

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN BENCH AT
JAIPUR**

S.B.Civil Writ Petition No. 3045 / 2017

1. Ramavtar Gupta S/o Om Prakash Vaidya,, Aged About 37 Years,
Plot No. 42, Private Bus Stand Colony, Gangapur City, District
Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
2. Yogendra Sharma S/o Ratan Lal Sharma,, Aged About 36 Years,
H.No. 1122, Mahaveer Nagar First, District Kota, Rajasthan
3. Girish Kumar Sharma S/o Shyam Lal Sharma,, Aged About 39
Years, 208, Divanath Ji Ka Rasta, Chandpole Bazar, District Jaipur,
Rajasthan
4. Anil Kumar Pareek,, Near Vodafone Tower, Ward No. 34,
Pandithpur, Ratangarh, District Churu, Rajasthan
5. Rajendra Kumar Chauhan S/o Tika Ram Chauhan,, Aged About
40 Years, B-34, Ganesh Nagar, Shoypur, Sanganer, District Jaipur,
Rajasthan
6. Mohit Prajapat S/o Kishan Lal,, Aged About 25 Years, Ward No.
1, Subhash Colony, Nawa City, District Nagaur, Rajasthan
7. Mangal Singh S/o Ratan Lal Mali,, Aged About 31 Years, Behind
New Telephone Exchange City Road, Madanganj, Kishangarh,
District Ajmer, Rajasthan
8. Mukesh Kumar Gupta S/o Ram Dayal Gupta,, Aged About 31
Years, V/P Gubrenda, Tehsil Masalpur, District Karauli, Rajasthan
9. Amit Khandelwal S/o Late Sh. Panna Lal,, Aged About 27 Years,
H.No. 5, Anand Vihar, Tekri Madri Link Road, Road No. 1, District
Udaipur, Rajasthan
10. Chandra Shekhar Soni S/o Satya Narayan Soni,, Aged About
41 Years, Near Govt. School, Ward No. 8, Mukundgarh, Jhunjhunu

-----Petitioners

Versus

Rajasthan Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary,,
Ajmer

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Ram Pratap Saini

For Respondent(s) :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VEERENDR SINGH SIRADHANA

Judgment / Order**28/02/2017**

Learned counsel for the petitioners, at the very outset, submits that the controversy raised in the instant writ application is no more res-integra in view of the adjudication made by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in S.B. Civil Writ petition No. 9170/2012: ***Datar Singh v. State of Rajasthan & Ors.***, which has been upheld by the Division Bench; wherein the respondent No.2 was directed to make necessary corrections in the application form submitted online by the petitioners and the persons alike on or before 13th September, 2012, if such persons point out the errors by submitting representations on or before 24th September, 2012.

Learned counsel further submits that the opinion in the case of Datar Singh (supra) was also relied in the case of Ajay Kumar Mishra & Ors., which has been confirmed even by the Supreme Court in SLP No. 3673/2017, decided on 13th February, 2017.

It is further contended that the petitioners, at this stage, would be satisfied if the respondent-Commission is directed to decide their representation, 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 petitioners to address a comprehensive representation enclosing a copy of the order in the case of Datar Singh (supra) and in case of Ajay Kumar Mishra & Ors., wherein SLP has been declined.

In case, a representation is so addressed within the

aforesaid period, the respondent-Commission is directed to consider and decide the same by a reasoned and speaking order, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible; however, in no case later than four weeks 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 as well as stay application stand disposed off.

(VEERENDR SINGH SIRADHANA)J.

Pooja/240

