



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT  
JODHPUR**

(1) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1785/2021

Ambika Nehra D/o Rajesh Kumar Nehra, Aged About 26 Years,  
R/o Vpo Balod Bhakharan Tehsil Fatehpur, District Sikar (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary Education Department, Government Of Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director (Secondary Education), Directorate Bikaner District Bikaner.
3. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer, District Ajmer.

-----Respondents

Connected With

(2) S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1213/2021

Sunita Kumari D/o Hari Ram Bhakar W/o Rajesh Nehra, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Post Kari Tehsil Nawalgarh District Jhunjhunu (Raj.) At Present R/o Care Of Rajesh Nehra 164/1 St Area Air Force Station Amla, District Betul Madhya Pradesh.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary Education Department, Government Of Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director (Secondary Education), Directorate Bikaner District Bikaner.
3. Rajasthan Public Service Commission Ajmer, District Ajmer Through Its Secretary.

-----Respondents

---

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Sushil Bishnoi  
For Respondent(s) : Mr. Vinit Sanadhya  
Mr. Sarwan Kumar

---

**JUSTICE DINESH MEHTA**  
**Order**

**12/09/2023**

1. By way of present writ petitions, the petitioners have challenged the answer key published by the respondent -



Rajasthan Public Service Commission in relation to question No.72.

2. Mr. Sushil Bishnoi, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the respondents had shown correct option in the model answer key but after deciding the objections, the same has been changed from D to B.

3. Learned counsel argued that the earlier option given by the respondent-Commission i.e. 'D' was the correct option and the respondents have committed an apparent error in preparing the final answer key.

4. Learned counsel tried to satisfy the Court about the error and incongruity in the answer key.

5. Mr. Vinit Sanadhya, learned counsel appearing for the respondent – Rajasthan Public Service Commission, at the outset, submitted that the recruitment which was initiated by the advertisement dated 13.04.2018 has attained finality. He further submitted that pursuant to the intervention granted by this Court, three committees have been constituted for examining the validity/correctness of various questions which included the question No.72 also, about which the petitioners have raised grievance.

6. Learned counsel submitted that since three expert committees have given their consistent opinion, this Court not being the expert on the subject should refrain from delving into the matter and examine the correctness of the answer adopted by the Commission.

7. Mr. Bishnoi, learned counsel for the petitioners in, rejoinder, vehemently argued that question No.72 and its answer does not





require any expert's opinion and this Court being well versed with law can conclude the correct answer to the question, which relates to the provision of the Right to Information Act, 2005.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the opinion that even if there is some substance in what has been argued by Mr. Sushil Bishnoi, no interference can be made at this stage. The recruitment process has to be given finality at some juncture. If answer to one question is not in conformity with the petitioners' perception, the entire result cannot be upturned.

9. That apart, since three consecutive committees of the experts had examined almost all questions, including the contentious question No.72, this Court does not feel persuaded to interfere in the matter, being guided by the principles laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of **Vikesh Kumar Gupta and Anr. Vs. The State of Rajasthan and Ors.** reported in **(2021) 2 SCC 309**.

10. The petitions therefore fail.

11. The stay petitions also stand disposed of accordingly.

**(DINESH MEHTA),J**

400-401-Arvind/-

