
(2019) 01 RAJ CK 0028
In the Rajasthan High Court
Case No : Civil Writ No. 212 Of 2019

Kishore Kumar And Ors

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Rajasthan And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 04-01-2019

Acts Referred:

Rajasthan Educational Sub-ordinate Service Rules, 1971 — Rule 6(D)

Citation : (2019) 01 RAJ CK 0028

Hon'ble Judges : Arun Bhansali, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Rajendra Katariya

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioners aggrieved against order dated 22.12.2018 (Annexure-P/3), whereby, the representation made by the petitioners has been rejected.

Aggrieved against the order passed under Rule 6(D) of the Rajasthan Educational Sub-ordinate Service Rules, 1971 ('Rules of 1971') the petitioners had approached this Court by way of filing S.B.C.W.P. No. 8625/2018, which came to be decided by order dated 20.06.2018, whereby, the respondents were directed to decide the representation of the petitioners by passing a speaking order within a period of 30 days from the date of order.

Pursuant thereto, the representation made by the petitioners has been decided by the impugned order.

The grievance raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is that this Court directed the respondents to decide the representation within a period of 30 days from the date of order, however, the same has been decided after six months. Further submissions have been made that the representation made by the petitioners has been decided cursorily and, therefore, the same requires interference by this Court.

I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners and have perused the material available on record.

A perusal of the order Annexure-3 indicates that the respondents have noticed all the issues raised by the petitioners and have dealt with the same appropriately. Looking to the nature of issues raised by the petitioners, it cannot be said that the determination made is cursory in any manner.

In view thereof and in so far as the merit of the order passed is concerned, the same does not call for any interference.

So far as the ground of delay raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is concerned, it was expected of the respondents to meticulously comply with the directions issued by this Court. However, merely on account of delay caused, the order does not stand vitiated.

In view of above discussion, there is no substance in the writ petition and the same is, therefore, dismissed.