



1

WP-37860-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA,  
CHIEF JUSTICE

&amp;

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VINAY SARAF

ON THE 4<sup>th</sup> OF NOVEMBER, 2025

WRIT PETITION No. 37860 of 2025

*USHA RAIDAS*

*Versus*

*COMMISSIONER AND OTHERS*

-----  
Appearance:

*Shri Ayush Upadhaya - Advocate on behalf of Shri Arvind Pathak - Advocate for petitioner.*

*Shri Anubhav Jain - Government Advocate for respondents/State.*  
-----

ORDER

*Per. Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjeev Sachdeva, Chief Justice*

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondents have erroneously held that petitioner's case is not covered by the judgment of this Court dated 28.4.2025 in Writ Petition no.5747/2023 (*Tabassum Qureshi & Ors. Vs. State of M.P. & Ors.*).

2. He submits that petitioner had taken admission prior to the Session 2012-13 in the year 2011. However, this fact has not been taken into account by the respondents.

3. Petitioner seeks a direction to consider the name of the petitioner for recruitment of Grade V Staff Nurse, Multipurpose Female Health Workers (ANM) and others through Direct Posting and Backlog Common Recruitment Examination, 2023.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that case of the petitioner is



squarely covered by the decision of this Court dated 27.06.2025 in *W.P. No.21367/2025 (Fatima Mary Masih Vs. State of M.P. & Ors.)*.

5. We note that the said order relies on the decision dated 28.04.2025 in *W.P. No.5747/2023 (Tabassum Qureshi & Ors. Vs. State of M.P. & Ors. )*. In light of said judgment, this Court in *Fatima Mary Masih* (supra) had noticed that petitioner therein had filed documents to evidence that the case of the petitioner was covered by paragraph 53 of the judgment in *Tabassum Qureshi* (supra).

6. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner also satisfy the same criteria.

7. Learned Additional Advocate General submits that he would need to take instructions as to whether the case of petitioner satisfies the requirement of paragraph 53 of *Tabassum Qureshi* (supra).

8. In view of the above, this petition is disposed of directing respondents to consider the case of the petitioner. In case, petitioner's case is squarely covered by paragraph 53 of the *Tabassum Qureshi* (supra), then identical relief be granted to the petitioner. However, in case respondents are of the view that case of petitioner is not covered by the said judgment, a reasoned speaking order be passed.

9. Accordingly, petition is disposed of in the above terms.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)  
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VINAY SARAF)  
JUDGE