
(2012) 04 RAJ CK 0004
In the Rajasthan High Court
Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 2164 of 2012

Santosh Kumari

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Rajasthan and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 02-04-2012

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2012) 04 RAJ CK 0004

Hon'ble Judges : Dinesh Maheshwari, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Rajender Soni, for the Appellant;

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Dinesh Maheshwari

1. The petitioner, who is said to have rendered services until 28.02.2012 as Pracheta with the Women and Child Development Department, Khajuwala, Bikaner pursuant to the order dated 01.06.2011 after having been sent by a placement agency, has filed this writ petition seeking the following reliefs:

"(i) the termination of the services of the petitioner from the post of Pracheta may kindly be quashed and set aside.

(ii) the respondents may kindly be directed to keep the petitioner continue on the post of Pracheta and directed to extend the service tenure of the petitioner.

(iii) Any other appropriate writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper may kindly be passed in favour of the petitioner."

The learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to an order dated 25.02.2011 as passed in CWP No. 1711/2011 wherein, after noticing the submissions that the respondents were going to employ other persons through voluntary agency, a co-ordinate Bench, while admitting the writ petition, directed by way of interim order that if after discontinuation of the services of the petitioners, the

respondents want to give fresh appointment on the post of Pracheta, first preference shall be given to the petitioners irrespective of any recommendation by voluntary agency. Such a relief has not been claimed in this writ petition.

2. The petitioner, rather, claims quashing of the so-called order of termination of her services and for directions to the respondents to continue her on the post of Pracheta. The petitioner was engaged for rendering services through placement agency until a particular date, i.e., 28.02.2012; and the term of the contract being already over, the relief as prayed for in this writ petition cannot be granted. It further appears from the document placed on record (Annex.4) that the respondents seek to engage the other in-service persons on deputation for such work of Pracheta. Such a process cannot be said to be that of engagement through any placement agency. No case of infringement of any existing legal right is made out so as to call for interference in the writ jurisdiction.

The petition fails and is, therefore, dismissed.