
(2021) 02 RAJ CK 0129

In the Rajasthan High Court

Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 11631 Of 2020

Rita Sanadhaya

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Rajasthan And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 23-02-2021

Acts Referred:

Rajasthan Civil Services(Revised Pay Scale) Rules, 2008 — Rule 3, 14

Citation : (2021) 02 RAJ CK 0129

Hon'ble Judges : Dinesh Mehta, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Abhishek Sharma

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the controversy raised in the instant writ petition is no more res-integra in view of the adjudication made in the case of Ramesh Chand Saini & ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.: D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4253/2019, wherein the

Division Bench of this Court observed that:

During the course of arguments, Mr. Ram Pratap Saini, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners has submitted that he does not press

the challenge to Rule 14 of the Rules of 2008 on peculiar facts of this case provided the State Government is directed to consider petitioners' case for

grant of one time relaxation to them.

Selection of the petitioners as Upper Primary Teachers was made with the Primary Teachers. Candidates of both the categories appeared in the

common written examination and participated in process of selection. Common merit list was prepared, but the appointments were given on the basis

of qualification/eligibility of the candidates. Appointments of the Primary Teachers were made on 24.09.2007, but the State Government delayed appointments of the petitioners as Upper Primary Teachers and eventually their appointment orders were issued on 01.01.2008. In between, State Government vide notification dated 12.09.2008 promulgated Rajasthan Civil Services(Revised Pay Scale) Rules, 2008. According to Rule 14 of the Rules of 2008, batch of the candidates appointed on the post of Primary Teachers received increment on 01.07.2010 since they completed one year probation period after their appointment before the applicability of the aforesaid notification, but in the case of petitioners, since their appointment was delayed, they could not complete their probation and their increment would be delayed by one year and would be payable on 01.07.2011. Learned counsel has invited attention of the Court towards Rule 3 of the Rules of 2008, where the Governor retains the power to relax the rule in the case of undue hardship in any particular case.

Prima facie, we are satisfied that it is a case of hardship, but since the State Government has not examined this matter, we refrain from expressing any further opinion, except requiring the State Government to have the case of the petitioners examined for grant of one time relaxation, so as to consider their case and bring them at par with the Primary Teachers appointed in the same process of selection held in pursuance of same advertisement by granting them one increment, may be notionally, with effect from 01.07.2010 considering that they were actually in service on that date and even prior thereto.

We, therefore, direct the State Government to undertake necessary exercise and pass appropriate order with regard thereto within a period of four months from the date of production of copy of this order. It goes without saying that in case grievances of the petitioners are not remedied, the petitioners would be at liberty to file fresh writ petition with the same prayer as made in the present writ petition and also incorporating challenge to the order that may be passed by the State Government.

It is further contended that in S.B.Civil Writ Petition No.10692/2018 (Lekhraj Meena & ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan& ors.) decided on 17.5.2018, similar view was taken by a coordinate Bench of this Court.

Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner would be satisfied, if the

State-respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner, in the backdrop of the adjudication in the case of Ramesh Chand Saini & Ors. (supra), within a time frame, which they are ready and willing to address within two weeks hereinafter.

In view of the limited prayer addressed; the instant writ proceedings are closed with a direction to the petitioner to address a comprehensive representation enclosing a copy of the order in the case of Ramesh Chand Saini & ors. (supra).

In case, a representation is so addressed within the aforesaid period, the State-respondents are directed to consider and decide the same by a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the representation along with a certified copy of this order.

With the observations and directions, as indicated above, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Stay petition also stands disposed of.