, 1971, which requires seniority to be assigned as per the inter-se merit of 7 the candidates in the merit list based on common selection. Even otherwise, no such intention of the Court is discernible from reading of that judgment. Mere appointment of the petitioner was a sufficient compliance of the judgment and not total compliance was the view taken by this Court also when contempt petition filed by the petitioners was dismissed. Question with regard to correct and wrong assignment of seniority having arisen subsequent to appointment of the petitioners would obviously give rise to a afresh cause of action. The writ petition filed by the petitioners, therefore, cannot be thrown either barred by resjudicata or otherwise improperly constituted.

7. In the result, this writ petition is allowed and the respondents are directed to

treat the petitioners senior to respondents No.4 to 8 as per their placement in the merit list.â??

Applying the principle, as extracted hereinabove, to the facts of the case at hand the factual position emerges is that the petitioners participated in the recruitment process in response to advertisement issued by Zila Parishad in the year 2012, inviting the applications from the eligible candidates for appointment on the post of Teacher Grade III. It is also not in dispute that the petitioners earlier instituted writ applications and as a consequence of directions issued by this Court, the result was revised in the month of November, 2016; resulting into appointment of the petitioners on the post of Teacher Grade III (Level I/Level-II).

Undeniably, the petitioners have already been accorded appointment. However, State-respondents have declined seniority and other benefits to the petitioners from the date the petitioners became entitled on account of revision of the result while candidates lower in merit to the petitioners have been accorded those benefits. Thus, the petitioners have claimed benefit of pay fixation and seniority on notional basis from the date juniors to the petitioners, have been accorded in the same recruitment process of the year 2012.

Accordingly, the State-respondents are directed to extend the benefit of pay fixation and seniority on notional basis to the petitioners from the date junior(s) to the petitioner(s) has/have been accorded with reference to the same recruitment process of the year of 2012.

In view of above, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the issue of petitioners in terms of the judgment of Surja Ram (Supra) by a speaking order within a period of 30 days from today.