



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR
BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
&
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VINAY SARAF**

**WRIT PETITION No. 3022 of 2020
AMREESH PATHAK AND OTHERS
Versus
*THE STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS***

WITH

**WRIT PETITION No. 8996 of 2016
RAMMURTI SHARMA AND OTHERS
Versus
*THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS***

**WRIT PETITION No. 9423 of 2016
NEELESH SHUKLA
Versus
*THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS***

**WRIT PETITION No. 10638 of 2016
MADAN GIRI AND OTHERS
Versus
*THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS***

**WRIT PETITION No. 12969 of 2016
SMT. SAROJ PANDEY AND OTHERS
Versus
*THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS***

**WRIT PETITION No. 13943 of 2016
*RAMDAS AND OTHERS***



Versus
UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 14973 of 2016
JAGDISH AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4850 of 2017
BHARAT KUMAR MISHRA AND OTHERS

Versus
UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8686 of 2018
INDRA KUMAR PATEL AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9551 of 2018
AMIT KUMAR TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 28769 of 2018
JAGANNATH GAUTAM

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 21 of 2019
MUBARIK KHAN (ALI) AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT APPEAL No. 1106 of 2019
TEJ BHAN SHUKLA AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 1265 of 2019
CHANDRA KUMAR TIWARI

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 11612 of 2019
DEVENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2439 of 2020
SANTOSH KUSHWAH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2561 of 2020
SHYAM KISHORE MISHRA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2627 of 2020
BIRAM SINGH MALVIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2885 of 2020



RAMSINGH YADAV AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2919 of 2020
IQLAKH KHAN AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2983 of 2020
SITARAM VISHWAKARMA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3075 of 2020
SAROJ PANDEY AND OTHERS
Versus
STATE OF MP AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3301 of 2020
NANDLAL CHATURVEDI AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3885 of 2020
PURUSHOTTAM KUSHWAHA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4230 of 2020
SUMER SINGH YADAV AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 4266 of 2020
MRIGENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4481 of 2020
JONDRU LAL RAHANGDALE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4632 of 2020
NANDRAM SAHU AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4657 of 2020
RAJ BAHADUR SHASTRI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4764 of 2020
PREM BHARTI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4815 of 2020
BHIKHUA KOL AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4906 of 2020
SIYARAM YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus



THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4965 of 2020

SHIV PRATAP SINGH SENGAR

Versus

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5020 of 2020

BHAGAT SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5031 of 2020

RAMKRISHNA RAJAK AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5047 of 2020

MANOJ AWASTHY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5112 of 2020

RAHUL YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5114 of 2020

RAKESH BAGRI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 5233 of 2020

RAMLAKHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5367 of 2020

SUMAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5398 of 2020

TEJKARAN SINGH CHOUHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5479 of 2020

RAM GOPAL RATHORE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5740 of 2020

IMTIYAZ AHMAD KHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5887 of 2020

GANGARAM KAURAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5952 of 2020

SHYAM KUMAR BAIRAGI AND OTHERS

Versus



THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5973 of 2020

PRAMOD KUMAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6016 of 2020

DHARMENDRA SINGH BAGHEL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6074 of 2020

SOHAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6825 of 2020

MANIRAM KAUSHAL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6829 of 2020

BHAGENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8482 of 2020

TOFAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT APPEAL No. 703 of 2021

RAMANUJ CHATURVEDI

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13214 of 2021

HARI SHANKAR NAGAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 217 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

RAM SINGH YADAV AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 239 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

SIYARAM YADAV AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 240 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

IMTIYAZ AHMAD KHAN AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 244 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

RAMLAKHAN AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 264 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

NANDLAL CHATURVEDI AND OTHERS



WRIT APPEAL No. 265 of 2022
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS
Versus
PREMBHARTI AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 266 of 2022
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS
Versus
NANDRAM SAHU AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 291 of 2022
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS
Versus
JONDRU LAL RAHANGDALE AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 323 of 2022
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS
Versus
PURUSHOTTAM KUSHWAHA AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 333 of 2022
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS
Versus
MRIGENDRA SINIGH AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 338 of 2022
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS
Versus
SHYAM KISHORE MISHRA AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 348 of 2022
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS
Versus



RAM GOPAL RATHORE AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 349 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

BIRAM SINGH MALVIYA AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 353 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

CHANDRA SHEKHAR PATEL AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 354 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

SUMER SINGH YADAV AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 362 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

GANGARAM KAURAV AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 363 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

SATYENDRA KUMAR VISHWAKARMA AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 402 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

SHYAM KUMAR BAIRAGI AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 403 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus



SUMAN SINGH AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 406 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

BHIKHUA KOL AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 421 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

RAKESH BAGRI AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 450 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

PRAMOD KUMAR AND OTHERS

WRIT APPEAL No. 451 of 2022

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Versus

MANOJ AWASTHY AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3348 of 2022

CHANDRA SHEKHAR PATEL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3351 of 2022

SATYENDRA KUMAR VISHWAKARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4575 of 2022

ASHU MESHRAM AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4842 of 2022

MANISH GOYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5001 of 2022

VIRENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5030 of 2022

NEERAJ YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5076 of 2022

KRISHNA KUMAR TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5175 of 2022

VISHNU CHOUHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5464 of 2022

DAYASHANKAR DWIVEDI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5607 of 2022

BHAGWAT SINGH AND OTHERS



Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5651 of 2022
VISHNU PRASAD AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5652 of 2022
CHANDRA SHEKHAR PATHORIYA AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5657 of 2022
PUSHRAJ SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5778 of 2022
CHANDRA SHEKHAR LODHI AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5780 of 2022
KALICHARAN BAGHEL AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5781 of 2022
LAL BAHADUR SHRIVASTAVA AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5782 of 2022
GYAN SINGH RAWAT AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5783 of 2022
SHIV PRASAD PANDEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5786 of 2022
ANURAJ CHOUHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5838 of 2022
AJAY BAGHEL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5857 of 2022
LOKENDRA SINGH SONGARA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5927 of 2022
RUP SINGH YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6048 of 2022
RANJEET SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6122 of 2022
VIJAY AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6240 of 2022
PAWAN KUMAR SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6302 of 2022
BHAGWAN SINGH YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6387 of 2022
JITEDNRA SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6389 of 2022
KRISHNA PRATAP SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6419 of 2022
SHUBHAM SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6425 of 2022
PRAFFUL YOGI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6427 of 2022
HARIRAM VISHWAKARA AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6620 of 2022

RAMESH PRASAD SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6832 of 2022

SUSHIL KUMAR TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6901 of 2022

JASRAM SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6956 of 2022

AJAY KUMAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7188 of 2022

SUDHESH KUMAR PANDEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7242 of 2022

RAM LAKHAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7249 of 2022

SANTOSH KUMAR AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7251 of 2022
ASHOK KUMAR TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7252 of 2022
JITENDRA KHARE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7272 of 2022
SANJAY SINGH DANGI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7436 of 2022
HARIDAS DHANRAI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7438 of 2022
RAMBILAS SARATHE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7577 of 2022
BALWAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7685 of 2022
KRISHNA KANT SHUKLA AND OTHERS



Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7686 of 2022
VERSINGH GADARIYA AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7803 of 2022
RAM PRASAD DWIVEDI AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7872 of 2022
KUNJ BIHARI SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7939 of 2022
SUBHASH KUMAR AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8166 of 2022
VINOD JOSHI AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8199 of 2022
JAGMOHAN PRASAD MISHRA AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8312 of 2022
RAJENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8315 of 2022
PEERU LAL PARMAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8554 of 2022
RAM BHAROSQA AHIRWAR AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8932 of 2022
VIJAY BAHADUR SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9416 of 2022
LALITA PRASAD SAKET AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9441 of 2022
SUNDAR SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9454 of 2022
BHAGIRATH SINGH CHOUHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9649 of 2022
KAMLESHWAR PRASAD DWIVEDI AND OTHERS



Versus
THE STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9737 of 2022
RAMLAL SAHU AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9864 of 2022
BHAGWAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10106 of 2022
MAHANAND PANDEY AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10176 of 2022
PRATAP SINGH UIKEY AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10184 of 2022
RAMKRIPAL KUSHRAM AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No.10546 of 2022
SUBHAM SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 11724 of 2022
SUNIL KUMAR MISHRA AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

WRIT PETITION No. 12640 of 2022

NILESH SALVI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13108 of 2022

RAM KRIPAL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

WRIT PETITION No. 13412 of 2022

PAWAN NINAMA AND OTHERS

Versus

HOME DEPARTMENT AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13713 of 2022

SHANTI LAL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13904 of 2022

PARASRAM TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 14124 of 2022

AKASH CHOUBEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 18001 of 2022

RAJENDRA KUMAR RANGOTHA AND OTHERS



Versus

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 18093 of 2022
NARENDRA HAROD AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 18382 of 2022
LAXMIDEEN PATEL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 19382 of 2022
YASHWANT YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 23861 of 2022
VINOD KUMAR SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 24194 of 2022
BABULAL CHOUBEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 24775 of 2022
TARUNENDRA KUMAR TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 24778 of 2022
MUKESH SISODIYA AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 25263 of 2022

RAMPRASAD AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 26054 of 2022

KAMAL KAITHWAS AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 26374 of 2022

INDER SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 26397 of 2022

SNEHRAJ DIXIT AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 26679 of 2022

SANT RAM CHAUDHARY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 26773 of 2022

SUJEET SEN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 26819 of 2022

RAMDAYAL DEHARIYA AND OTHERS



Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27486 of 2022
NEELESH SHUKLA

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27517 of 2022
SHYAMLAL AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27658 of 2022
OMSHANKAR AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27684 of 2022
RAMKISHORI DUBEY AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27850 of 2022
GHANSHYAM PATHAK AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 28707 of 2022
RAM KISHOR SAHU AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 28735 of 2022
KISHAN LAL KUSHWAHA AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 28749 of 2022

SHYAMDAS SONWANI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29036 of 2022

SANTOSH MEHRA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29048 of 2022

THOBAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29280 of 2022

SANTOSH GIRI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7 of 2023

SHOBIT SAXENA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 270 of 2023

JAIHIND SINGH MARAVI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 693 of 2023

NARENDRA KUMAR TIWARI AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1369 of 2023
RAJENDRA RAIKWAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1537 of 2023
PAWAN KUMAR SONWANI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1796 of 2023
SAROJ PILLAI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1804 of 2023
KUMER SINGH TAKWANA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2012 of 2023
RAMAYAN PRASAD KOL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2019 of 2023
CHETRAM MALVIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2359 of 2023
JAGDISH AND OTHERS



Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2505 of 2023
PRABHU DAYAL SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2506 of 2023
RAJENDRA PRASAD MISHRA AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2516 of 2023
KALURAM AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2560 of 2023
SANTOSH TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus
STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2574 of 2023
WAHEED KHAN AND OTHERS

Versus
STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2693 of 2023
TUKARAM AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3049 of 2023
BHUPENDRA KUMAR PATHAK AND OTHERS

Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 3287 of 2023
ASHOK KUMAR JANGHELA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3347 of 2023
RAGHUNATH SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHAYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3438 of 2023
KALICHARAN AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3867 of 2023
ASHWIN SHARMA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3920 of 2023
SAMRATHMAL AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4066 of 2023
BHAIRO SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MP AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4122 of 2023
KAILASH PRASAD KOL AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 4701 of 2023
NANDLAL JHARIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4912 of 2023
MUKESH HANAUTIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4944 of 2023
NARAYAN PRASAD JHARIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4955 of 2023
RAM PRASAD SOUR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5291 of 2023
NAGENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5572 of 2023
RAJESH CHOUBEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5634 of 2023
HAKIM SINGH YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5664 of 2023



GOPAL SHARMA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5682 of 2023
RAJENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MP AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5685 of 2023
BADRILAL AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MP AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5686 of 2023
SURYAKANT TIWARI AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MP AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5704 of 2023
GYAN SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5835 of 2023
NAJEER MOHAMMAD AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5929 of 2023
VINOD YADAV AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5945 of 2023
SHALIGRAM PATEL AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6312 of 2023

BATULAL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6615 of 2023

NARENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6902 of 2023

CHANDA BAI GOND AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6904 of 2023

MS. SHIVANI RAJAK AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6906 of 2023

PAWAN SAHU AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7064 of 2023

UMESH KUMAR SHUKLA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7201 of 2023

PREMLAL JHARIYA AND OTHERS

Versus



STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7210 of 2023
BHAIYARAM GOUND AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7356 of 2023
SHEETAL PRASAD AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7358 of 2023
BHAIRO SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7371 of 2023
SYAMKANT SHUKLA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8452 of 2023
RAVI SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8853 of 2023
RAJNI TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9178 of 2023
KAMAL SINGH TOMAR AND OTHERS

Versus



THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9283 of 2023
SHEKH JAHUR KHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9431 of 2023
PARMANAND UIKEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9949 of 2023
BABULAL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10411 of 2023
VIJAY DEWALIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10412 of 2023
JAGDEV AHIRWAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10855 of 2023
NAARAD SINGH DHURVE AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10953 of 2023
DANSHAHA SINGH INVATI AND OTHERS

Versus



THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 12034 of 2023

MAMTA TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 12636 of 2023

PRATAP SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 12729 of 2023

MAHESH PRASAD SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13389 of 2023

MUKESH KUMAR MISHRA AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13399 of 2023

MAHESH BAIRAGI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13869 of 2023

KRISHAN KUMAR YOGI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 14530 of 2023

MUNNALAL PATEL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 14723 of 2023
TULSIRAM VISHWAKARMA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 15029 of 2023
RAKESH KUMAR PARSTE AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 15449 of 2023
KAILASH CHOUHAN AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 16178 of 2023
JWALA PRASAD VISHWAKARMA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 16876 of 2023
BHAGWAN SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 18259 of 2023
LACHHU SINGH GOND AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 18402 of 2023
ANAND SURYAVANSHI AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 18411 of 2023
SMT. SHIREE FARHAT AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 19456 of 2023
GURUDATT NAMDEO AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 20582 of 2023
JAI SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 20739 of 2023
RAJESH VERMA (JAAT) AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 22422 of 2023
SHUMER SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 23031 of 2023
TULSIRAM TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 23443 of 2023
GIRJA TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 23500 of 2023



MANI KANT SHARMA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 24532 of 2023
VEERENDRA KUMAR PATEL AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 24888 of 2023
DHOLIRAM AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 25057 of 2023
KAMAL SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 25451 of 2023
RAMKISHAN
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27068 of 2023
KANTI LAL AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27448 of 2023
HEMENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27789 of 2023
DEVENDRA KUMAR



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 28462 of 2023
SHIVCHARAN RAJAK AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 28881 of 2023
KUNWAR SIGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29019 of 2023
BHURELAL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29089 of 2023
MAJBOOT SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29341 of 2023
AJAY PATEL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29551 of 2023
ARVIND SINGH RAJPUT AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29797 of 2023
RAJJAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus



THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29844 of 2023

SANDHYA AHIRWAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 30047 of 2023

MUNNI LAL RAJAK AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 30187 of 2023

AVDESH TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 30515 of 2023

MUKESH PATEL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 30847 of 2023

SUNDERLAL KURVETI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 30906 of 2023

GOPAL DAS VAISHNAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31004 of 2023

HARSH VERMA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 31022 of 2023

ANITA SEN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31080 of 2023

SUDAMA PRASAD PATEL AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31085 of 2023

SUBHASH RAV SHINDE AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31095 of 2023

RAKESH YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31185 of 2023

MUKESH KUMAR SHAHU AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31206 of 2023

RAJKUMAR SONWANI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31378 of 2023

HARI BAI AHIRWAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 31416 of 2023

KRIPAL SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31631 of 2023

ANANDI LAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31765 of 2023

SARMANLAL AHIRWAR

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31774 of 2023

MAHESH KUMAR UPADHYAY

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 32109 of 2023

BALWAN SINGH MARAVI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 32127 of 2023

MANMOHAN SAHU AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 99 of 2024

AKASH CHOUBEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 119 of 2024



KUNWAR SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 191 of 2024
ANJA BAI AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 301 of 2024
SHUSHIL SHARMA AND OTHERS
Versus
STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 495 of 2024
AJMER SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 544 of 2024
INDER SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 583 of 2024
AKHILESH KUMAR GURU AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 615 of 2024
NARMADA PRASAD PATEL AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 725 of 2024
SUNNY PARMAR AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 759 of 2024

GULAB PATEL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 795 of 2024

YAJVENDRA SINGH CHAWHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 944 of 2024

PREMNARAYAN CHOUHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1175 of 2024

RAO JI KADVE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1205 of 2024

VEERAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1229 of 2024

SHEIKH NAZIM AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1420 of 2024

GOPAL PRASAD JANGHELA AND OTHERS

Versus



THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1422 of 2024

HARISH KUMAR SINGROURE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1435 of 2024

RAJKUMAR SIROHIYA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1569 of 2024

GOPAL SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1698 of 2024

SUSHIL KUMAR JHARIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1703 of 2024

GAJENDRA SINGH CHOURE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1752 of 2024

RAJESH PATEL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1949 of 2024

GAJRAJ SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 1951 of 2024

SURESH KUMAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2249 of 2024

AJAY KUMAR MISHRA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2359 of 2024

ARJUN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2362 of 2024

TEJRAM AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2780 of 2024

ANIL KOLI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2826 of 2024

MANGILAL CHOUHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2970 of 2024

KARULAL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 3143 of 2024

YOGESH YOGI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3246 of 2024

VISHAL JOSHI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3485 of 2024

RADHESHYAM AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3631 of 2024

GHASIRAM AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3742 of 2024

BALBAHADUR SINGH VERMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3965 of 2024

BABULAL YUVNATI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4003 of 2024

KHUSHILAL SONI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4092 of 2024



PRIYANKA MISHRA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4169 of 2024
SACHIN VISHWAKARMA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4314 of 2024
SALAKRAM BARASKAR AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4383 of 2024
SHRIRAM VERMA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4445 of 2024
ARJUN SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4507 of 2024
MEHARBAN SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4719 of 2024
RAMDAS PAWAR AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4896 of 2024
SANJAY MISHRA



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4927 of 2024

DEVENDRA SINGH JANGHELA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5116 of 2024

NEERAJ KUMAR SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5244 of 2024

MUKESH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5276 of 2024

RAMESH NAMDEV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5914 of 2024

VASUDEV PRASAD BADGAIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6261 of 2024

BRAHMANAND JANGHELA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6340 of 2024

SHRIPAL SINGH GUNHARE

Versus



THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6520 of 2024

OMDATT TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6598 of 2024

BANSHI LAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6679 of 2024

ANITA SINGH THAKUR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6734 of 2024

CHANDRAKANT JHARIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6951 of 2024

BHARAT SHUKLA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6959 of 2024

GHANSHYAM AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7177 of 2024

PREMNARAYAN DUBEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 7249 of 2024

DHANRAJ SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7334 of 2024

RAMAKANT TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7340 of 2024

SHRI LAL DHURVE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7419 of 2024

PARASRAM YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 7998 of 2024

MUKESH RAIKWAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8322 of 2024

RAJENDRA PRASAD YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8853 of 2024

JITENDRA SINGH RAJPOOT AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 9349 of 2024
VINOD MASATAKAR AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9489 of 2024
LAL BAHADUR SINGH PARMAR AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9691 of 2024
HARISHANKAR SEN AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9734 of 2024
ANOO P SINGH PARIHAR AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10132 of 2024
BHAN SINGH SAROTE
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10275 of 2024
RATU SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10524 of 2024
SALIK RAM JANGHELA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 11057 of 2024



MANOJ KUMAR AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 11088 of 2024
PHOOLCHAND JAISWAL AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS
WRIT PETITION No. 11253 of 2024
MAAN SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 12074 of 2024
DINESH MASATKAR AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 12111 of 2024
REMU SINGH BHABAR AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13031 of 2024
SHANTILAL AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13148 of 2024
RAMNATH KORI AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13185 of 2024
OM PRAKASH KHEDE AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 13413 of 2024

RAGHUNATH EKLE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 14167 of 2024

DEVENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 14241 of 2024

MANOJ KUMAR NAKIB AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 14917 of 2024

PARKASH SONRISH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 15499 of 2024

KUVAR SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 16152 of 2024

OMSHANKAR SURYAWANSHI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 16320 of 2024

YASHWANT KUMAR SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus



THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 16440 of 2024

DILIP AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 16469 of 2024

HANUMAT SINGH THAKUR

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 16488 of 2024

LAKHAN TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 16740 of 2024

MULAI SINGH UDDE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 16968 of 2024

MAHENDRA KUMAR MISHRA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 17170 of 2024

GYANI LAL SAHU AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 17859 of 2024

RAMESH SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 18239 of 2024
RAMLAKHAN SINGH SOLANKI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 18473 of 2024
MANOJ BRAHME AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 18504 of 2024
MANOHAR LAL SITARIA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 18723 of 2024
PANNALAL MEDA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 19038 of 2024
RAMSWARUP SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 19517 of 2024
SHIVNARAYAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 20518 of 2024
LALIT KMAR SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 20804 of 2024

ISAHAAK KHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 21207 of 2024

GIRJA PRASAD AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 21301 of 2024

DEVENDRA KUMAR BHAVEDI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 21324 of 2024

DINESH TAMRAKAR

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 21483 of 2024

MANOHAR SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 21494 of 2024

MADHAV TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 21805 of 2024

MOHD. YUSUF KHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

STATE OF M.P. AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 22383 of 2024



RAGUNATH YADUWANSI

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 22812 of 2024

BUDHAN SINGH DHURVE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 23586 of 2024

MAHENDRA KUMAR AHIRWAR

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 23961 of 2024

KALAYAN SINGH

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 24225 of 2024

ASHOK SONI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 24458 of 2024

PRAKASH SURYAWANSHI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 24524 of 2024

ARUN TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 24882 of 2024

RAMESH CHANDRA PARIHAR AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 25007 of 2024

RAJENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 25088 of 2024

MANOJ KUMAR VARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 25790 of 2024

DHANUSH KUMAR ARYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 26195 of 2024

PRABHUNATH MISHRA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 26988 of 2024

DWARKA PRASAD YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27185 of 2024

SANTOSH KUDOPA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 27670 of 2024

LALIT MOHAN YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 27809 of 2024

RAJESH MISHRA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 28008 of 2024

RAJKUMAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 28519 of 2024

GHISILAL KUSHWAHA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 28764 of 2024

VIJAY SHARMA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 29011 of 2024

ANKIT DUBEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 30013 of 2024

RAMCHANDRA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31107 of 2024

RAJESH KUMAR SAROTE

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 31134 of 2024
SANDEEP SHRIVASTAVA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31222 of 2024
MUNNI LAL AHIRWAR

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 31514 of 2024
HAZARI LAL AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 32152 of 2024
MAROTI PAWAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 32347 of 2024
REWA SHANKAR GOUR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 33010 of 2024
SHANKAR SHINGH THAKUR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 33567 of 2024
PANKAJ MANDLOI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 34250 of 2024



DEEPAK KUMAR DUBEY AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 34317 of 2024
PRATAP SINGH UIKEY AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 34986 of 2024
KAILASH VERMA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 35215 of 2024
BRAJESH KUMAR DUBEY AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 35853 of 2024
TULSI DAS AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 35936 of 2024
DINESH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 36480 of 2024
PREHLAD SINGH THAKUR
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 36964 of 2024
DEEPAK UIKEY AND OTHERS
Versus



THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 37171 of 2024
INDRA SEN YADAV AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 37901 of 2024
SUSHIL SONI

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 38029 of 2024
FIKIR CHAND AHKE AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 38393 of 2024
MANGILAL THAKUR

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 38828 of 2024
KUNJ BIHARI TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 38833 of 2024
GANGARAM UIKEY

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 38956 of 2024
LAIHU PATEL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 38991 of 2024



MOHIT KUMAR SURYAVANSHI AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 39310 of 2024
BIHARI SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 39326 of 2024
SATENDRA TIWARI AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 39608 of 2024
KAUSHAL TOMAR AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 39859 of 2024
SURENDRA KUMAR SONI AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 40796 of 2024
DEEPAK KARVADIYA AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 41123 of 2024
POORAN GOUND AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MP AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 42020 of 2024



SAHESHLAL SAREYAM AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6 of 2025
JAGRAJ SINGH PATEL AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 419 of 2025
SOURABH TIWARI AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1317 of 2025
DHARMENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1420 of 2025
VINAY MANDRAH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 1972 of 2025
KUMER SINGH AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2293 of 2025
PAWAN KUMAR
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2550 of 2025
MOHIT NAYAK
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 2576 of 2025

NILESH PARMAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2619 of 2025

HARIRAM SINGH LODHI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2764 of 2025

SURENDRA SINGH RAJPUT AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 2796 of 2025

RAMLAL VISHWAKARMA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3457 of 2025

DINESH CHANDRA MALI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3663 of 2025

SANTOSH TIWARI AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3716 of 2025

SUHAGCHAND SOLANKI

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3748 of 2025

JAGDISH PRASAD

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 3837 of 2025

ANGIRA PANDEY AND OTHERS



Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4025 of 2025

PAWAN KUMAR JAIN

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 4078 of 2025

SMT.LAKSHMI AHIRWAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5176 of 2025

AJAYPAL SINGH CHOUHAN AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5640 of 2025

LAKHAN SINGH AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 5820 of 2025

NILESH UIKEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6221 of 2025

ABHISHEK GOND AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 6694 of 2025

INDRAPAL BUNKAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 8366 of 2025

RAJESH MALVIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8502 of 2025

ASHARAM AHIRWAR

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8718 of 2025

BUNDEL SINGH BAGHEL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 8755 of 2025

PAVITRA BAI AND OTHERS

Versus

***DIRECTOR GENERAL, HOME GUARDS AND CIVIL DEFENCE AND
OTHERS***

WRIT PETITION No. 9553 of 2025

AJAY KUMAR DHURVEY AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 9852 of 2025

RAM SINGH KUSHRAM AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



WRIT PETITION No. 10036 of 2025

JAIRAM NIWARIYA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10060 of 2025

LILADHAR AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10892 of 2025

MURAT SINGH

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 10909 of 2025

SHIV CHARAN TEKAM

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

AND

WRIT PETITION No. 11257 of 2025

SHIV PRASAD CHOUREY

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WRIT PETITION No. 12371 of 2025

ROHIT RAY

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS



Advocates for the Petitioners/Appellants:

Shri D.K. Dixit, Senior Advocate, Shri Manoj Sharma, Senior Advocate, Ms. Anjali Banerjee, Senior Advocate with Shri Anshul Dixit, Ms. Shrankhala Dorekar, Ms. Shail Patel, Shri Vikas Mahawar, Shri K.K. Pandey, Shri S.P. Dubey, Shri Gopal Singh, Shri S.P. Mishra, Shri Prasanna R. Bhatnagar, learned Advocate (through VC), Shri Ajay Kumar Jain, Shri Rajeev Badkur, Shri Vijay Tripathi, Shri Praveen Yadav, Shri Vijay Kumar Pandey, Ms. Jailaxmi Aiyer, Shri Ratnesh Yadav, Shri Satyendra Dubey and Shri Aman Tiwari, Shri Surya Kumar Patel, Shri G.S. Baghel, Shri Vinay Pratap, Shri Vidya Pratap, Shri Vidya Prasad, Shri Ashok Kumar Chourasiya, Ms. Ghuncha Rasool, Shri Rohit Pegwar, Shri Harsh Virmani, Shri Kundanlal, Shri Khenchand Raikwar, Shri Pankaj Ajmera, Shri Lokesh Kumar Bhatnagar, Shri Rahul Kumar Chourasiya, Smt. Deepika Seth, Shri Manoj Manav, Shri Nirmal Sharma, Shri Deo Krishna Katare, Shri Arun Katare, Shri Mumares Pathak, Shri Siddharth Patel, Shri Rakesh Kumar Tripathi, Shri Kaushtubh Shankar Jha, Shri Vikram Singh, Shri Abhishek Tiwari, Shri Puneet Chaturvedi, Shri Vihag Shekhar Dubey, Shri Vakas Rathi, Shri Vidya Shankar Mishra, Shri Ganga Ram Saket, Shri Priyan Shrivastava, Shri Kamal Bhanvishwakarma, Shri Kaushal Sisodiya, Shri Ashish Mishra, Shri Virendra Singh Choudhary, Shri Abhishek Arjariya, Shri Shailesh Tiwari, Advocates.

Advocates for the Respondents:

Shri Swapnil Ganguli, learned Deputy Advocate General with Shri Gaurav Maheshwari, Advocate for the State.

Reserved on : 29.07.2025

Pronounced on : 26.09.2025



JUDGMENT

Per: Justice Sanjeev Sachdeva

1. All the Writ Petitions and Appeals raise common question of law and have similar facts and as such all the petitions and appeals were taken up for analogous hearing and are being disposed of by a common judgment.
2. Petitioners and Appellants in their respective writ petitions and appeals are serving as Sainiks in Home Guards. They were appointed on different dates as Sainiks in Home Guards. The date of appointment of each of the petitioner and appellant is not relevant for the purposes of determining the controversy arising in these petitions and appeals.
3. Petitioners and Appellants have primarily impugned the orders whereby the Home Guards have been “called off” for a period of two months.
4. The “call off” orders are claimed to have been passed in the exercise of powers under Rule 27 (1) (c) of the *Madhya Pradesh Home Guard Rules 2016* (hereinafter referred to as the said Rules).
5. The Appellants had filed their respective Writ Petitions impugning the respective orders whereby they were called off duty. Since there was no challenge to any statutory provision or rule, said Writ Petitions were listed before learned single judges of this court.



Against the orders passed in the Said Petitions intra court writ appeals have been filed which have been listed before us.

6. In the Writ Petitions before us, apart from challenging the orders whereby the Sainiks in Home Guards were called off, there is a challenge to the validity of the statutory provisions *inter alia* Section 7(2) of the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) and Rule 27 (1) (c) of the Rules and that is the reason the Writ Petitions were also listed before the Division Bench.

7. It is contended on behalf of the Petitioners/Appellants (hereinafter collectively referred to as the Petitioners), that the *Sainiks* in Home Guards of Madhya Pradesh perform the same functions and duties which the constables of Regular Police Establishment perform but they are denied similar benefits.

8. It is contended that the *Homeguard Sainik Evam Pariwar Kalyan Sangh* and several Home Guard Sainiks filed Writ Petitions *inter alia* W.P. No. 10000/2010 (titled *Homeguard Sainik Evam Pariwar Kalyan Sangh versus State of Madhya Pradesh*) seeking a direction for declaring the post of Sainiks of Home Guards as a Civil Post and for grant of all consequential benefits and to treat them at par with the whole time staff of Home Guards. They also sought a direction to the respondents to frame rules regarding their service conditions including benefit of salary, allowances, increments, pay scale, leave, provident fund, gratuity etc. at par with the Home Guards appointed on substantive post. It is further contended that said petition



was disposed of vide order dated 02.12.2011 *inter alia* directing the state government to lay down schemes, rules or regulations for regulating the working of Home Guards establishment and as an interim to give them minimum of the pay, payable to a Constable in the Police Department and do away with the principle of calling off or rotation of duty. It is submitted that the challenge to the said judgment was negated up to the Supreme Court of India.

9. It is contended that thereafter a Committee was formed and the Home Guard Rules of 2016 were framed. The 2016 Rules are also under Challenge. The 2016 Rules, however prescribed the term of service till the age of 60 years. The Rules provided for a system of Calling off duty of Home Guards for a period of 2 months in a year. Subsequently by an amendment, by notification dated 13.09.2022, the duration of call out duty has been changed from 10 months in a year to 34 months out of 36 months. During the period of Call off the Home Guard Sainiks would not be entitled to any salary or allowances.

10. It is submitted that the call off of two months in 12 months and 03 years as the case may be, is in breach of the orders passed in the *Homeguard Sainik Evam Pariwar Kalyan Sangh (supra)* by this court. It is contended that on account of the Call off, the Home Guard remain unemployed for two months and that the Rule 27 (1) (c) is violative of Article 14, 16, 19(1)(b) and 21 of the Constitution of India.



11. It is also contended on behalf of the Petitioners that Section 7(2) of the Act, has become unconstitutional by efflux of time as the rationale and determining principle used at the time of its enactment is no longer reasonable. It is submitted that at the time when the said provision was enacted, State Government did not need the Home Guards as a full time force and they were raised and called put specifically for occasions such as emergencies, *Simhashta mela* etc. however, in the present days, the state government requires and is using the services of Home Guards on a full time basis. This is fortified by the fact that they are to be on call out duty for 34 months out of 36 and to ensure their availability respondents have directed that 90% of the sanctioned strength is always at work and only 10% are to be called off as per roster.

12. It is also submitted on behalf of the Petitioners/Appellants that since 2016, there has been no recruitment on the said post and as such as on date Home Guards Sainiks much less than 90% of the sanctioned strength are employed, thus there is no need to call off the Home Guards on rotation basis even for 2 months in 36 months.

13. Per contra, learned Counsel for the Respondent State contends that Home Guard services are voluntary services and no benefits akin to regular service can be claimed. It is contended that as per Rule 21(2) of the Rules, voluntary Home Guards can be called out not in excess of 90% of the authorized strength of the district reserve force. Call out up to 100% can only be made with prior approval of the State Government. It is contended that initially call out was provided for 6



months in a year and from 2010 to 2022 it was 10 months in a year and after the amendment on 13.09.2022, it was made 34 months in three years.

14. It is contended that the engagement of Home Guard Sainik is for real emergency, when the police force is inadequate to deal effectively with the ongoing situation thus by giving limited power/access, the assistance is being taken in general measure of public welfare.

15. It is submitted that the voluntary Home Guard can surrender the certificate and when the voluntary Home Guard is not engaged in duty or training, then he/she can engage in any other employment, not in conflict with the interest of the department. Thus the service conditions are strictly not governed as per a regular government servant.

16. It is contended that there is a presumption in favour of the constitutionality and validity of a subordinate legislation and the burden is upon him who attacks the validity. It is further contended, that the call out is a policy decision and it is not for the courts to consider the relative merits of different economic policies and consider whether a wiser or better one can be evolved. For testing the correctness of a policy, the appropriate forum is the Parliament and not the Courts. It is thus submitted that the Petitioners are not entitled to be equated with the Police Constables or personnel and cannot claim parity with pay or scales of pay as provided to Police Personnel.



17. The gravamen of the Challenge in the Writ Appeals and the Writ Petitions is to the orders passed by the respondents whereby all the Sainiks in Home Guards are called off duty for a period of two months. All the Sainiks in Home Guards who have been enrolled after 13.04.2016 have been decided to be called out on duty for a period of 10 months in a year and their services have been subjected to roster system. Said decision has been taken under Rule 27(1)(c) of the Rules. Subsequently, by an amendment in the year 2022 of Rule 27(1)(c) of the Rules, the call out period has been modified to 34 months in every 03 years. Besides challenging the respective orders passed directing Call off of two months in a period of 12 months (pre 2022 amendment) and call off of two months in three years (post 2022 amendment). Petitioners also impugn the validity of Rules 27(1)(c) of the rules.

18. Challenge has thus been made to the validity of Section 7(2) and 7 (2A) of the Act and Rules 27(1)(a), 27(1)(c), 27(2)(d) and 27(4) of the Rules. Petitioners/Appellants have also sought regularization of their service and to treat the Home Guards as equal to other employees in the Police Departments and to treat them as permanent employees and to grant consequential benefits as that of regular employees. Further, retirement age enhancement has been sought till the age of 62 years. We may note that in some of the petitions that were filed prior to the amendment of the Rules in 2017, the age enhancement is sought till the age of 60 years. The 2017 amendment has enhanced the age to 60 years.



19. The questions that arise for consideration in these petitions and appeals are :

- (i) *Whether Section 7(2), 7(2A) of the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Act, 1947 and Rules 27(1)(a), 27(1)(c), 27(2)(d) and 27(4) of the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Rules, 2016 are unconstitutional and liable to struck down?*
- (ii) *If Section 7(2), 7(2A) of the Act and Rules 27(1)(a), 27(1)(c), 27(2)(d) and 27(4) of the Rules are valid, can the Respondents still call off the Home Guard Sonics for two months on roster basis?*
- (iii) *Whether Sainiks of Home Guards are liable to treated at par with the employees in the police department and entitled to regualrisation of service and all consequential benefits as regular/permanent employees?*
- (iv) *Whether the Sainiks are entitled to age enhancement up to the age of 62 years?*

20. Prior to referring to the statutory scheme of the Act and rules, it would be expedient to refer to the earlier round of litigation on this aspect. As noticed above, the issue of regualrisation and “Call Out” was subject matter of litigation before this Court in W.P. No. 10000/2010 titled *Homeguard Sainik Evam Pariwar Kalyan Sangh versus State of Madhya Pradesh* and other batch of petitions.

21. Reference may be had to the Judgment dated 02.12.2011 in W.P. No. 10000/2010. The questions arising for consideration in the said Petitions were as under:

*“*****The relief claimed for in these writ petitions: are, that the petitioners be declared as holders of “civil post” and treating them to be so, all consequential benefits be granted*



to them as is being granted to regular employees of the State Government, particularly in the Police Department. That apart, further direction, sought for is to issue a. 'mandamus' to the respondents directing them to frame rules and regulations governing conditions of service for the persons working in the Home Guards Organization, Particularly with reference to pay scale, allowances, . increments, pensionary benefits and. other service conditions. Further prayer made is to, grant the benefit of pay and allowances as is paid to other employees of the Police Department and treat the petitioners as regular employees in the department and finally it is claimed that after so regularizing and absorbing them in. the regular establishment, the system of calling off duty, which is followed be done away with."

(underlining supplied)

22. With regard to the claim for being declared as a Civil Post Holder, the learned writ court relying upon the decision of the Supreme Court of India in *Mallikarjuna Rao & Others versus State of Andhra Pradesh & Others* (1990) 2 SCC 707, held that the court could not issue a mandamus for implementing the recommendations of the State Human Rights Commission and thus the relief could not be granted.

23. Learned Judge in *Homeguard Sainik Evam Pariwar Kalyan Sangh (supra)* held as under:

"24- Even though initially when the Act of 1947 was enacted, the same was enforced for establishing a voluntary organization and the organization that came into force was also a voluntary organization, but the voluntary nature of the organization lost its identity, with the passage of time and the nature of work which the organization started performing also underwent substantial change in due course of time, it attained the status of a regular establishment. Even the employees, like the petitioners, who are working have



continued to work for more than 10-20 years and it is, therefore, correct on the part of the petitioners in contending that with the passage of time and with the manner in which the organization had progressed, the voluntary nature of the organization had ceased to exist. This aspect of the matter is considered by the Supreme Court in the case of Pantha Chatterjee (supra){State of West Bengal versus Pantha Chatterjee, AIR 2003 SC 3569} and after taking note of the continued deployment of Home Guards for a period of more than 10 years, in that particular case, it has been held by the Supreme Court that the voluntary nature of the organization has lost its identity and it has become more or less a regular establishment. It is held by the Supreme Court that in the prevailing situation, it is unfair on the part of the competent authorities to contend that it is a voluntary organization and no relationship of master and servant exists. It has been held that the scheme, which was originally indicated as a voluntary organization, has lost its characteristic and now it is nothing but a regular establishment, catering to the needs of the State in various matters.

25- *Even though under the Act of 1947, the Home Guards organization is termed to be a voluntary organization, the nature of duties of the Home Guards as is specified in Section 10 clearly indicates that the Home Guards have to perform various duties. The duties performed by the Home Guards and the findings recorded by the Human Rights Commission in this regard would be referred to after some point of time. For the present, it may be taken note of that the State Government itself feeling that the Home Guards organization is no more a voluntary organization, temporary in nature, has enacted various rules exercising powers under Article 309 of the Constitution and if these rules are taken note of, it would be seen that the State Government had been harping upon an idea of creating a permanent organization with a permanent set up, regular substantive posts were to be created with a particular pay scale. The statutory rules framed in this regard namely the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards (Gazetted) Service Rules, 1973; the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards [Class III Ministerial] Service Recruitment Rules, 1973; The Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Class III (Ministerial)*



Service Recruitment Rules, 1973; The Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Class III (Executive) Recruitment Rules, 2000; The Home Guards Class III (Executive) Recruitment Rules and the Pension Rules are all examples of various enactment made by the State Government for giving a permanent characteristic to the Home Guards organization.”

24. Learned Judge after referring to the report submitted by the Human Rights Commission held that *“the Home Guards are discharging all the duties, which are being performed by a regular police personnel except actual investigation into a crime and anti-dacoity operations and this is the admission of the Director General before the Commission.”*

25. It has further been held that *“It is also seen from this report that keeping in view the increasing demand of the Home Guards and due to non-grant of adequate financial assistance from the State Government, the system of calling off duty was introduced, in his statement the Director General has admitted this position. It is, therefore, clear from the statements of the Director General (Home Guards) that the calling of duty was necessitated due to economic and financial constraints inspite of requirement for the work.”*

26. It was further held as under:

“37- As already indicated hereinabove, this Court cannot issue any ‘mandamus’ to the State Government for implementing the recommendations of the Human Rights Commission in its totality nor can the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’ be enforced. Similarly, the declaration sought by the petitioners for declaring them as civil post holders and, therefore, to regularize treating them to be “civil post” holders can also be not granted in view of the judgments



rendered by this Court in the case of Kedar Prasad (supra) and again in the case of Pun Pratap Singh (supra), wherein it has been held by Division Bench of this Court that as the Home Guards are not civil post holders and they did not enjoy 'equal pay for equal work' in the absence of rules being framed and made applicable to them by the State Government. To that effect, the objections raised by Shri R.D. Jain, learned Advocate General, has to be upheld.

38- But, at the same time taking note of the fact that the petitioners, who are Home Guards, and are required to work continuously year after year and are not even getting the bare minimum salary as is given to their counterparts in the Police Department, the amount paid presently is not sufficient enough to sustain them and their family, relief has to be granted to them so that they can earn living wage by working as Home Guards and at the same time the system of calling of, which is not at all justified in any manner, should be done away with.

39- During the course of hearing of this petition Shri R.D. Jain, the learned Advocate General, except for contending that the recommendations made by the State Human Rights Commission cannot be enforced, did not point out even a single error or illegality or perversity in the findings of fact recorded by the State Human Rights Commission, with regard to the manner in which the Home Guards are treated in the State of Madhya Pradesh. Not a single ground was canvassed during the time of hearing to show as to why the findings recorded in this Report be not taken to be correct. If the facts that have come out in the Report are correct, then it clearly shows that the constitutional and fundamental rights of the Home Guards are being violated and the State Government is not even following the mandate of the Constitution for protecting the rights of the Home Guards.

40- This Court had passed an interim order directing for payment of certain minimum salary and doing away with the system of calling of. Even though the order was passed more than three months back on 22.9.2011, the order has not been given affect to and the State Government by filing an



application for recall has not given any reason as to why the said directions cannot be implemented. Except for contending that the financial and economic condition of the State Government prevents the State Government from implementing the said directions, no justifiable reason is given as to why the decision cannot be implemented. Financial constraints of the State Government cannot be an excuse for denying the constitutional rights of an employee discharging duties for the State Government. The Home Guards are performing duty by protecting the life and liberty of the citizens of the State and safeguarding the properties and assets of the State Government and whey they are doing so, the bare minimum of paying them some living wage, enough to sustain them has to be granted and mere financial constraints cannot be an excuse for denying the said benefit to the petitioners.

41- In a welfare State and particularly when the State has to act as a model employer, the State is required to set an example by giving wages and salary sufficient enough to sustain an employee and his family. The State cannot be permitted to act like a private employer and exploit the working class or the labour force doing duties for the State and citizens. The State has to act as a model employer and in the absence of any cogent justification from the Government for not doing so, the excuse of financial constraints cannot be accepted.

47- While evaluating the facts with regard to working conditions of the Home Guards, the State Human Rights Commission has found that in the matter of prescribing working conditions of the petitioners and in the matter of granting them various facilities, the basic human rights requirement are not complied with and it is violative of Articles 14, 21 and 23 of the Constitution. If that be so and if the basic human rights and constitutional rights are found to be violated, this Court cannot simply close its eyes and leave it to the Government to take a decision at its own sweet will. For more than 50 years, nothing has been done and it is not known as to for how many more years, the petitioners and



Home Guards will have to suffer this violation of their basic human rights in the matter of giving them a fair wage and other working and service conditions, decent enough to maintain themselves and their family.

48- Under such circumstances, even though this Court deems it appropriate to leave it to the State Government to take a final decision into the matter, but with a view to do immediate justice to some extent to the petitioners, the interest of not only justice, but the constitutional mandate requires that till a final decision is not taken by the State Government, as a measure of interim relief or interim benefit, some relief should be granted to the petitioners so that their grievance are mitigated to some extent and the violation of their human and constitutional rights are to some extent remedied and it was taking note of all these factors that an interim order was passed by this Court on 22.9.2011, directing the respondents atleast to give to each of the petitioners the minimum of the pay, payable to a Constable in the Police Department and in doing away with the principle of calling of or rotation of duty.

49- In view of the aforesaid and in the facts and circumstances of the case, for the grounds and reasons indicated hereinabove, these petitions are allowed in part. Even though this Court does not deem it appropriate to issue any 'mandamus' with regard to the prayer made by the petitioners for declaring them as civil post holders or for granting them regular service alongwith regular benefits available to a personnel in the police department, the following directions are issued in the facts of the present case:

(a) On receipt of a certified copy of this order, the State Government shall take note of the recommendations made by the State Human Rights Commission and if required after constituting a High Level Committee or Commission to go into the questions and recommendations made by the Human Rights Commission and after studying the organization, working set up and other factors in the establishment of the Home Guards, make endeavour to lay down schemes, rules



or regulations for regulating the working of the Home Guards establishment and if required, may formulate statutory rules and regulations in this regard, for prescribing their service conditions.

(b) Till the aforesaid exercise is not completed, all the employees working in the Home Guards department and who are petitioners before this Court, so also other similarly situated persons, who may have not filed writ petitions, be granted salary at the minimum/basic of the pay prescribed for the lowest post i.e. constable in the police department, without any running pay scale, allowances etc.

(c) All the employees would be entitled to the minimum of the pay scale i.e. the basic of the pay, as is payable to a constable in the police department, and the said benefit shall be extended to the employees with effect from 1.1.2011.

(d) The employees would be paid the aforesaid amount with revision of basic pay, if any, in the corresponding police department from time to time hereafter, till a final scheme or regular rules and regulations are not formulated for working in the Home Guards organization.

(e) Apart from the aforesaid, the system of calling of duty shall be done away with and the employees shall be employed throughout the year subject to their being physically fit or otherwise entitled to work in accordance to law.

50- If this Court does not grant even this bare minimum relief to the petitioners, this Court would be failing in its duty of protecting the constitutional rights of the petitioners and having been prima facie satisfied that the action of the State Government is unjustified and amounts to violation of the constitutional and human rights, cannot sit back and look without issuing any directions. It is under these compelling circumstances that this Court is constrained to pass this order so that till the State Government takes a final decision into the matter, the petitioners are granted some interim benefit.”

(underlining supplied)



27. In *Homeguard Sainik Evam Pariwar Kalyan Sangh (supra)* learned single judge of this court issued a direction to the State Government to consider the report of the Human Rights Commission and directed that till a final decision was taken by the State Government, some interim benefit should be granted to the Home Guards so that their grievance are mitigated to some extent and the violation of their human and constitutional rights are to some extent remedied. The Learned Judge noticed that by an interim order dated 22.09.2011, it was *inter alia* directed the respondents to atleast give to each of them the minimum of the pay, payable to a Constable in the Police Department and to do away with the principle of calling of or rotation of duty. Learned Judge further directed the State Government to take note of the recommendations made by the State Human Rights Commission and to endeavour to lay down schemes, rules or regulations for regulating the working of the Home Guards establishment and to formulate statutory rules and regulations in this regard, for prescribing their service conditions. Learned Judge also directed that the system of calling of duty shall be done away with and the employees shall be employed throughout the year subject to their being physically fit or otherwise entitled to work in accordance to law.

28. The Judgment dated 02.12.2011 in *Homeguard Sainik Evam Pariwar Kalyan Sangh (supra)* was challenged before the Division Bench of this Court. The Division Bench in W.A. 80 of 2012 and



W.A. 106 of 2012 and other batch of appeals by its order dated 08.05.2011 held as under:

“In these appeals, it is not the stand of the State Government that the State Government has no work to provide employment to these Home Guards throughout the year and that they would sit idle and would get payment without performing any duty. It has also not been shown to us that how the State Government which is expected to be a model employer, can deny minimum wages to its employees. Under Section 18 of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993 the State Human Rights Commission may make recommendations to the State Government. The State Government has to consider the recommendation which may be made by State Human Right Commission.

The only argument advanced before us by the learned Government Advocate while arguing the appeals filed on behalf of the State is that High Level Committee which is to examine the recommendations of the Human Rights Commission may feel itself inhibited because of the observations and finding given by the learned Single Judge in the impugned order.

Having regard to the aforesaid submissions it is clarified that while examining the recommendations of the State Human Commission, the High Level committee would not be influenced in any manner by any of the observations made in the order of learned Single Judge or any of the observations made above in this order. In fact, when the State Government takes a final decision after the recommendations of the High Level Committee, the State Government will also not be influenced by any of the observations referred to above. Both, the High Level Committee and the State Government, will consider the recommendations of the State Human Rights Commission independently keeping in mind the constitutional and human rights of the persons involved, the needs and requirements of the establishment and the capacity of Home Guards to fulfill such needs.

(underlining supplied)



29. The order of the Division Bench became subject matter of challenge before the Supreme Court of India in S.L.P. (C) CC No. 21470 – 21471 of 2014 titled *State of M.P. & Ors versus Damodar Malviya & Others* and other batch of Special Leave Petitions. The Supreme Court of India by its order dated 21.01.2015 noticed the contention of the State that State was primarily aggrieved by the direction issued by the court in clause (c) of the judgment and order of the Court, which was the direction to the State to pay the minimum of the pay-scale i.e. the basic of the pay, as was payable to a constable in the police department w.e.f. 01.01.2011 and the contention that if such a direction was to be complied with by the State, it had to face heavy financial burden.

30. The Supreme Court of India after considering the submissions made by the parties, held that if the benefit that was payable to the Home Guards was modified to the extent that the said benefit shall be paid by the State w.e.f. 01.12.2011, it would not cause prejudice either to the State or to the respondents. Accordingly, it was directed that the benefit of the basic pay as ordered by the High Court be extended to the Home Guards not w.e.f. 01.01.2011 but w.e.f. 01.12.2011 till the date honorarium had been enhanced to Rs. 9000/- by the State Government. The Supreme Court further directed the State Government to frame appropriate rules and regulations for regulating the working conditions of the respondents/home guards as early as possible and till such time to pay to the respondents/home guards the honorarium that was fixed by the State Government on the



recommendations made by the high level Committee from the date such recommendation was made by the high level committee.

31. It may be noticed from the orders of the Division Bench and the Supreme Court that the grievance of the State Government had been primarily to the direction for payment of higher pay. There was no challenge to the direction for doing away with the concept of “*call off*”.

32. We may thus note that the question as to whether the Home Guard Sainiks are liable to be treated at par with the employees in the police department and entitled to regularisation of service and all consequential benefits as regular/permanent employees has already been conclusively decided against the Home Guard Sainiks in *Homeguard Sainik Evam Pariwar Kalyan Sangh (supra)*. The Court has already held that “*the declaration sought by the petitioners for declaring them as civil post holders and, therefore, to regularize treating them to be “civil post” holders can also be not granted*”. It has also been held that “*the system of calling of duty shall be done away with and the employees shall be employed throughout the year subject to their being physically fit or otherwise entitled to work in accordance to law.*”

33. As noticed hereinabove, the Supreme Court in the appeal by the State noticed that the State was primarily aggrieved by the direction issued by the Court to the State to pay the minimum of the pay-scale i.e. the basic of the pay, as was payable to a constable in the police



department w.e.f. 01.01.2011. No challenge was laid to the direction by the learned Single Judge of doing away with the system of “Calling Off”. Thus State cannot follow the concept of Call off either for two months in a year or two months in three years as is sought to be done.

34. We may at this juncture also examine the Statutory Scheme of the Act and the Rules. Reference may be had to the relevant provisions of the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Act, 1947. Section 7 (2) and Section 10 of the Act reads as under:

“Section 7 -Duties and training of Home Guards-

*(1) ******

(2) Subject to any rules made in this behalf a Home Guard may be required to undergo training for such period and in such manner as may be prescribed after which he shall serve as a Home Guard for a period of six months which period may be extended by the State Government to a total period of not more than twelve months if the State Government considers such extension necessary and shall thereafter serve in the reserve for a period of three years and while in the reserve shall be liable to be called out for duty at any time.

(2-A) The Commandant-General may with the written consent of a Home Guard, extend from time to time the period of service of such Home Guard in the reserve and thereupon such Home Guard shall serve in the reserve for a further period of three years and while in the reserve shall be liable to be called out for duty at any time.

Section 10- Calling out Home Guards-

(1) The District Magistrate having jurisdiction over any revenue district or part thereof in which Home Guards are raised may by an order made in such manner as may be



prescribed call out any Home Guard for the discharge of any duty assigned to the Home Guards in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the rules made there under].

(2) The District Magistrate may, in cases of emergency, by order in writing, direct that the power of calling out any Home Guard under sub-section (1) for the purpose of securing the public safety or preventing the commission of offences against person or property shall, in such circumstances and under such conditions, if any, as may be specified in that direction be exercised by any Magistrate not being a Magistrate of the third class or a police officer not below the rank of a Sub-Inspector of Police.

(3) The Commandant-General or such officer of the Home guards as may be authorised by him in this behalf may call out the Home guards in any area for the performance of any duty relating to any general measure of public welfare and prescribed under sub-section (1) of Section 7.”

35. Section 7(2) and (2A) of the Act stipulates that a Home Guard shall serve as a Home Guard for a period of six months which may be extended by the State Government to a total period of twelve months and shall thereafter serve for a period of three years and while in reserve shall be liable to be called out for duty at any time. Section 7(2A) empowers the Commandant – General, with the consent of a Home Guard extend the period of service of the Home Guard from time to time and thereupon the Home Guard shall serve in reserve for a further period of three years and while in reserve shall be liable to be called out for duty at any time.

36. Section 10 of the Act empowers the District Magistrate having jurisdiction over any revenue district in which Home Guards are raised may call out any Home Guard for the discharge of any duty



assigned to the Home Guards. The District Magistrate in cases of emergency may delegate the power of calling out any Home Guard to any Magistrate not being a Magistrate of the third class or a police officer not below the rank of a Sub-Inspector of Police. The Commandant-General or any authorized officer of the Home guards may also call out the Home guards for the performance of any prescribed duty relating to any general measure of public welfare.

37. Rule 21 (2) of the Rules prescribes that the total number of Home Guards called out shall not be in excess of 90% of the authorized strength of the District Reserve and Call out upto 100% can be made with the prior approval of the State Government. Rule 21 (2) reads as under:

“Rule 21. Calling out of Home Guards:-

(1) *****

(2) The total number of the Volunteer Home Guards so called out shall not be in excess of 90% of the authorized strength of the District Reserve. Call Out up to 100% can only be made with the prior approval of the state Government.

(3) *****”

38. Rule 27 of the Rules is the main rule under challenge in these petitions and appeals. The Rule underwent amendment in 2017 and 2022. Some of the Petitions were filed prior to each the 2017 amendment and some prior to and some post the 2022 amendment and as such the rule as it existed prior to the 2017 amendment with the amendments of 2017 and 2022 is extracted hereinafter:



“27. Conditions of Service: (1) Term of Enrolment:-

- (a) On successful completion of training a Volunteer Home Guard shall serve as a Home Guards for a period of six months, which may be extended by the State Government to a total period of not more than 12 months if the State Government considers such extension necessary and shall thereafter serve in the reserve for a period of three years and while in reserve shall be liable to be called out for duty at any time.*
- (b) A volunteer Home Guard shall be eligible for extension of his enrolment on completion of his initial period of enrolment from time to time subject to his satisfactory conduct antecedent, character verification, medical examination, physical fitness and willingness, on the recommendation of District Review committee headed by an officer nominated by the Director General not below the rank of Divisional Commandant. The extension shall be allowed upto the age of 41 years only. (amended to 60 years by the 2017 amendment).*
- (c) A volunteer Home Guard shall be on call out duty for 10 months in a year. (amended to 34 months in every 03 years by the 2022 amendment) Equal opportunity to be called out shall be ensured for each volunteer enrolled on the District reserve. A proper roster shall be prepared and published for this purpose and copy of it shall be made available to volunteers on demand.*
- (2) Discharge of a Volunteer Home Guard:-** *A Volunteer Home Guard shall be liable to be discharged in the following conditions:-*

 - (a) On account of his unwillingness to continue in the District Home Guard Reserve,*
 - (b) Failure to pass the examination on completion of basic training even after giving one more opportunity,*
 - (c) Being found unsuitable or physically unfit.*



- (d) *On completing the age of 41 years. (amended to 60 years by the 2017 amendment)*
- (e) *On imposition of punishment of discharge.*
- (f) *On filing of charge sheet in a criminal case or on being detained in police custody for more than 48 hours.*

The competent authority shall, under the aforesaid conditions, issue the discharge order in Appendix G.

(3) *Deployment: A Volunteer Home Guard when Called Out for duty under rule-21 shall be liable to be deployed at any place in Madhya Pradesh or anywhere in the Country or beyond and even in any foreign country by an special order issued by the State Government. Deployment in foreign country shall normally be made with the consent of the concerned volunteer Home Guard.*

(4) *Allowances: A Volunteer Home Guard on Call Out duty or Training, shall receive Honorarium and other allowances as fixed by the Government from time to time.*

(5) *Bar on employment during period of enrolment:-*

- (a) *A volunteer Home Guard when on Call Out duty or training shall not engage himself into any other employment.*
- (b) *A volunteer Home Guard when not on duty or training shall be at liberty to engage himself in any job or a vocation under intimation to the District Commandant.*

Provided that,-

- (i) *No such job or avocation whether full time or part time shall be accepted by him, which may involve conflict of interest with that of the department.*



(ii) He shall not engage himself in any job or avocation unbecoming of his status as a member of District Reserve of Home Guard.”

39. Rule 27 of the Rules dealing with the Conditions of Service stipulates that on successful completion of training the Volunteer Home Guard shall serve as a Home Guards for a period of six months, which period could be extended by the State Government to a maximum of 12 months and thereafter shall serve in the reserve for a period of three years. While in reserve he/she shall be liable to be called out for duty at any time.

40. Rule 27 of the Rules further provides that the Home Guard shall be eligible for extension of his/her enrolment on completion of his/her initial period of enrolment from time to time subject to certain conditions. The extension shall be allowed upto the age of 60 years.

41. Rule 27 further stipulates that volunteer Home Guard shall be on call out duty for 34 months in every 03 years. It is this stipulation that is primarily under challenge in these petitions and appeals.

42. As per Rule 27 of the Rules, the Volunteer Home Guard has to serve after completion of his training for six months, this period can be extended upto twelve months and thereafter he/she has to be placed in reserve. During reserve he is liable to be called out for service. This rule thus implies that during the initial period of six months or twelve months after training, he shall remain on duty throughout and the concept of call out does not apply to him. After the expiry of the said period, he is placed in reserve and while serving in



reserve he is liable to be called out for duty for 34 months in three years.

43. Learned Deputy Advocate General appearing for the State candidly admitted that there is no order passed in respect of any Volunteer Home Guard, placing him/her in reserve.

44. It may be noticed that in all cases orders are being passed of “call off” for a period of two months in twelve months in pre 2022 amendment and for a period of two months in thirty six months post the 2022 amendment.

45. We may note that there is no concept of “Call Off” in the Act or the Rules. The concept is of “Call Out”. “Call Out” implies that as and when there is a necessity, the Competent Authority shall “Call Out” the Volunteer Home Guards to come out and provide their services. The Volunteer Home Guards who are serving in reserve, till they attain the age of 60 years, can be called out as and when there is a need. However, what the respondents are doing is that the Volunteer home Guards are deemed to be on permanent “Call Out” but for two months are put on “Call Off”.

46. The purpose of raising of the Home Guards force, is apparent from the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Act, which reads as under:

“Statement of Objects and Reasons.—Experience has shown that in real emergencies the ordinary police force is inadequate to deal effectively with the forces of disorder without fuller assistance and co-operation from the members



of the public. The present unsettled conditions point to the vital necessity of securing such co-operation and a condition precedent is the inculcation of the habits of self-reliance and discipline and spirit of civic service among the public. This Bill is designed to meet this purpose. The “Home Guards” will be a purely volunteer force and will supplement the ordinary police, to be used in times of emergency for the purpose of maintaining law and order, the protection of the person and property of the citizen and public safety. To start with, the force will be raised in 14 places only, but it may be extended to other areas as necessity arises.”

47. The Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Act clearly shows that it was felt that in real emergencies the ordinary police force is inadequate to deal effectively with the forces of disorder without fuller assistance and co-operation from the members of the public. The “Home Guards” was envisaged to supplement the ordinary police, to be used in times of emergency for the purpose of maintaining law and order, the protection of the person and property of the citizen and public safety.

48. At the time when the concept of Home Guards was envisaged, it was felt that in certain situations and times, the ordinary police force may not be sufficient to deal with the issues arising and there may be a necessity to “Call Out” a trained individual, who had volunteered to serve as a Home Guard. Since, it was not treated as a full time service, the Home Guards, while in reserve, were free to take up other vocations and employment subject to certain conditions. However, they could be called out to serve from time to time. As noticed above, Rule 27 provided a maximum period of call out as ten



months in a year pre 2022 amendment and 34 months in three years post the 2022 amendment.

49. Over the years, with the increase in population, there was a need to increase the strength of the police force for the purposes of maintaining law and order, the protection of the person and property of the citizen and public safety. However, the increase in strength of the police force could not keep up with the requirement and that it apparent from the change in concept in which Call Out is being implemented. From “Call Out” it has changed to “Call Off”. “Call Out” implies that the Home Guard is not on duty till called out. On the other hand “Call Off” implies that they are on duty 24 x 7 till called off. From the Act and the Rules, is evident that there is no concept of “Call Off”. The Act and Rules provide for a concept of “Call Out” and not “Call Off”.

50. It is not the case of the Respondents that they do not have the necessity to supplement the police force 24 x 7. When there is a necessity to supplement the police force 24 x 7, there is no apparent logic as to why the concept of “Call Off” is being applied. As per the Respondents, no direct recruitment has been done for the last 15 years, except for some compassionate appointment and 2700 inductions during the 2016 *Singhanstha Kumbh*.

51. As per Rule 21 of the Rules, “Call Out” shall not be in excess of 90% of the authorized strength of the District Reserve. However, “Call Out” up to 100% can be made with the prior approval of the



state Government. As against the sanctioned strength of 15,800 Home Guards, only 9,438 are working and there are 6,362 vacancies. Thus, even as per the Respondents only 59% of the Home Guards are serving. Even if all the Home Guards are on “Call Out” throughout the year, as is being prayed by the Petitioners/ appellants, respondents would not fall foul of Rule 21 of the Rules.

52. Apart from the grievance raised as being Called Off for a period of two months, there is no ground raised by the Appellants/Petitioners to lay a challenge to the validity of the Act and the Rules. The challenge to the validity of Section 7(2), 7(2A) of the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Act, 1947 and Rules 27(1)(a), 27(1)(c), 27(2)(d) and 27(4) of the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Rules, 2016 is thus negated.

53. In view of the above, the questions that arise are thus answered and the Writ Petitions and Writ Appeals are disposed of in the following terms:

(i) Section 7(2), 7(2A) of the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Act, 1947 and Rules 27(1)(a), 27(1)(c), 27(2)(d) and 27(4) of the Madhya Pradesh Home Guards Rules, 2016 are not unconstitutional or liable to be struck down. The Challenge is thus negated.

(ii) However, Respondents cannot call off the Home Guard Sainiks for two months on roster basis. The Home Guard Sainiks shall be on Call Out duty throughout the year till the percentage mentioned in Rule 21 of the Rules is achieved. i.e. till the strength of Home Guards exceed 90% of the authorized strength of the District Reserve.



(iii) The Sainiks of Home Guards cannot be treated at par with the employees in the police department and entitled to regularisation of service or all consequential benefits as regular/permanent employees in the present rule position.

(iv) No mandamus can be issued to the State Government to enhance the age upto 62 years. However, it is open to the State Government to take a decision on the said demand.

(v) Respective orders of Call Off are set aside.

(vi) All Home Guard Sainiks shall be deemed to be on Call Out Duty, throughout the year and entitled to all consequential benefits of pay and allowance in respect of the same.

54. All the Writ Appeals and Writ Petitions are disposed of in the above terms. There shall be no orders as to Costs.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VINAY SARAF)
JUDGE