

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR
BEFORE**

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE GURPAL SINGH AHLUWALIA

ON THE 23rd OF AUGUST, 2023

WRIT PETITION No.4783 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. VAISHALI WADHWANI D/O DILEEP WADHWANI, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MAINS ROLL NO.104389 R/O SINDHI COLONY, STATION GANJ DISTRICT NARSINGHPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MANU SAXENA D/O YOGENDRA SAXENA, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MAINS ROLL NO. 106567 R/O H.NO.14, KUNDAN NAGAR BEGMUGALIA, TEHSIL HUZUR, DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. VINDHYA MISHRA D/O SHRI CHANDRA KANT MISHRA, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MAINS ROLL NO. 110367 R/O 15/1635, SAMAN BANDH, TEHSIL HUZUR, DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)
4. PRAGYA DWIVEDI D/O SHRI RAJKARAN DWIVEDI, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MAINS ROLL NO. 104341 R/O VILLAGE KUDIYA KOTHAR, TEHSIL RAMPUR NAIKIN, DISTRICT SIDHI (MADHYA PRADESH)
5. MAMTA MISHRA D/O SHRI K.B. MISHRA, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MAINS ROLL NO. 100579 R/O NEAR BAPU SIKSHA MANDIR, ANAND NAGAR BODA BAGH, DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)
6. ANJALI TOMAR W/O JATIN SINGH KAMBOJ, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MAINS ROLL

**NO. 105665 R/O 41/42 PRINCE COLONY,
VILLAGE SHAHJAHANBAD, TEHSIL
HUZUR, DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

- 7. HARSHIKA BHARGAVA D/O MAHESH
KUMAR BHARGAVA, AGED ABOUT 27
YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019
MANIS ROLL NO. 104900 R/O NABAB SAHAB
ROAD, NEAR AIRTEL TOWER, DISTRICT
SHIVPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 8. RUPAL JAIN D/O SHRI NARENDRA KUMAR
JAIN, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MAINS ROLL
NO. 100066 R/O GRAM POST BANDRI BANDA
ROAD, DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA
PRADESH)**
- 9. ASTHA CHOUBEY D/O SHRI RAMPRAKASH
CHOUBEY, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MAINS ROLL
NO. 104672 R/O VILLAGE HILGAN, TEHSIL
SAGAR, DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA
PRADESH)**
- 10. HIMANSHI KUSHWAHA D/O MAHADEV
KUSHWAHA, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MANIS ROLL
NO. 102396 R/O 444, SWAMI VIVEKANAND
COLONY, ENGLISH PURA, DISTRICT
SEHORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 11. ANUSHRI SHUKLA D/O V.P. SHUKLA, AGED
ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT
2019 MANIS ROLL NO. 102410 R/O 988,
ADARSH NAGAR, MAKRONIA, DISTRICT
SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 12. KIRAN DHAKAD D/O NAVRANG DHAKAD,
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION:
STUDENT 2019 MANIS ROLL NO. 106028 R/O
WARD NO.02, A.B. ROAD, PACHORE,
TEHSIL SARANGPUR, DISTRICT RAJGARH
(MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 13. NEETU RAGHUWANSHI D/O SHIVRAJ
SINGH RAGHUWANSHI, AGED ABOUT 25
YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019
MANIS ROLL NO. 103902 R/O DALVI**

COLONY, DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)

- 14. PRANJUL GUPTA S/O MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MANIS ROLL NO. 109658 R/O BEHIND SP RESIDENCE, HATHIKHANA, TEHSIL SHIVPURI, DISTRICT SHIVPURI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 15. PRACHI JAIN D/O ANIL KUMAR JAIN, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MANIS ROLL NO. 101366 R/O 495, JAWAHARGANJ WARD, GARHA PHATAK, JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 16. TISHALI CHOUBEY D/O SANJAY KUMAR CHOUBEY, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MANIS ROLL NO. 106856 R/O P/162 SHIV NAGAR, DAMOH NAKA, DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 17. SUPRIYA PATHAK D/O RADHA VALLABH PATHAK, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MANIS ROLL NO. 106319 R/O MIG V-36 VASUNDHARA COLONY TEELA JAMALPURA DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 18. SHUBHI DIXIT D/O SHRI R.S. DIXIT, AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 2019 MANIS ROLL NO. 100451 R/O HIG H-88 DHANVANTRI NAGAR, SECTOR A, GARHA ROAD, DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI SANJAY K. AGRAWAL - ADVOCATE WITH SHRI AAKASH LALWANI - ADVOCATE)

AND

- 1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY**

RESIDENCY AREA, INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE AND INTERVENOR BY SHRI RAMESH SINGH THAKUR - ADVOCATE WITH SHRI VINAYAK PRASAD SHAH - ADVOCATE)

WRIT PETITION No. 11662 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. **JYOTI TIWARI D/O SHRI SANTOSH TIWARI, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT PRESENTLY RESIDING AT BUNGLOW NO 1, TEHSIL COLONY PIPAIRYA DISTT. NARMADAPURAM (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **RANU RAGHUWANSHI D/O SHRI VEER SINGH RAGHUWANSHI, AGED ABOUT 24 YEARS, R/O GRAM SINGAKHEDI, POST ATASEMAR BASODA, DISTRICT VIDISHA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. **THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA, INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

WRIT PETITION No. 12106 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

ANAND YADAV S/O SHRI HARVEER SINGH YADAV, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION:

STUDENT PRESENTLY RESIDING AT FLAT NO S
1 SWADESH APARTMENT PLOT NO 12
TRILANGA HUZUR DISTRICT BHOPAL
(MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONER

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 12109 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

ASTHA AGRAWAL D/O LATE SHRI ASHOK
AGRAWAL, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: GOVT. EMPLOYEE R/O
MAHATMA GANDHI WARD NO 2 RAILWAY
STATION ROAD TEHSIL BUDANI DISTT. SEHORE
(MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONER

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALALBH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS***(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*****WRIT PETITION No. 12121 of 2023****BETWEEN:-****AYUSHI SONI D/O SHRI SANJAY SONI
OCCUPATION: STUDENT D.O.B. 27/05/1998
PRESENTLY RESIDING AT 706 SNEH NAGAR
LINK ROAD JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)****.....PETITIONER*****(BY SHRI MANU V. JOHN - ADVOCATE)*****AND**

- 1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH
BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS***(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*****WRIT PETITION No. 12248 of 2023****BETWEEN:-**

- 1. MONALI KUNGANI D/O SHRI SHANKAR
KUNGANI, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 5 LANE D-1
KACHNAR CITY DISTRICT JABALPUR
(MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. BHAGWAN DAS RAJAK S/O SHRI B.L.RAJAK,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, OCCUPATION:
STUDENT GAYATRI NAGAR ADHARTAL
DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 3. AMAN CHOURASIA S/O SHRI
J.K.CHOURASIA, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: GOVT.EMPLOYEE EWS 629
KOTRA SULTANABAD KAMLA NAGAR
DISTT. BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**

4. **KARTAVYA AGRAWAL S/O PIYUSH AGRAWAL, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, OCCUPATION: GOVT.EMPLOYEE KATANGI DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
5. **ABHINAV DUBEY S/O SITARAM DUBEY, AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS, OCCUPATION: DENTIST R/O 99 MALVIYA NAGAR DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
6. **DEEKSHA PANDEY W/O ANIL DUBEY, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT H.NO. 113 GRAM POST JODAURI TEHSIL SIRMOUR DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
7. **ANKUR SHUKLA D/O SHRINIWAS SHUKLA, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION: GOVT.EMPLOYEE R/O H.NO. 426/1 PANEHRA TYPE I GCF ESTATE GOVT.QTR.DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
8. **SWATI SHARMA D/O BHANU PRASAD SHARMA, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT PRESENTLY RESIDING AT NEW LIG 41, NEAR POWER HOUSE, DHANWANTARI NAGAR, DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
9. **ANUSHRI CHOUDHARY D/O ARUN CHOUDHARY, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT PRESENTLY RESIDING AT 13/33, THAPAK MOHALLA, MAIN ROAD PATAN, DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. **THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION R/O VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

**(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE AND
INTERVENOR BY SHRI RAMESH SINGH THAKUR - ADVOCATE WITH SHRI
VINAYAK PRASAD SHAH - ADVOCATE)**

WRIT PETITION No. 12335 of 2023**BETWEEN:-**

1. SAPNA CHOURASIYA D/O SHRI CHINTAMAN CHOURASIYA, AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O SHASHTRI WARD PAGARA ROAD DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. BRAJESH KUMAR NAGAR S/O SHRI RAMCHANDR, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O MAHARANA PRATAP NAGAR, DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. MADHUMALINI BAKORIYA D/O SHRI MOTILAL BAKORIYA, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O G-11, AGRICULTURE TRAINING CENTRE, BETUL BAZAR, DISTRICT BETUL (MADHYA PRADESH)
4. ADITYA SINGH PARIHAR S/O SHRI JORAWAR SINGH PARIHAR, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT EMPLOYEE PRESENTLY RESIDING AT WARD NO.11, BEHIND MATA MANDIR, POST TAMIA, DISTRICT CHHINDWARA (MADHYA PRADESH)
5. PRACHI YADAV S/O SHRI RAJESH YADAV, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT PRESENTLY RESIDING AT 13, WARD NO.01, NEAR GYNDEEP SCHOOL, SHIVPUR, HOSHANGABAD DISTRICT HOSHANGABAD (MADHYA PRADESH)
6. ANURAG TAMRAKAR D/O SHRI D.K. TAMRAKAR, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 493 BAKSHWAHA DISTRICT CHHATARPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)
7. NAHID ANJUM D/O SHRI NAFIS ALAM,

**AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION:
GOVT. EMPLOYEE R/O DEEN KI KUTIYA,
LAJPAT PURA WARD, DISTRICT SAGAR
(MADHYA PRADESH)**

8. **ISHWAR SONI S/O RAJENDRA PRASAD
SONI, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO.11,
BEHIND MATA MANDIR, POST TAMIA,
DISTRICT CHHINDWARA (MADHYA
PRADESH)**
9. **KAMAL DUTT SHARMA S/O H.D. SHARMA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS, OCCUPATION:
PRIVATE JOB R/O P-17, IDEAL ESTATE
NARMADA ROAD, GVARIGHAT ROAD,
DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
10. **PRATIBHA BHALAVI D/O SHRI MANOHAR
BHALAVI, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO.13,
NEW MPEB COLONY NEAR SAI PUBLIC
SCHOOL, CHANDANGAON, DISTRICT
CHHINDWARA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
11. **SHIVANGI RAJAK D/O SHRI MOHAN LAL
RAJAK, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: GOVT. EMPLOYEE R/O
YADAV COLONY, BHAGAT SINGH WARD,
DISTRICT NARSINGHPUR (MADHYA
PRADESH)**
12. **ABHISHEK BANWARI S/O SHRI MAHESH
BANWARI, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, R/O
H.NO. 40 WARD NO.22 BEHIND TVS
SHOWROOM GARIMA NAGAR RASULIYA
DISTRICT HOSHANGABAD (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. **THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH
BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE**

**COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA, INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

***(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)***

WRIT PETITION No. 12447 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

- 1. BASUNDHRA MEENA D/O KAILASH CHAND MEENA, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: NIL WARD NO. 4 KAJALKHEDI DISTRICT HOSHANGABAD (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. PRIYANKA SHAKYA D/O SHRI SHIV KUMAR SHAKYA, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, D-65 NEW MINAL RESIDENCY J.K ROAD DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 3. AAKANKSHA PATHAK D/O SHRI VIRENDRA PATHAK, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE UMARI POST RITHI TEHSIL GURH DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 4. ANIKET TIWARI S/O LATE SHRI ONKAR TIWARI, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, R/O KOUSHALPURI COLONY DISTRICT TIKAMGARH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 5. SONAM BHILAWE D/O SHRI RADHELAL BHILAWE, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO. 06 CHIRCHIRA NAYEGAON DISTRICT SEONI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 6. SOURAV SINGH THAKUR S/O SHRI GOVIND SINGH THAKUR, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, R/O GRAM GULAR POST KHURAI DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 7. ARUN KARORIYA S/O SHRI ASHA RAM KARORIYA, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, T.23 SAINIK COLONY NEAR DURGA MANDIR BAIRAGARH DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**

8. **SATENDRA CHANSORIYA S/O RAMNARAYAN, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT WARD NO. 1 KISHANGARH ROAD AMANGANJ DISTRICT PANNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
9. **DHARAM SINGH S/O RAMESHCHAND, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 49/2 TOLKA KHEDA TEHSIL JAWAR DISTRICT SEHORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**
10. **ARUN BARKHANE S/O SHRI ARJUN BARKHANE, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT H.NO. 12 PRESTINE VILLA INDUS TOWN DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
11. **BHUPENDRA SINGH THAKUR S/O SHRI LALLOO SINGH THAKUR, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 4/1 CHANDRA SEKHAR WARD 16 NEAR RSK OFFICE LINK ROAD DISTRICT BETUL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
12. **AJAY YADAV S/O SHRI ANIL YADAV, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, PRATAP NAGAR DISTRICT NARSINGHPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
13. **BASANT SINGH TOMAR S/O SHRI JASWANT SINGH TOMAR, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT PRATAP NAGAR DISTRICT NARSINGHPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
14. **NEHAL PATEL D/O SHRI AJAY PATEL, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 123 LORDGANJ KACHHIYANA DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
15. **JYOTENDRA SINGH RAGHUWANSHI S/O SHRI MAHENDRA SINGH RAGHUWANSHI, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O H.NO. 124 LORDGANJ GOL BAZAR DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
16. **ANKITA CHOUBEY D/O SHRI SATISH**

**CHOUBEY, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O GRAM
PANCHAYAT RAJA KHEDI MAKRONIYA
DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**

17. **AKANKSHA MISHRA D/O SHRI RAJESH
MISHRA, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O SHYAMA
PRASAD MUKHERJEE WARD NO. 2
DISTRICT PANNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
18. **VIJAY SHAKYA S/O SHRI MOHAN LAL
SHAKYA, AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, R/O 49/2
TOLKA KHEDA TEHSIL JAWAR DISTRICT
SEHORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**
19. **NIDHI PAL D/O SHRI GHANSHYAM PAL,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, R/O MAHARANA
PRATAP NAGAR DISTRICT BHOPAL
(MADHYA PRADESH)**
20. **DEEPIKA PATEL D/O SHRI SHAMBHU
PRASAD PATEL, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT GHAROLLA
MOHALLA BEHIND IRRIGATION OFFICE
DISTRICT SHAHDOL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
21. **POOJA LAXKAR D/O SHRI BHAGWAN DAS
LAXKAR, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O NEAR
GAYATRI MANDIR JATARA DISTRICT
TEEKAMGARH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
22. **NIDHI TRIVEDI D/O SHRI GIRISH
CHANDRA TRIVEDI, AGED ABOUT 28
YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT H.NO. 2029
KANCHGHAR CHOWK NEAR YADAV
DAIRY DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA
PRADESH)**
23. **VEERENDRA SINGH LODHI S/O SHRI
GOVIND SINGH, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE
ATATILA TEHSIL MALTHONE DISTRICT
SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
24. **APARNA VISHWAKARMA D/O SHRI LATE
SHRI PURUSHOTTAM VISHWAKARMA,
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION:
STUDENT NEAR GUPTA BUS TRAVELS**

**CHAKRAGHAT WARD DISTRICT SAGAR
(MADHYA PRADESH)**

25. **SUJATA VYAS D/O SHRI MANOJ VYAS, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O NEAR JAIN MANDIR BANPUR DARWAJA DISTRICT TIKAMGARH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
26. **RAVI VERMA S/O SHRI BADRILAL VERMA, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O MAHARANA PRATAP NAGAR DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
27. **RAMAKANT GUPTA S/O SHRI DULI CHAND GUPTA, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT VILLAGE KATHAR TEHSIL MANPUR DISTRICT UMARIYA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
28. **MADHU GUPTA W/O SHRI SHUBHAM GUPTA, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO. 08 IN FRONT OF GRAM PANCHAYAT KARITALAI TEHSIL VIJAYRAGHAVGARH DISTRICT KATNI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
29. **DIKSHA SINGH BARGAHI D/O SHRI DINESH SINGH BARGAHI, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO. 13 GRAM PAKARIA BUDHAR DISTRICT SHAHDOL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
30. **VAISHALI TIWARI D/O SHRI RAMSWAROOP TIWARI, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O SITA RAM BHAWAN NEAR SANSKAR SCHOOL MEHTA BAGICHA DISTRICT DAMOH (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS**(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)****AND**

1. **THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**

2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

WRIT PETITION No. 12452 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. LOKESH KUMAR S/O SHRI BUDHRM CHOUDHARY, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCCUPATION: GOVT. EMPLOYEE RESIDENT OF GRAM PANGRA , POST JARAHMOHGAON, TEHSIL KATANGI, DISTRICT BALAGHAT (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. JUHI THAKUR D/O SHRI GOPENDRA SINGH THAKUR, AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O MOTI NAGAR PARASIA ROAD BEHIND COLD STORAGE DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. POOJA SINGH D/O SHRI VASUDEO SINGH UTIYA, AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O H.NO. 85 BELSARA NOWROZABAD BANDHOGARH DISTRICT UMARIYA (MADHYA PRADESH)
4. SUPRIYA JAT S/O SHRI RAMESHWAR SINGH JAT, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT SANSKAR CITY DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 12484 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. SHRIRAM KESHRI S/O PRAMOD KESHRI,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCCUPATION:
STUDENT R/O KHACHROD DISTRICT
SEHORE (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. SANTOSH KUSHWAHA S/O SHRI
BHAGIRATH KUSHWAHA, AGED ABOUT 33
YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O H.NO.
192/3 WARD NO. 12 OLD GAS AGENCY
MARGE DISTRICT CHHATARPUR (MADHYA
PRADESH)
3. TARUN BARANIYA S/O SHRI PRAKASH
BARANIYA, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO. 5
MAJHPATIYA MUHA LUVKUSH NAGAR
LAUNDI DISTRICT CHHATARPUR (MADHYA
PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
THROUGH SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH
BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 12486 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. VISHNU MARAN S/O SHRI LAXMINARAYAN
MARAN, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,

**OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB
PREPARATION R/O H NO 102 NEAR RRDTC
BARKHEDI KALAN BHADBHADA ROAD
BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**

2. **NOOPUR SHARMA W/O SHRI PANKAJ
SHARMA, AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT/JOB PRPARATION
H.NO. DK 2/213 DANISH KUNJ KOLAR ROAD
HUZUR BHOPAL(MADHYA PRADESH)**
3. **KAPIL GOUR S/O LATE SHRI SITARAM
GOUR, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT/JOB PRPARATION
WARD NO. 18 NEW HOUSING BOARD
COLONY MIG 58 HOSHANGABAD DISTRICT
NARMADAPURAM (MADHYA PRADESH)**
4. **SURABHI JAIN D/O SHRI BIRENDRA KUMAR
JAIN, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDNET/JOB PRPARATION
R/O H.NO. 6B KAYASTHPURA MAHADEV
MANDIR ROAD PURANA KABAD KHANA
BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI NITYA NAND MISHRA - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. **THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT,
VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA
PRADESH)**
2. **MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

***(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)***

WRIT PETITION No. 12487 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

**RIA SINGH D/O SHRI RAJESH SINGH, AGED
ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O**

**ARJUN NAGAR NEAR ANAND APARTMENT,
AMAHIYA, DISTT. REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONER

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

- 1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THR. ITS
SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
DEPTT. VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL
(MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

**(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)**

WRIT PETITION No. 12489 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

- 1. RISHABH KUMAR SAHU S/O RAJKUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION:
STUDENT R/O 66 AMAHINOTA NEAR SAHU
CHAKKI DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA
PRADESH)**
- 2. NAMAN VISHWAKARMA S/O SHRI OM
NARAYAN VISHWAKARMA, AGED ABOUT
27 YEARS, 2405/2 NEW KANCHANPUR NEAR
TEEN PULIYA ADHARTAL DISTT.
JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 3. JAY KUMAR GUPTA S/O SHRI GURU DAYAL
GUPTA, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, HOUSE
NO. 30 AZAD CHOWK RAMPUR DISTT.
JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 4. AMIT KUMAR GOUR S/O SHRI BHAN SINGH
GOUR OCCUPATION: STUDENT VILLAGE
GOURAI GUBARI DISTT. SAGAR (MADHYA
PRADESH)**
- 5. YASHWANT SINGH PARMAR S/O SHRI SHIV
PRATAP SINGH PARMAR, AGED ABOUT 29
YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT VILLAGE**

BUDRAKH DISTT. CHHATARPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)

6. **ADARSH JAIN S/O SHRI MUKESH JAIN, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT WARD NO. 37 NEW COLONY QTR NO. G-4 DISTT. CHHATARPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
7. **MAYANK PATEL S/O SHRI MUKESH PATEL, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 646 YADAV COLONY NEAR DAYA NAGAR CHOWK DISTT. JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
8. **ASHISH KUMAR JAIN S/O SHRI NIRMAL KUMAR JAIN, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO. 10 NEAR MAHAVEER JAIN MANDIR GHURA DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
9. **RANI JAIN D/O SHRI RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT WARD NO. 4 REHLI DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
10. **VIRAG JAIN S/O SHRI PAWAN JAIN, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT TULSI NAGAR BHAGWANGANJ DISTT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
11. **AJAY SINGH BHATI S/O SHRI B.S BHATI, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT VILLAGE BAGAUTA DISTRICT CHHATARPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
12. **KIRAN CHAURASIYA D/O SHRI MAHADEV CHAURASIYA, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT NEAR SENGER PETROL PUMP MAUGANJ DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS***(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*****AND**

1. **THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH**

BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)

2. **MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 12561 of 2023**BETWEEN:-**

1. **SONAM KATARE D/O VINAY MOHAN KATARE, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT PRESENTLY RESIDING AT DAMOH NAKA SHANTI NAGAR JABALPUR DISTT. PERMANENT RESIDENT OF WARD NUMBER 5 PIPAL CHOWK CIVIL LINE DISTT. DINDORI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **ANSHIKA AGRAWAL D/O SHRI MUKESH KUMAR AGRAWAL, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 21 STATE BANK COLONY DOUBLE STORY UKHRI ROAD BALDEOBAGH DISTT. JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI SANJAY KUMAR PATEL - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. **STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA, INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 12622 of 2023**BETWEEN:-**

1. **SAKSHI MISHRA D/O SHRI GAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF GRAM AND POST DHURWAR SOHAGPUR DISTRICT SHAHDOL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **SACHIN SHARMA S/O SHRI KESHAV DAYAL SHARMA, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF 63 VILLAGE AND POST JAGIR BARELI DISTRICT RAISEN (MADHYA PRADESH)**
3. **UPENDRA MAVAI S/O SHRI MAN SINGH MAVAI, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF H.NO. 20 CHOLA NAKA NEAR GANESH MANDIR DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
4. **SHIVANI JAIN D/O SHRI GAJENDRA JAIN, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, RESIDENT OF VILLAGE AND POST BAHORIBAND DISTRICT KATNI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
5. **SAFIYA QURESHI D/O JAVED QURESHI, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUENT RESIDENT WARD NO 14 GANGOTRI COLONY WARASONI DISTRICT BALAGHAT (MADHYA PRADESH)**
6. **SHIVANGI SHARMA D/O SHRI SHAILESH SHARMA, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RRESIDENT OF 12 / 211 BEHIND AGRAWAL NURSING HOME KHUTEHI DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
7. **MANISHA UDAWAT D/O SHRI J.P. UDAWAT, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF H.NO. 98 SOMA PALACE HOSTEL MALVIYA NAGAR DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
8. **NARESH KUMAR BHASKAR S/O SHRI CHHOTE LAL AHIRWAR, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF VAISHALI NAGAR COLONY NEAR**

**COLLECTORATE WARD NO 22 DISTRICT
TIKAMGARH (MADHYA PRADESH)**

9. **JAY KUMAR JATAV S/O SHRI KHYALIRAM, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF 21 T SECTOR VANDANA NAGAR GEHUKHEDA KALAN ROAD DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
10. **YOGESH DHATE S/O SHRI GOVIND RAV, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT PRESENTLUY RESIDENT AT 28 B AZAD NAGAR BYPASS ROAD DISTRICT BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
11. **NEHA SHARMA D/O SHRI KRISHNA GOPAL SHARMA, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF 101 PREM NATH WARD NO 6 NEAAR PREM NATH JI MANDIR MOHLLA DHAM DISTRICT PANNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
12. **MANISHA CHOUHAN D/O SHRI GULABCHAND CHOUHAN, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF VILLAGE AND POST MALAJPUR TEHSIL CHICHLI DISTRICT BETUL (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. **THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THORUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

WRIT PETITION No. 12628 of 2023**BETWEEN:-**

1. **MANOJ CHOUDHARY S/O MOHANLAL CHOUDHARY, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 1053/A AAYUBH NAGAR DISTRICT NARMADAPURAM (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **ASHISH KUMAR SHRIWAS S/O RAJENDRA KUMAR SHRIWAS, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, R/O WARD NO.5, AMBEDKAR WARD BAJRANJ CHOWK BARGHAT DISTRICT SEONI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
3. **BARKHA JAIN D/O HEMANT JAIN, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, R/O SURAT COLONY WARD NO.13, JAWAD, NEEMUCH DISTRICT-NEEMUCH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
4. **SHREYASH BARSAINYA S/O SHARAD KUMAR, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O BAISA MOHALLA SAGAR DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
5. **RAVI KUMAR SAHU S/O SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, R/O MAIN ROAD BHIM GARH TEHSIL CHHAPRA DISTRICT SEONI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
6. **SHUBHAM S/O MOHANLAL, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE BHOGAON SIPANI SANAWAD, DISTT. KHARGAON (MADHYA PRADESH)**
7. **AKAKNSHA SINGH D/O ANIL SINGH, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO.4, BEHIND TEHSIL OFFICE, MAIHAR ROAD, AMARPATAN DISTRICT SATNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
8. **AKANSHA THAKUR D/O MAHENDRA SINGH THAKUR, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO.1, KURWAI VIDISHA DISTRICT VIDISHA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
9. **TEENA CHOUDHARY D/O LATE AJIT SINGH CHOUDHARY, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,**

OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 10, MANGAL NAGAR UJJAIN DISTRICT-UJJAIN (MADHYA PRADESH)

10. **DIVYA DUBEY D/O RAJKISHORE DUBEY, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE JAMUA POST WAIHDHAN SINGRAULI DISTRICT SINGRAULI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
11. **RIMANSHU CHHARI S/O RAVINDRA CHHARI, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O HOUSE NO.4, WARD NO. INDAER GHRA, DATIA DISTRICT DATIA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
12. **SONIYA DHAKAD D/O UGRASEN DHAKAD, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE KHIRIYA GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
13. **SHIKHA CHADAR D/O SOHAN SINGH, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE MAHARAJPURA ORCHA NIVARI DISTT. CHHATARPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
14. **SHIVKUMAR AHIRWAR S/O PALLU LAL AHIRWAR, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O TULSI NAGAR DERI ROAD, CHHATARPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
15. **APOORVA TIWARI D/O JAYPRAKASH TIWARI, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O ALPHONSA SCHOOL PRITHVIPUR NIWARI DISTT. CHHATARPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
16. **SHIWANI TIWARI D/O HARGOVING TIWARI, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O SIVIL WARD-6 MUKESH COLONY DAMOH DISTRICT DAMOH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
17. **AKSHAY SHRIVASTAVA S/O DIPAK SHRIVASTAVA, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 1125/1 JAIPRAKASH NAGAR ADHARTAL JABALPUR DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA**

PRADESH)

18. **CHETANA D/O OMPRAKASH, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 62 GRAM KATORA SANAWAD DISTT. KHARGONE (MADHYA PRADESH)**
19. **MONIKA PANIDRAHA D/O CHOTELAL PANIDRAHA, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O JHARRA TITURIYA RANGNATH MANDIR FARESTER MURWARA DISTRICT KATNI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
20. **KRISHNA GOVIND MEENA S/O RAGHU RAJ SINGH, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 301 GRAM PENCHI THE CHACHODA GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
21. **GEETIKA RAIKWAR D/O BRIJMOHAN RAIKWAR, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO. 5 BHAIKAV MOHALLA TIKAMGARH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
22. **GAURAV THAKUR S/O BHOPAT SINGH, AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O MIG 182 JAIN MANDIR MAKRONIA DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
23. **LAUVKUSH MEENA S/O MANNA MEENA, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE JUJHALPURA CHACHODA GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
24. **LOKESH RATHOD S/O NANDKISHORE RATHOD, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE KALIBAWDI TEHSIL MANAWER DHAR DISTRICT DHAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
25. **SANJAY KUMAR MASRAM S/O HAINAM MASRAM, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O CIVIL LINE WARD NO. 9 TEHSIL BAINAR DISTRICT BALAGHAT (MADHYA PRADESH)**
26. **JYOTI TIWARI D/O YUVRAJ KUMAR**

- TIWARI, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O KANCHAN VIHAR BEHIND SISODIYA PALACE VIJAY NAGAR JABALPUR DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 27. USHA ATOOT D/O NARESH ATOOT, AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O TEJAJI NAGAR NEAR IDEAL SCHOOL INDORE DISTRICT INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 28. BABITA JADON D/O RAJENDRA KUMAR JADON, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O SHREEKRISHNA REVENUE FACE-2 KHANDWA ROAD LIMBODI INDORE DISTRICT INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 29. RAHUL CHAUHAN S/O UDAY VEER SINGH, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE NAWATEDA MAINPURI (UTTAR PRADESH)**
- 30. MONA HARCHANDANI AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O ARJUN NAGAR TB WARD REWA DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 31. MANISH MEENA S/O RAMSWAROOP MEENA, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE UDAYPURA THE MAKSDANGARH GUNA DISTRICT GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 32. SNEHDEEP SINGH YADAV S/O PRANVEER SINGH YADAV, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O JHIR KEI BAGIYA PRASAD COLONY TIKAMGARH DISTRICT TIKAMGARH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 33. NIDHI DWIVEDI D/O DR. RAMBHADRA DWIVEDI, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O HARIOM NAGAR REWA DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI SANJAY K. AGRAWAL - ADVOCATE WITH SHRI SARTHAK NEMA -

ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATION GOVERNMENT OF MADHYA PRADESH MANTRALAYA VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS GOVERNMENT OF MADHYA PRADESH MANTRALAYA VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. THE MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INODRE (MADHYA PRADESH)
4. THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATION MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION RESIDENCY AREA INODRE, DISTRICT- INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENTS/ PSC BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 12630 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. HARSH KUMAR JAIN S/O SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR JAIN, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/JOB PREPARATION R/O 14 WARD NO.1 NEAR JAIN MANDIR DARGUWAN CHAUPRA TIKAMGARH (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. SAMIKSHA JAIN D/O SHRI MUKESH JAIN, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION OPPOSITE JAIN MAHILA ASHRAM RAM PYAU ROAD, BARIYAGHAT WARD, SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. MAYANK BAISHAKHIYA S/O SHRI

- DEVENDRA KUMAR JAIN, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION 05 NEAR KHINNI KUA, SHAHGARH BANDA DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
4. **SHUBHAM JAIN S/O SHRI PREM CHAND JAIN, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT /JOB PREPARATION R/O GARETHA, SHIVPURI, (MADHYA PRADESH)**
 5. **SWATI JAIN D/O SHRI LALCHAND JAIN, AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION CIVIL 6 NEAR AIRTEL TOWER CHHTRASAL WARD, DAMOH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
 6. **ANAMIKA JAIN D/O AKSHAY KUMAR JAIN, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION R/O HAT ROAD, GUNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
 7. **RICHA JAIN D/O SHRI RAJEEV KUMAR JAIN, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION R/O ACTIVE COMPUTER JAWAHAR GANJ WARD, KATRA BAZAR, SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
 8. **SWATI SINGHAI D/O SHRI KALYAN KUMAR, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION R/O NARSINGH MOHALLA SADHUMAL LALITPUR (UTTAR PRADESH)**
 9. **AASTHA JAIN S/O SHRI MADHAV KUMAR JAIN, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION R/O WARD NO.13 PACHOR MOHALLA SHAHGARH BANDA SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
 10. **DOLLY KHEMCHANDANI D/O SHRI SHANKAR LAL KHEMCHANDANI, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION R/O WARD NO.19, NEAR TMD HALL SINDHI CAMP RAGHURAJNAGAR SATNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

11. RAHUL SHRIWAS S/O SHRI RAJESH, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/JOB PREPARATION CIVIL 6 R/O VILLAGE TUNDILA JAURA MORENA (MADHYA PRADESH)
12. DEEPAK RAI S/O SHRI SHARAD PRASAD RAI, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION R/O CIVIL WARD 09, SUREKHA COLONY NEAR CENTRAL SCHOOL DAMOH KHAS DAMOH (MADHYA PRADESH)
13. VIKAS KUMAR YADAV S/O SHRI KISHOR KUMAR YADAV, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION R/O 3/12, TELECOM COLONY, DIVERSION ROAD, KHARGON (MADHYA PRADESH)
14. AMBUJ KUMAR TIWARI S/O SHRI DIWAKAR PRASAD TIWARI, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION R/O GAUTAM NAGAR NARMADA BHAWAN, HUZUR BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
15. NITESH PAL S/O SHRI NARAYAN PAL, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/JOB PREPARATION R/O AARI, THE BABAI, NARMADAPURAM (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI NITYANAND MISHRA - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

***(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)***

WRIT PETITION No. 12653 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. AJITESH DIXIT S/O SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR DIXIT, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF WARD NO 14 PATANGANJ REHLIKHAS DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. DURGA VERMA D/O SHRI NAND LAL VERMA, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT VILLAGE AND POST MANEGAON CHHINDWARA (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. MAMTA D/O SAMPATLAL GEHLOT, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, SECTOR C 29/3 SAINATH COLONY KOLAR ROAD BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
4. RAKESH SINGH S/O HEERA SINGH, AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, WARD NO. 15, BIMHAURI SHAHDOL (MADHYA PRADESH)
5. NEHA JAIN D/O SHRI PAWAN KUMAR JAIN, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, B-54, MANNIPURAM COLONY, BEHIND BITTAN MARKET BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
6. VIVEK INVATI S/O SHRI GHANSHYAM INVATI, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, WARD NO. 1, UMARIYA, POST MOYA DISTRICT CHHINDWARA (MADHYA PRADESH)
7. MEGHA MISHRA D/O SHRI KAMLESH MISHRA, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, H.NO. 306, SAGAR, EDAN GARDEN PHASE-I BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
8. RAGHVENDRA GHOSI S/O SHRI VIRENDRA SINGH GHOSI, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, H. NO. 27, GRAM KOSAMKHEDA, NARSINGHPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)
9. AMIT CHOUHAN S/O SHRI JAMNALAL, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, SELKARE HOUSE, KOUDIDHANA NEAR GAJANAND TEMPLE, BETUL (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

*(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)***AND**

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADASH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, INDORE RESIDENCY AREA, INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)***WRIT PETITION No. 12654 of 2023****BETWEEN:-**

ASHISH YADAV S/O SHRI MAN SINGH YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, PRESENTLY RESIDING
AT 4/13 NARAYANGANJ RATH ROAD,
HARPALPUR DISTRICT CHHATARPUR (MADHYA
PRADESH)

.....PETITIONER

*(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)***AND**

1. STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 13175 of 2023**BETWEEN:-**

1. RAJUL RICHHARIYA D/O SHRI HARISHARAN RICCHARIYA, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD BI 29 SHANTI NAGAR COLONY DISTRICT CHHATARPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. ARPIT MEHTA S/O SHRI ANIL KUMAR, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCCUPATION: GOVT. EMPLOYEE B-56 ARIHANT VIHAR DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. YATEENDRA MANI TIWARI S/O SHRI CHHEDI LAL TIWARI, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: GOVT. EMPLOYEE WARD NAWAGAON POST KHARAHARI HUZUR DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)
4. SAKSHI JAIN D/O SHRI HEMCHAND JAIN, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT NEAR JAIN MANDIR NAYAPURA GOURJHAMAR DISTRICT SAGAR (MADHYA PRADESH)
5. ANIL MORE S/O SHRI BALUSINGH MORE, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION: GOVT. EMPLOYEE D/17 JASUJA CITY R-1-39 DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)
6. ANKIT KUMAR MARSKOLE S/O SHRI GYAN SINGH MARSKOLE, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT WARD NO. 15 NEAR RAILWAYLINE LAHSUI KOTMA DISTRICT ANUPPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)
7. PRATIKSHA DUBEY D/O SHIV NARAYAN DUBEY, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT WARD NO. 8 CHOURAI DISTRICT CHHINDWARA (MADHYA PRADESH)
8. ANUPAM RAJE PARMAR D/O JAGDISH SINGH PARMAR, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT WARD NO. 5 JAIL ROAD NOWGONG DISTRICT CHHATARPUR

(MADHYA PRADESH)

9. **SOURABH CHOUHAN S/O UMA SHANKER CHOUHAN, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT WARD NO. 15 CIVIL LINE WARASEONI DISTRICT BALAGHAT (MADHYA PRADESH)**
10. **AYESHA GANI D/O MOHAMMAD HUSAIN GANI, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT WARD NO. 15 BESIDE CIVIL LINE WARASEONI DISTRICT BALAGHAT (MADHYA PRADESH)**
11. **MD. ALTAPH RAZA S/O MAHMOOD RAZA, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 23 WARD NO. 15 NEAR RAILWAY LINE LAHSUI KOTMA DISTRICT ANUPPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
12. **VARSHA RAI D/O PRAMOD KUMAR RAI, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT GRAM MUHARA JATARA DISTRICT TIKAMGARH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
13. **ABHILASH PAYASI S/O GAYA PRASAD PAYASI, AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT 349 GRAM CHANDOLI BAIRIHAYI DISTRICT SHAHDOL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
14. **HEENA BANO D/O ANWAR ALI, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE H. NO. 2684/3 SHAKTI BHAWAN ROAD INDRA NAGAR NEAR KAMAL KIRANA STORE RAMPUR DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
15. **PRAVEEN SOLANKI S/O KHUMAN SINGH, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT POONAM BHAWAN VIRAT NAGAR DISTRICT SATNA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS**(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)****AND**

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT R/O VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

WRIT PETITION No. 13177 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. DEEPENDRA UDENIYA S/O SHRI MAHENDRA PRATAP UDENIYA, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 64 SHANTI NAGAR COLONY CHAVALA SHIV MANDIR DISTRICT DAMOH (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. SANDHYA VARMA D/O SHRI KAMLESH VARMA, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: GOVT. EMPLOYEE 826 SHIVRAJPUR DISTRICT SATNA (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. YASHWANT SINGH PATEL S/O SHRI CHANDAN SINGH, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT GRAM BARUREW POST BHAISA PALA DISTRICT NARSINGHPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT R/O VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE

THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT RESIDENCY
AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWARNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 13492 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

PARIPURNA TRIPATHI D/O SHRI VIDYAKANT
TRIPATHI, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: TECHNICIAN ALLINDIA RADIO
REWA R/O 9/1556 KAILASHPURI REWA
(MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONER

(BY SHRI ADITYA SANGHI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
THROUGH PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT
R/O VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA
PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS CHAIRMAN
DALY COLLEGE ROAD, RESIDENCY AREA
INDORE, DISTRICT INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWARNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 13706 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

AKASH YADAV S/O SHRI ARJUN YADAV, AGED
ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT
FLAT NO. WILLOW C 304 SPRING ALLY DEW
KATARA HILLS HUZUR DISTRICT BHOPAL
(MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONER

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THR. PRINCIPAL SECRETARY GENERAL ADMIN. VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

WRIT PETITION No. 13742 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. PRASHANT SINGH S/O SHRI RAMPAL SINGH, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 15/40 SANJAY NAGAR DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. DILEEP DHAKAR S/O SHRI PYARE LAL, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT PRENTLY RESIDING AT G-3 POLICE OFFICERS COLONY NEAR DHARMTEKRI PARK DISTRICT CHHINDWARA (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. KAVEETA MEENA D/O SHRI PYARE LAL MEENA, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF LIG 66, KATRA SULTANABAD, BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
4. SHASHANK MALVIYA S/O SHRI SUBHASH MALVIYA, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDING AT RAJENDRA WARD 29 GANJ, BEHIND AABHASHREE HOTEL, BETUL (MADHYA PRADESH)
5. SHRASHTI BUNDELA D/O SHRI PRATAP SINGH, AGED ABOUT 24 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF

H.NO. 538 GRAM MATGUWAN,
CHHATARPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH
ITS SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH
BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 13951 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. SANDESH RAI S/O SHRI MAHESH RAI, AGED
ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT
R/O WARDNO 11 DR. AMBEKDAR WARD
NEAR MASJID BAMHNI BANJAR DISTRICT
MANDLA (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. DIVYA PANDEY S/O SHRI AVDHESH KUMAR
PANDEY, AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O GRAM
BARELI, KINDARAI DISTRICT SEONI
(MADHYA PRADESH)
3. RASHMI MISHRA W/O SHRI SHASHANK
MISHRA, AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS, R/O 334,
SINDHI COLONY, DIXITPURA DISTRICT
JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL

ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT
VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA
PRADESH)

2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA, INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 14034 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

INDU SINGH D/O SHRI SUBODH SINGH, AGED
ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/JOB
PREPARATION R/O 202/T/27/2 SHANTI NAGAR
NARMADAPURAM (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONER

(BY SHRI NITYA NAND MISHRA - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH
BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

*(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)*

WRIT PETITION No. 14605 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. MAHIMA SINGH HAIHAYWANSHI D/O SHRI
BALWANT SINGH, AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: STUDENT PRESENTLY
RESIDING H.NO. 130 APR COLONY BILHARI

**MANDLA ROAD DISTRICT JABALPUR
(MADHYA PRADESH)**

2. **PREETI SINGH MARKO D/O SHRI JAMUNA SINGH, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO.5, BHAIYA TOLA, ATARIYA, KARAN PATHAR, DISTRICT ANUPPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. **STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA, INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

WRIT PETITION No. 14927 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. **KRITI BHADOURIA D/O SHRI SPS BHADOURIA, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/ JOB PREPARATION GOVERDHAN COLONY SHANKAR PURI NEAR GLOBAL PUBLIC SCHOOL GOLA KA MANDIR GWALIOR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
2. **ANJALI UPADHYAY D/O SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR UPADHYAY, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT / JOB PREPARATION R/O RAVATPURA KALAN TOLA BHIND (MADHYA PRADESH)**
3. **ASHISH SINGH S/O SHRI PREM SINGH, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT/JOB PREPARATION R/O H.NO. 184 BOUTARAI THE PATHARIA (MADHYA**

PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI NITYA NAND MISHRA - ADVOCATE)

AND

- 1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

WRIT PETITION No. 15144 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

- 1. MANORAMA BOUDDHA D/O SHRI JAGMOHAN BOUDDH, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE AND POST HINDORIYA DISTRICT DAMOH (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. PRIYA D/O SHRI SURESH KAG, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE AND POST CHOTI KHARGONE TEHSIL MAHESHWAR DISTRICT KHARGONE (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 3. MAYANK S/O SHRI R.C. KHEMARIYA, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O KHEMARIYA MOHALLA KOLARAS DISTRICT SHIVPURI (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 4. HEMLATA D/O SHRI PRAKASH CHANDRA SHARMA, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE BHENSADABER POST BONDINA DISTRICT RATLAM (MADHYA PRADESH)**

5. **SUMIT KUMAR PAWAR S/O SHRI SUDHIR KUMAR PAWAR, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O POST CHANDORA KHURD TEHSIL MULTAI DISTRICT BETUL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
6. **RAVINDRA RAWAT S/O SHRI SANTOSH SINGH, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE GONGHARI POST CHHATA DISTRICT DATIA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
7. **AAYUSH DUBEY S/O SHRI VASUDEV DUBEY, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O H. NO. 18 STREET NO. 5SHANKAR NAGAR CHHINDWARA (MADHYA PRADESH)**
8. **ASHISH PATIDAR S/O SHRI ISHWAR PATIDAR, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O KOTESHWAR ROAD NEAR PATIDAR DHARMSHALA VILLAGE KOD DISTRICT DHAR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
9. **ANMOL VAID D/O ASHOK VAID, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O D-6 TRIPTI VIHAR SONVER ROAD GOVT. ENGINEERING COLLEGE UJJAIN DISTRICT UJJAIN (MADHYA PRADESH)**
10. **SHEETAL PATEL D/O MAHADEV PATEL, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE CHITRAMOD POST KHANGWADA SANAWAD DISTRICT KHARGONE (MADHYA PRADESH)**
11. **VIKAS PUROHIT S/O SHRI PRAMOD PUROHIT, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O 49-G PRATAPPURA BHIND DISTRICT BHIND (MADHYA PRADESH)**
12. **SANDHYA PATEL W/O SHRI SACHIN SINGH PATEL, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDNET R/O VILLAGE DIGHARI POST SIMRIBADI GOTEGAON DISTRICT NARSINGHPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**

13. PRAMOD PATEL S/O SHRI CHUNNILAL, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE NANDNA MALHANWADA BANKHEDI DISTRICT NARMADAPURAM (MADHYA PRADESH)
14. VIJAY SHARMA S/O SHRI RAMLAKHAN SHARMA OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O BH-76 DEENDAYAL NAGAR GWALIOR DISTRICT GWALIOR (MADHYA PRADESH)
15. HEMANT DHOTE S/O SHRI YADARAO DHOTE OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O SUPPER-F 1295 M.P.P.G.C.L. COLONY SARNI DISTRICT BETUL (MADHYA PRADESH)
16. VASHU PANDEY S/O SHRI DEVENDRA PANDEY OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O MIG 127 DHANWANTRI NAGAR JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI NAVEEN KUMAR - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH PRINCIPAL SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATION GOVERNMENT OF MADHYA PRADESH MANTRALAYA VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS GOVERNMENT OF MADHYA PRADESH MANTRALAYA VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. THE MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INDORE DISTRICT INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)
4. THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATION MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

***(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENTS/PSC BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)***

WRIT PETITION No. 15785 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. SATYAM PANDEY S/O SHRI DINESH PANDEY, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, OCCUPATION: GOVT. EMPLOYEE H.NO. 374 S.S. GAUTAM BEOHARBAGH DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. RAHUL JAGDEV S/O SHRI NANDU JAGDEV, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF 518 DAMUA NAKA SARNI DISTRICT BETUL (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. AMJAD ALI S/O MOHD. SARDAR ALI, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT RESIDENT OF VILLAGE BAGDARI POST AND TEHSIL GURH DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA INODRE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

***(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)***

WRIT PETITION No. 19428 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

**JYOTI PATEL D/O SHRI SHIV KUMAR PATEL,
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, OCCUPATION:**

**STUDENT R/O WARD NO 6, ROURA SANSARPUR,
DISTRICT REWA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONER

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

- 1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH
BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

***(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)***

WRIT PETITION No. 19432 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

**SHRASHTI SHARMA D/O SHRI VINOD SHARMA,
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION:
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE R/O QTR. NO. 8,
GOMTI BLOCK, POLICE LINES NEAR HIGH
COURT, DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONER

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

- 1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH
BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
RESIDENCY AREA INDORE (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,

RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)
WRIT PETITION No. 20501 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

1. DEENDAYAL MEENA S/O SHRI PAHALWAN SINGH, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O H NO 893, INDRA NAGAR SUHAGI ADHARTAL DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. NANDINI MEENA D/O SHRI DEVI PRASAD MEENA, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O SUHAGI, ADHATAL, DISTRICT JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)
3. AKHLESH KURMI S/O SHRI GOVIND KURMI, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O VILLAGE HARDWANI NARAYAN POST PIPRIYA CHAMPAT, TEHSIL PATHARIYA, DISTRICT DAMOH (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONERS

(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA, INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL, RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)

WRIT PETITION No. 13047 of 2023

BETWEEN:-

PIYUSHI PATHAK D/O SHRI ARUN PATHAK, AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, OCCUPATION: STUDENT R/O WARD NO 22 HOPE RESIDENCY

**KUNWARPURA ROAD DISTRICT TIKAMGARH
(MADHYA PRADESH)****.....PETITIONER****(BY SHRI ANSHUL TIWARI - ADVOCATE)****AND**

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. MADHYA PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY RESIDENCY AREA, INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS**(STATE BY SHRI SWAPNIL GANGULY - DEPUTY ADVOCATE GENERAL,
RESPONDENT NO.2 BY SHRI PARAG TIWARI - ADVOCATE)**

.....
 "Reserved on : 17/08/2023"

"Pronounced on : 23/08/2023"

*These petitions having been heard and reserved for orders, coming
 on for pronouncement this day, the court passed the following:*

ORDER

By this common order, W.P. No.4783/2023,
 W.P. No.11662/2023, W.P. No.12106/2023, W.P. No.12109/2023,
 W.P. No.12121/2023, W.P. No.12248/2023, W.P. No.12335/2023,
 W.P. No.12447/2023, W.P. No.12452/2023, W.P. No.12484/2023,
 W.P. No.12486/2023, W.P. No.12487/2023, W.P. No.12489/2023,
 W.P. No.12561/2023, W.P. No.12622/2023, W.P. No.12628/2023,
 W.P. No.12630/2023, W.P. No.12653/2023, W.P. No.12654/2023,
 W.P. No.13175/2023, W.P. No.13177/2023, W.P. No.13492/2023,
 W.P. No.13706/2023, W.P. No.13742/2023, W.P. No.13951/2023,
 W.P. No.14034/2023, W.P. No.14605/2023, W.P. No.14927/2023,

W.P. No.15144/2023, W.P. No.15785/2023, W.P. No.19428/2023, W.P. No.19432/2023, W.P. No.20501/2023, W.P. No.13047/2023 shall be disposed of.

2. For the sake of convenience, facts of **W.P. No.4783/2023** and **W.P. No.12628/2023** shall be considered.

3. W.P. No.4783/2023 has been filed seeking following reliefs:-

- "1. To quash the impugned order dated 13.01.2023 (ANNEXURE/P-9) passed by Respondent No.2 being illegal and arbitrary which disqualified the petitioners from the recruitment process even before merging and normalising them with the students who would qualify in Special Mains.
2. To direct respondent no.2 to declare the petitioners as qualified candidates being amongst the 1918 students of the *Second* category covered by the judgement passed on 29.11.2022 in WP no.25982/2022 **Manu Saxena vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors.**, to get merged and normalised with candidates who would qualify the Special Mains examination to finally face the interview.
3. To hold that the impugned decision dated 13.01.2023 is contrary to the Judgment passed on 29.11.2022 in WP no.25982/2022 **Manu Saxena vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors.**
Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the facts of the present case."

4. W.P. No.12628/2023 has been filed seeking following reliefs:-

- "(i) The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a Writ in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned result dated 18.05.2023 (**Annexure P/10**) of 2019 main examination in so far as the petitioners have

been declared ineligible for interview as arbitrary, illegal and void.

- (ii) The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondents to disclose the process and manner in which normalisation of marks has been carried out between the candidates who had appeared in the 2019 main examination conducted between 21.03.2021 to 26.03.2021 and special main examination conducted on 15.04.2023 and 20.04.2023.
- (iii) The Hon'ble Court may be pleased to declare the process of merging and normalisation of marks adopted by the respondent as arbitrary illegal and void.
- (iv) The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a Writ in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents to declare the petitioners qualified in 2019 main examination and be permitted to appear in the interview.
- (v) Any other suitable relief deemed fit in the facts and circumstances of the case may also kindly be granted together with the cost of this Petition."

5. The facts necessary for disposal of present petition in short are that petitioners appeared in Madhya Pradesh Public Service Commission (in short 'M.P.P.S.C.') 2019 Preliminary Examination conducted by respondent No.2 on 12.01.2020. Advertisement was issued on 14.11.2019 and preliminary examination was conducted on 12.01.2020. Thereafter, on 17.02.2020 i.e. after preliminary examination was conducted, an amendment was incorporated in M.P. State Services Examination Rules, 2015 (in short 'Rules 2015') by introducing Rule 4(3)(d)(III) in M.P. State Services Examination Rules, 2015 (in short 'Amended Rules 2015') by which it was provided that if a person belonging to any of the categories mentioned in sub-section (2) get

selected on the basis of merit in an open competition with unreserved candidates, he shall not be adjusted against vacancies reserved for such category under sub-section (2). Thereafter, by applying amended rules, result of preliminary examination was declared on 21.12.2020. Accordingly, W.P. No.542/2021 was filed by one Kishor Choudhary thereby challenging the Amended Rules 2015 as *ultra vires*. In view of modified interim order dated 27/01/2021 passed in connected W.P. No.807/2021, respondent No.2 conducted main examination in the month of March, 2021. Accordingly, on 31.12.2021, result of main examination was declared. Ultimately **W.P. No.542/2021 (Kishor Choudhary Vs. State of M.P. and others)** and other connected Writ Petitions were finally allowed by order dated 07.04.2022 and constitutionality of sub-section (4) of Section 4 of Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Anusuchit Jatiyon, Anusuchit Jan Jatiyon Aur Anya Pichhde Vargon Ke Liye Arakshan) Adhiniyam 1994 was upheld and Rule 4(3)(d)(III) introduced by amendment on 17.02.2020 in Rules 2015 was declared as *ultra vires* and it was held that recruitment process be conducted and completed in consonance with unamended Examination Rules 2015.

6. Accordingly, by order dated 10.10.2022, a revised examination result was declared and result of preliminary examination as well as result of main examination were cancelled and it was decided that revised result of preliminary examination shall be declared and such candidates shall be permitted to appear in main examination. Thereafter, said order was challenged by number of petitioners by filing **W.P. No.23828/2022 (Harshit Jain and Others Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and Another)**, **W.P. No.25982/2022 (Manu Saxena and**

others Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and Another) etc. These Writ Petitions were finally disposed of by a Coordinate Bench of this Court by order dated 29.11.2022. Order of Single Judge was challenged before Division Bench of this Court in **W.A. No.1706/2022 (Deependra Yadav and others Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and others)** and by order dated **25.01.2023, W.A. No.1706/2022** was dismissed.

7. It is submitted by counsel for intervenors that judgment passed by Writ Appellate Court has been challenged by candidates by filing **Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).5817/2023 (Deependra Yadav and others Vs. State of M.P. and others)** and thus, it is submitted that judgment passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court in W.P. No.23828/2022 and order dated 25.01.2023 passed in W.A. No.1706/2022 are sub-judice before Supreme Court.

8. It is not out of place to mention here that Supreme Court has passed order dated 10.04.2023 in SLP (Civil) No.5817/2023, which reads as under:

“Issue notice, returnable in two weeks.

Mr. Harsh Parashar, AOR accepts notice for respondent nos.3 to 15.

Notices be issued to the unrepresented respondents.

Dasti service, in addition to ordinary process is permitted.

Though, learned counsel for the petitioners has made a prayer for interim relief but taking the totality of the circumstances into account and the subject matter, we are not passed any interim order in this matter as at present. However, in the interest of justice, it is, of course, provided that any proceedings/process pursuant to the advertisement in question shall remain subject to the final orders to be passed in this petition.”

9. It appears that before that, respondent No.2 had already passed the impugned order dated 13.01.2023 by which certain candidates, who were earlier declared eligible for interview, were declared ineligible for interview and *vice versa*.

10. Challenging the order dated 13.01.2023, it is submitted by counsel for petitioners that a Coordinate Bench of this Court in **Harshit Jain (supra)** had held that if entire result of main examination is quashed, a right will be created in favour of candidates, who could not pass the main examination in earlier examination conducted by PSC and it would be giving a premium to such 8894 candidates by reviving their candidature, who earlier appeared in main examination and failed to qualify. It is further submitted that Coordinate Bench had also directed that a special main examination shall be conducted for those meritorious candidates of reserved category, who became entitled to be placed in unreserved category by virtue of judgment passed in **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** and thereafter, a fresh list of select candidates, on the basis of result of two written examinations (mains) i.e. conducted in March, 2021 and special main examination, which will be conducted in compliance of order passed in **Harshit Jain (supra)** shall be prepared by merging and normalizing two lists as per process adopted by PSC on previous occasions. It is submitted that petitioners had qualified for interview in main examination, which was conducted in month of March, 2021 and therefore, they should have been taken up to the stage of merging and normalization of two lists i.e. result of main examination conducted in month of March, 2021 and result of special main examination. However, that has not been done and petitioners have been ousted even prior to merging and normalizing of two lists. It is further

submitted that petitioners were not party to **W.P. No.542/2021 [Kishor Choudhary (supra)]**, therefore, they are not bound by law laid down by this Court in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)**. Petitioners can always challenge the *ratio decidendi*. It is submitted that in a subsequently pronounced judgment by a different Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Pushendra Kumar Patel and others Vs. High Court of M.P. and others decided on 02/01/2023 in W.P. No.8750/2022**, it has been held that judgment passed by Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** is *per incuriam*. Therefore, judgment passed by Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** stands washed out and original result of preliminary examination as well as main examination should have been restored. To buttress his contentions, counsel for petitioners has relied upon judgment passed by the Supreme Court in the case of **Sanjay Singh and Another Vs. U.P. Public Service Commission, Allahabad and Another** reported in **(2007) 3 SCC 720**. It is further submitted that principle of normalization should not have been applied but principle of moderation should have been applied because when examination is conducted in two parts, then doctrine of “examiner variability” and “hawk-dove” effect would come into picture and a procedure should have been evolved to ensure uniformity to *inter se* examiners so that effect of “examiner subjectivity or examiner variability” is minimized. It is submitted that where examinations are subjective in nature, then principle of moderation should have been applied and not normalization. It is further submitted that in order to avoid “examiner variability”, only one and single examination should have been conducted and conducting a separate special main examination for candidates, who got migrated to

unreserved category by virtue of judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** was unwarranted. It is further submitted that procedure, which has been adopted by respondent No.2, has not been made known to anybody and persons, who were earlier declared ineligible for interview, have now been declared eligible. Thus, candidates who were already ousted from the fray have been brought in competition, which is not permissible.

11. *Per contra*, petition is vehemently opposed by counsel for respondent No.2. It is submitted by Shri Parag Tiwari that after the judgment was pronounced in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)**, respondent No.2 was left with no other option but to cancel the result of preliminary examination as well as result of main examination. Total 2721 candidates of reserved category got eligible to appear in main examination in the light of judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)**. The merger and normalization could have been done only by taking result of preliminary examination into consideration. It is submitted that in order to maintain secrecy of examination, respondent No.2 cannot disclose the pattern/ process which was adopted by it for merger and normalization except that merger and normalization was done after considering result of preliminary examination *viz-a-viz* newly declared eligible candidates of reserved category.

12. It is not out of place to mention here that this case was heard on two days i.e. on 16/08/2023 and 17/08/2023. On 16/08/2023, a statement was made that respondent No.2 shall produce the record with regard to the process which was adopted by it for normalization and merger as directed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in W.P. No.

23828/2022 and accordingly, on 17/08/2023 a sealed envelope was provided by Shri Parag Tiwari and he specifically pointed out that so far as process, which was adopted by respondent No.2 for merger and normalization of marks is concerned, the same cannot be disclosed and cannot be provided to the Court but the formula which was adopted for normalization of marks can be provided and only that formula is in sealed cover. Thus, it is clear that respondent No.2 in the name of maintaining secrecy of examination has refused to disclose the process adopted by it for merger and normalization of two lists, except by saying that merger and normalization was done by taking initial list of preliminary examination into consideration. It is submitted by counsel for respondent No.2 that after that was done, petitioners of W.P. No.4783/2023 could not get their place in the list of candidates eligible to appear in main examination, and therefore, they have been declared ineligible.

13. So far as question of washing out of effect of judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** is concerned, it is submitted that although principle of retrospective overruling applies but it would not reopen the closed cases. The judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** was never challenged before higher forum and thus, it has attained finality and therefore, procedure adopted by respondent No.2 cannot be assailed on the ground that it has been done on the basis of law laid down in the case which was subsequently declared as *per incuriam*.

14. So far as contention of counsel for petitioners that in fact the effect of “examiner variability” could have been avoided by conducting single examination is concerned, it is submitted by counsel for

respondent No.2 that earlier there were two sets of Writ Petitions and even in present bunch, there are two sets of Writ Petitions. In present bunch, one set of Writ Petition is of those candidates, who were declared eligible for main examination and also cleared the same, but now they have been declared ineligible for main examination itself and another set of Writ Petition is of those candidates, who were earlier declared eligible for main examination as well as for interview but now they have been declared ineligible to participate in interview. It is submitted that respondent No.2 by order dated 10/10/2022 had already decided to conduct single main examination and for that purposes, earlier examination was cancelled but same was challenged before this Court and by order dated 29/11/2022 passed in **Harshit Jain (supra)** and other connected matters, decision dated 10/10/2022 taken by respondent No.2 to conduct a joint main examination was set aside and therefore, now petitioners cannot take U-turn to justify decision of respondent No.2 to conduct fresh main examination by preparing a fresh result of preliminary examination in the light of unamended Rules of 2015. It is submitted that now two lists have been prepared by respondent No.2 i.e. by taking quota of OBC as 27% and by taking quota as 13%. It is submitted that decision will be taken up whether the quota of OBC should be taken up as 27% or 13% on the basis of judgment which is already sub-judice before this Court. It is further submitted that once respondent No.2 had merged and normalized the marks by taking result of preliminary examination into consideration, then because of normalization some candidates who were earlier declared ineligible now have been declared eligible for the reason that in case of normalization, three eventualities may arise i.e. (i) Raw marks obtained by candidate

may get reduced, (ii) Raw marks may remain same and (iii) Raw marks after normalization may get increased.

15. It is submitted that after applying formula of normalization there may be certain candidates whose normalized marks became more than their raw marks obtained by them in their examination and therefore, if such candidates have been declared eligible then it cannot be said that action of respondent No.2 is bad. Counsel for respondent No.2 has relied upon the judgment passed by this Court in the case of **State of M.P. Vs. Maharaj Singh (dead)** decided on 30/07/2019 in **W.P. No.3257/2017 (Gwalior Bench)**.

16. Counsel for intervenors submitted that judgment passed by another Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Pushendra Kumar Patel (supra)** is erroneous as it has not taken note of various provisions of Constitution. However, it is further submitted by counsel for intervenors that judgment passed in the case of **Pushendra Kumar Patel (supra)** is sub-judice before the Supreme Court. It is further submitted that even if judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** has been declared to be *per incuriam*, but it would not result in washing out its effect on the present case and therefore, *ratio decidendi* decided in the case of **Pushendra Kumar Patel (supra)** will not have any effect to the present case. Counsel for intervenors has also relied upon judgment passed by the Supreme Court in the case of **State of U.P. and others Vs. Jeet S. Bisht and Another** reported in **(2007) 6 SCC 586** to submit that principle of *sub silentio* should be applied to ignore the judgment passed by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Pushendra Kumar Patel (supra)**. Counsel for intervenors has also relied upon judgments passed by the Supreme

Court in the case of **Haryana Financial Corporation and Another Vs. Jagdamba Oil Mills and Another** reported in (2002) 3 SCC 496, **Dr. Shah Faesal and Others Vs. Union of India and Another** reported in (2020) 4 SCC 1, **State of Bihar Vs. Kalika Kuer @ Kalika Singh and Others** reported in (2003) 5 SCC 448, **Rattiram and others Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh** reported in (2012) 4 SCC 516, **Jabalpur Bus Operators Association Vs. State of M.P.** reported in (2003) 1 MPHT 226, **State of U.P. and others Vs. Jeet S. Bisht and Another** reported in (2007) 6 SCC 586 and **Bharat Petroleum Corpn. Ltd. And Another Vs. N.R. Vairamani and Another** reported in (2004) 8 SCC 579 to submit that judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** would apply because same was passed in the present case itself.

17. Heard learned counsel for parties.

18. A Coordinate Bench of this Court by order dated 08.05.2023 had framed following questions:-

- “1. The preparation of revised merit list was done behind the back of the petitioners?
2. Whether judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** can be applied retrospectively by ignoring the decision in the case of **Puspendra Kumar Patel (supra)**?
3. Once petitioners had cleared preliminary and main examination, then can they be debarred on the basis of subsequent judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)**?
4. Whether those candidates, who were permitted to migrate, then whether the authorities can issue revised result retrospectively or they are required to create supernumerary slots for accommodating such migration without adversely affecting rights of the petitioners or similarly situated persons?”

19. After hearing counsel for the parties, this Court is of considered

opinion that following questions arise for consideration:-

- I. Whether respondent No.2 was right in merging and normalizing subsequently declared 2721 eligible candidates of reserved category with the original list of preliminary examination or not?
- II. Whether judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** would stand washed out in the light of subsequently passed judgment in the case of **Pushendra Kumar Patel (supra)**?
- III. Whether respondent No.2 should have conducted a common examination for mains in order to avoid “examiner variability”?
- IV. Under the facts and circumstances of the case, whether doctrine of normalization should have been applied or doctrine of moderation should have been applied?
- V. Whether candidates, who were earlier declared ineligible can be declared eligible after normalization or not?

I. Whether respondent No.2 was right in merging and normalizing subsequently declared 2721 eligible candidates of reserved category with the original list of preliminary examination or not?

And

V. Whether candidates, who were earlier declared ineligible can be declared eligible after normalization or not?

20. In the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**, a Coordinate Bench of this Court has held as under:

“19. It is undisputed that the preliminary examination of all the candidates as well as the main examination of unreserved category candidates were conducted as per 2015 Rules.

The problem arose when the result of preliminary examination in regard to the reserved category candidates was declared on the basis of amended Rules of 2020. After the decision in W.P. No. 542/2021 (supra), the PSC has taken some corrective steps and redrawn the list of successful reserved category candidates. In such fact situation, four categories of students emerge :-

One:- the newly qualified reserved category candidates (2721 in number) for main examination as per the result dated 10.10.2022;

Second:- 1918 select list candidates (un-reserved candidates) who passed the main examination held from 21.03.2021 to 26.03.2021 as per the 2015 Rules and have provisionally qualified for interview;

Third:- candidates out of these 1918 candidates who would be ousted from the select list of 1918 candidates, if special main examination is conducted and result is normalized;

Fourth:- those 8894 candidates, out of 10767 candidates, who sat in the main examination, but could not pass the main examination.

20. As per the new/redrawn list prepared by the PSC after the decision in W.P. No. 542/2021, there are 2721 newly qualified reserved category candidates, who are eligible to appear in mains. If special mains examination is held, the PSC would only have to take care of these newly qualified 2721 candidates.

21. In case the entire result of the main examination is quashed, right is created in favour of candidates from category No.4 mentioned herein above. This on one hand will be like setting the clock back for those candidates who have already cleared the mains and secured a place in the provisional list for interview, whereas on the other hand, would be like giving premium to such 8894 candidates by reviving

their candidature, who earlier appeared in the main examination and failed to qualify it.

22. It is true that by mere inclusion of the name in the select list, no right has accrued to the selected candidates for appointment but by inclusion/securing a place in the select list for interview, the select candidates are entitled for consideration for appointment which could not be taken away by canceling the mains examination/result, as this would cause serious prejudice and grave injustice to those candidates who are declared eligible and qualified in the shortlisting process.

23. As regards the 8894 candidates under the fourth category, no serious prejudice would be caused to them in case a special main examination is conducted for newly qualified reserved category candidates, as they could not qualify the mains examination held earlier.

24. Holding the entire examination (mains) afresh will not only resulted in incurring a huge cost but also is a public loss and may also result in injustice to a large number of candidates who already cleared the mains examination and shortlisted for interview for no fault of theirs. When no defect was pointed out in regard to the mains examination, there was no justification for canceling the mains examination, which has resulted in the present litigation. For the forgoing reasons, the order dated 10.10.2022 passed by PSC cannot be sustained and hereby quashed.

25. I am of the considered view that this all could have been avoided and the situation could have been appropriately met by holding special mains examination as also done by the PSC earlier on several occasions for newly eligible reserved category candidates as per the redrawn list. In the larger interest of the candidates, it is, therefore, directed to hold a special main examination as per the redrawn list for the newly qualified reserved category candidates. On the

basis of the result of these two written examinations (mains) for unreserved category candidates and special mains examination to be held for unreserved category candidates, a fresh list of select candidates in terms of Recruitment Rules, 2015 for interview shall be prepared by merging and normalizing the two lists as per the process adopted by the PSC on previous occasions.

26. The entire process of holding special mains examination and interview be completed and finalized within a period of six months.”

21. Thus, it is clear that candidates were divided by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in four different categories:

- (i) newly qualified reserved category candidates (2721 in number) for main examination as per list of 10.10.2022.
- (ii) 1918 select list candidates (unreserved candidates), who passed main examination held from 21.03.2021 to 26.03.2021, who were provisionally declared qualified for interview.
- (iii) Candidates out of these 1918 candidates, who would be ousted after normalization.
- (iv) 8894 candidates out of 10767 candidates, who sat in main examination but could not pass the same.

22. In paragraph 21 of order passed in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**, it was specifically held by Coordinate Bench that if entire result of main examination is quashed, then even those candidates, who earlier could not succeed for interview, would get another chance to appear and it would be like giving premium to such 8894 candidates by reviving their candidature.

23. Further in paragraph 23 of the aforesaid order, it was mentioned

that as regards 8894 candidates under fourth category, no serious prejudice would be caused to them in case special main examination is conducted for newly qualified reserved category candidates, as they could not qualify the main examination held earlier. Ultimately, in paragraph 25 of the order, it was directed that on the basis of result of these two written examinations (mains for unreserved category candidates and special mains examination to be held for unreserved category candidates), a fresh select list in terms of Rules 2015, for interview be prepared by merging and normalizing two lists as per process adopted by PSC on previous occasions.

24. Now only question for consideration is as to whether this Court had given liberty to respondents to adopt doctrine of merger and normalization by including even those 8894 candidates, who could not qualify for main examination on earlier occasion or they are not entitled for reconsideration of their candidature for interview after merger and normalization of marks.

25. By referring to paragraph 25 of order passed in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**, it is submitted by counsel for respondent No.2 that respondent No.2 was directed to re-draw a list and therefore, same can be done only if list of newly qualified reserved category candidates is merged in result of preliminary examination. Therefore, counsel for respondent No.2 tried to convince that in fact list of 1918 candidates, who were earlier declared eligible for interview, was also quashed by Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**. However, counsel for respondent No.2 could not point out any such direction from the said order. On the contrary in paragraph 19, a specific separate category was formulated consisting of those 8894 candidates

out of 10767 candidates, who earlier sat in main examination but could not pass main examination and in paragraph 23 of the said order, it was specifically mentioned that in case if decision of respondent No.2 to conduct examination of mains afresh is quashed, then no serious prejudice would be caused to 8894 candidates, as they could not qualify the main examination on earlier occasion. Further another observation was made specifically in paragraph 21 of order passed in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)** that giving an another opportunity to compete for finding place in the list of eligible candidates for interview, it would like giving premium to such 8894 candidates by reviving their candidature, who earlier appeared in main examination and failed to qualify it. Therefore, it is clear that Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)** had specifically ousted 8894 candidates from the fray but according to respondent No.2, their candidature for interview was reconsidered by using the result of preliminary examination for merger and normalization of marks with 2721 newly qualified reserved category candidates.

26. Thus, what was specifically prohibited by Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)** was done by PSC/respondent No.2 and thus it was not permissible. If respondent No.2 was of the view that direction given by Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)** is not in accordance with law or it would cause any legal difficulty, then PSC should have challenged the said findings/directions by filing Writ Appeal. However, admittedly no Writ Appeal was filed by respondent No.2 and Writ Appeal was filed by candidates, who were permitted to intervene in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**. Even the SLP, which has been filed before the Supreme

Court against order passed in Writ Appeal of **Deependra Yadav (supra)** has not been filed by respondent No.2, but it has been filed by the candidates.

27. Be that whatever it may be.

28. One thing is clear that what was forbidden by the Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)** could not have been done by respondent No.2 and by using result of preliminary examination for merger and normalization with 2721 eligible candidates of reserved category, respondent No.2 has travelled beyond the directions given by Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**. In the light of order passed in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**, respondents could have applied the doctrine of merger and normalization by taking list of 1918 candidates, who were already declared eligible for interview with list of candidates, who were declared successful in special main examination, but respondent No.2 applied doctrine of merger and normalization from previous stage, which is bad in law and contrary to the directions given by Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**. Accordingly, same is **quashed**.

29. It is really unfortunate that in spite of assurance given by this Court that the process which was adopted by respondent No.2 shall not be disclosed and same should be placed before this Court for perusal in sealed cover, respondent No.2 decided not to place the same. Under these circumstances, this Court was left with no other option but to decide the petitions on the basis of submissions made by counsel for the parties.

II. Whether judgment passed in the case of Kishor Choudhary

(supra) would stand washed out in the light of subsequently passed judgment in the case of Pushendra Kumar Patel (supra)?

30. It is the submission of counsel for petitioners that in a subsequently pronounced judgment in the case of **Pushendra Kumar Patel (supra)**, another Division Bench of this Court has held that judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** is *per incuriam* and therefore, it is not a good law. It is submitted that even a Contempt Petition Civil No.2481/2022 was filed by *Madhya Pradesh Anusuchit Jati Janjati Pichhada Varg Avam Alpsankhyak Adhikari, Karmchhari Sangathan* which was dismissed by Division Bench by holding that the doctrine of migration/ mobility is not applicable in the stage of preliminary examination and thus, judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** would lose its effect and whatever steps were taken by respondent No.2 in compliance of judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** are bad and therefore, original result which was declared by respondent No.2 should be restored back. It is the case of the petitioners in W.P. No.4783/2023 that they were not party to W.P. No.542/2021, therefore they can always challenge the *ratio decidendi* and to buttress his contention, counsel for petitioners has relied upon the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of **Sanjay Singh (supra)**. Whereas, it is the submission of counsel for respondent No.2 as well as intervenors that the judgment pronounced by Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Pushendra Kumar Patel (supra)** is bad and therefore it has to be ignored. However, it was fairly conceded by counsel for respondent No.2 as well as intervenors that the judgment passed in the case of **Pushendra Kumar Patel (supra)** is sub-judice before the Supreme Court. However, it is submitted by

counsel for intervenors that respondent No.2 is not filing its return in the said SLP.

31. Be that whatever it may be.

32. The moot question for consideration is that whether *per incuriam* judgment is binding *inter se* parties or not or it would lose its effect?

33. The undisputed facts are that the result of preliminary examination was challenged by aggrieved persons by filing W.P. No.542/2021 and it was held that Rule (4)(3)(d)(III) introduced by amendment in Examination Rules, 2015 on 17/02/2020 is *ultra vires* and it was directed that recruitment process be conducted and completed in consonance with unamended Examination Rules, 2015 and only on the basis of direction given in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)**, entire exercise has been done by respondent No.2. Thus, undisputedly judgment in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** was passed in the present case itself.

34. In the case of **A.R. Antulay Vs. R.S. Nayak and Another** reported in (1988) 2 SCC 602, it has been held as under:-

"**104.** To err is human, is the oft-quoted saying. Courts including the apex one are no exception. To own up the mistake when judicial satisfaction is reached does not militate against its status or authority. Perhaps it would enhance both.

105. It is time to sound a note of caution. This Court under its Rules of Business ordinarily sits in divisions and not as a whole one. Each Bench, whether small or large, exercises the powers vested in the court and decisions rendered by the Benches irrespective of their size are considered as decisions of the court. The practice has developed that a larger Bench is entitled to overrule the decision of a smaller Bench

notwithstanding the fact that each of the decisions is that of the court. That principle, however, would not apply in the present situation and since we are sitting as a Bench of Seven we are not entitled to reverse the decision of the Constitution Bench. Overruling when made by a larger Bench of an earlier decision of a smaller one is intended to take away the precedent value of the decision without affecting the binding effect of the decision in the particular case. *Antulay*, therefore, is not entitled to take advantage of the matter being before a larger Bench. In fact, if it is a case of exercise of inherent powers to rectify a mistake it was open even to a Five Judge Bench to do that and it did not require a Bench larger than the Constitution Bench for that purpose.

* * *

182. It is asserted that the impugned directions issued by the Five-Judge Bench was per incuriam as it ignored the statute and the earlier *Chadha case* [*AIR 1966 SC 1418 : (1966) 2 SCR 678 : 1966 Cri LJ 1071*].

183. But the point is that the circumstance that a decision is reached per incuriam, merely serves to denude the decision of its precedent value. Such a decision would not be binding as a judicial precedent. A co-ordinate Bench can disagree with it and decline to follow it. A larger Bench can overrule such decision. When a previous decision is so overruled it does not happen — nor has the overruling Bench any jurisdiction so to do — that the finality of the operative order, inter partes, in the previous decision is overturned. In this context the word ‘decision’ means only the reason for the previous order and not the operative order in the previous decision, binding inter partes. Even if a previous decision is overruled by a larger Bench, the efficacy and binding nature, of the adjudication expressed in the operative order remains

undisturbed *inter partes*. Even if the earlier decision of the Five-Judge Bench is *per incuriam* the operative part of the order cannot be interfered within the manner now sought to be done. That apart the Five-Judge Bench gave its reason. The reason, in our opinion, may or may not be sufficient. There is advertence to Section 7(1) of the 1952 Act and to the exclusive jurisdiction created thereunder. There is also reference to Section 407 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Can such a decision be characterised as one reached *per incuriam*? Indeed, Ranganath Misra, J. says this on the point: (para 105)

“Overruling when made by a larger Bench of an earlier decision of a smaller one is intended to take away the precedent value of the decision without effecting the binding effect of the decision in the particular case. *Antulay*, therefore, is not entitled to take advantage of the matter being before a larger Bench.” "

35. Thus, it is clear that doctrine of *per incuriam* merely takes away the precedent value of a decision but in no manner dilutes or affects the binding nature of the aforesaid decision on the parties *inter se*. Therefore, merely because the judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** was subsequently held to be *per incuriam*, would not wash out its effect and law laid down in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** would bind the parties *inter se*. Although counsel for intervenors tried to develop his arguments on the question of correctness of judgment passed in the case of **Pushpendra Kumar Patel (supra)** but it is suffice to mention here that since the judgment passed in the case of **Pushpendra Kumar Patel (supra)** is sub-judice

before the Supreme Court, therefore submissions made by counsel for intervenors do not require any consideration specifically when this Court has already held that the judgment passed by Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** will bind the parties *inter se*.

36. So far as contention of counsel for petitioners that since petitioners of W.P. No.4783/2023 were not party to the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** is concerned, the same cannot be considered in the light of observations made in paragraph 46 of order passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)**. It was specifically held that once impugned amendment dated 17/02/2020 was held to be *ultra vires* then argument relating to 'substitution' pales into insignificance and since no candidate has been finally selected and no right has accrued in favour of any candidate therefore, it is not necessary to implead the candidates who are going to be adversely affected by the outcome of this judgment. At the cost of repetition, it is once again clarified that judgment passed in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** was never challenged.

37. Furthermore, counsel for petitioners could not point out any substantial right of petitioners which might have accrued only on the ground that they were declared successful for interview on the basis of main examination. Even a selected candidate does not have any vested right for getting appointment provided that the State Government acts bonafidely. Further, once the Division Bench in the case of **Kishor Choudhary (supra)** has already held that candidates, who have been declared successful in the meanwhile, are not necessary party and unless and until that finding is set aside, this Court cannot take a contrary view. Apart from that Division Bench in W.P. No.807/2021 by interim order

dated 27/01/2021 had made it specifically clear that further proceedings shall be subject to final outcome of the Writ Petition.

38. Under these circumstances, contention of petitioners of W.P. No.4783/2023 that they were not party to W.P. No.542/2021, therefore they can challenge the *ratio decidendi*, is misconceived and it is accordingly **rejected**.

III. Whether respondent No.2 should have conducted a common examination for mains in order to avoid “examiner variability”?

39. It is the contention of counsel for petitioners that in order to avoid “examiner variability”, a common main examination should have been conducted in place of special main examination.

40. It is suffice to hold that earlier respondent No.2 had taken a similar decision on 10.10.2022, which was challenged by candidates by filing multiple Writ Petitions and order dated 10.10.2022 was modified by Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**. Therefore, submission made by counsel for petitioners cannot be considered at all.

IV. Under the facts and circumstances of the case, whether doctrine of normalization should have been applied or doctrine of moderation should have been applied?

41. It is the contention of another set of writ petitioners that in order to avoid “examiner variability”, doctrine of moderation should have been applied. To buttress his contention, counsel for petitioners has relied upon judgment pronounced by the Supreme Court in the case of **Sanjay Singh (supra)**, which reads as under:-

“**23.** When a large number of candidates appear for an examination, it is necessary to have

uniformity and consistency in valuation of the answer-scripts. Where the number of candidates taking the examination are limited and only one examiner (preferably the paper-setter himself) evaluates the answer-scripts, it is to be assumed that there will be uniformity in the valuation. But where a large number of candidates take the examination, it will not be possible to get all the answer-scripts evaluated by the same examiner. It, therefore, becomes necessary to distribute the answer-scripts among several examiners for valuation with the paper-setter (or other senior person) acting as the Head Examiner. When more than one examiners evaluate the answer-scripts relating to a subject, the subjectivity of the respective examiner will creep into the marks awarded by him to the answer-scripts allotted to him for valuation. Each examiner will apply his own yardstick to assess the answer-scripts. Inevitably therefore, even when experienced examiners receive equal batches of answer-scripts, there is difference in average marks and the range of marks awarded, thereby affecting the merit of individual candidates. This apart, there is “hawk-dove” effect. Some examiners are liberal in valuation and tend to award more marks. Some examiners are strict and tend to give less marks. Some may be moderate and balanced in awarding marks. Even among those who are liberal or those who are strict, there may be variance in the degree of strictness or liberality. This means that if the same answer-script is given to different examiners, there is all likelihood of different marks being assigned. If a very well-written answer-script goes to a strict examiner and a mediocre answer-script goes to a liberal examiner, the mediocre answer-script may be awarded more marks than the excellent answer-script. In other words, there is “reduced valuation” by a strict examiner and “enhanced valuation” by a liberal examiner. This is known

as “examiner variability” or “hawk-dove effect”. Therefore, there is a need to evolve a procedure to ensure uniformity inter se the examiners so that the effect of “examiner subjectivity” or “examiner variability” is minimised. The procedure adopted to reduce examiner subjectivity or variability is known as moderation. The classic method of moderation is as follows:

(i) The paper-setter of the subject normally acts as the Head Examiner for the subject. He is selected from amongst senior academicians/scholars/senior civil servants/judges. Where the case is of a large number of candidates, more than one examiner is appointed and each of them is allotted around 300 answer-scripts for valuation.

(ii) To achieve uniformity in valuation, where more than one examiner is involved, a meeting of the Head Examiner with all the examiners is held soon after the examination. They discuss thoroughly the question paper, the possible answers and the weightage to be given to various aspects of the answers. They also carry out a sample valuation in the light of their discussions. The sample valuation of scripts by each of them is reviewed by the Head Examiner and variations in assigning marks are further discussed. After such discussions, a consensus is arrived at in regard to the norms of valuation to be adopted. On that basis, the examiners are required to complete the valuation of answer-scripts. But this by itself, does not bring about uniformity of assessment inter se the

examiners. In spite of the norms agreed, many examiners tend to deviate from the expected or agreed norms, as their caution is overtaken by their propensity for strictness or liberality or erraticism or carelessness during the course of valuation. Therefore, certain further corrective steps become necessary.

(iii) After the valuation is completed by the examiners, the Head Examiner conducts a random sample survey of the corrected answer-scripts to verify whether the norms evolved in the meetings of examiner have actually been followed by the examiners. The process of random sampling usually consists of scrutiny of some top level answer-scripts and some answer books selected at random from the batches of answer-scripts valued by each examiner. The top level answer books of each examiner are revalued by the Head Examiner who carries out such corrections or alterations in the award of marks as he, in his judgment, considers best, to achieve uniformity. (For this purpose, if necessary certain statistics like distribution of candidates in various marks ranges, the average percentage of marks, the highest and lowest award of marks, etc. may also be prepared in respect of the valuation of each examiner.)

(iv) After ascertaining or assessing the standards adopted by each examiner, the Head Examiner may confirm the award of marks without any change if the examiner has followed the agreed norms, or

suggests upward or downward moderation, the quantum of moderation varying according to the degree of liberality or strictness in marking. In regard to the top level answer books revalued by the Head Examiner, his award of marks is accepted as final. As regards the other answer books below the top level, to achieve maximum measure of uniformity inter se the examiners, the awards are moderated as per the recommendations made by the Head Examiner.

(v) If in the opinion of the Head Examiner there has been erratic or careless marking by any examiner, for which it is not feasible to have any standard moderation, the answer-scripts valued by such examiner are revalued either by the Head Examiner or any other examiner who is found to have followed the agreed norms.

(vi) Where the number of candidates is very large and the examiners are numerous, it may be difficult for one Head Examiner to assess the work of all the examiners. In such a situation, one more level of examiners is introduced. For every ten or twenty examiners, there will be a Head Examiner who checks the random samples as above. The work of the Head Examiners, in turn, is checked by a Chief Examiner to ensure proper results.

The above procedure of “moderation” would bring in considerable uniformity and consistency. It should be noted that absolute uniformity or consistency in valuation is impossible to achieve

where there are several examiners and the effort is only to achieve maximum uniformity.”

42. Whether doctrine of normalization should have been applied or doctrine of moderation should have been applied is beyond the scope of consideration in the present petition. In the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**, Coordinate Bench of this Court has already held that doctrine of merger and normalization should be applied. Furthermore, said order is sub-judice before the Supreme Court in SLP (C) No.5817/2023. Even otherwise, this Court in exercise of power under Article 226 of Constitution of India cannot modify the order passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**.

43. It was further contended by counsel for petitioners that in absence of any rules/provisions, scaling, moderation/grace marks cannot be granted and to buttress his contention counsel for petitioners has relied upon the judgments passed by Supreme Court in the case of **Umesh Chandra Shukla Vs. Union of India and others** reported in (1985) 3 SCC 721, **Uttar Pradesh Public Service Commission Vs. Manoj Kumar Yadav and Another** reported in (2018) 3 SCC 706, **Sujasha Mukherji Vs. High Court of Calcutta Through Registrar and Others** reported in (2015) 11 SCC 395.

44. However, it is sufficient to hold that aforesaid submission is beyond the scope of this Writ Petition because Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)** has already directed for merger and normalization of marks, which is subject matter of SLP (C) No.5817/2023 and even otherwise this Court in exercise of power under Article 226 of Constitution of India cannot re-open the order passed by a Coordinate Bench in another set of Writ Petitions, which was already

affirmed by Division Bench of this Court in Writ Appeal and is sub-judice before the Supreme Court.

45. No other argument is advanced by counsel for the parties.

46. Accordingly, petition(s) is/are **partly allowed** to the extent mentioned above only and respondent No.2 is directed to merge and normalize two lists i.e. result of first main examination and result of special main examination as directed by Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Harshit Jain (supra)**.

47. It is needless to mention here that this order shall be subject to final outcome of **Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).5817/2023 (Deependra Yadav and others Vs. State of M.P. and others)**.

(G.S. AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

Shanu/
Shubhankar