HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10221/2025

Dr. Vinay Kumar S/o Late Shri Sanwal Ram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of 3/123, GAD Flats, Gandhi Nagar, Jaipur.

----Petitioner

Versus

- 1. State Of Rajasthan, Represented Through Principal Secretary, Medical Education (Group-I), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
- 2. Registrar, Rajasthan University Of Health Sciences (RUHS), Sector-18, Kumbha Marg, Pratap Nagar, Sanganer, Jaipur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. R.N. Mathur, Sr Adv with

Mr. Utkarsh Dubey

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Rajendra Prasad, AG with

Ms. Harshita Thakral and

Ms. Dhriti Laddha

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHENDAR KUMAR GOYAL Judgment / Order

21/07/2025

Inviting attention of this Court towards a Division Bench Judgment of this Court dated 06.09.2022 passed in the case of **Dr. Ranjan Mathur Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.: D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.6312/2022** wherein, while dealing with the issue of retirment age of the medical teachers holding BDS/MDS Degree, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that it was held that "the words- Medical Teachers holding BDS/MDS degrees shall be read into the notification dated 30.03.2018. Consequently, it is ordered that the petitioner shall be allowed to continue in service upto the age of 65 years. The respondent authorities shall pass necessary orders to continue Medical Teachers (Dental) in service till the age of 65 years with



all consequential benefits." Learned Senior Counsel further submits that based upon the aforesaid judgment, a Coordinate Bench has been pleased, in the S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.13857/2023: Dr. Vipin Kumar Varshney Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. and S.B. Civil Writ **Petition** No.16038/24: Dr. Seema Choudhary (Sheoran) Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. involving identical controversy, vide its 29.09.2023 interim orders dated and dated 20.11.2024 respectively, to direct the respondents to permit the petitioners to continue in service in terms of notification dated 30.03.2018, i.e., till the age of 65 years and prays for similar interim order.

Learned Advocate General prays for two weeks' time to file reply.

Heard. Considered.

Taking into consideration the contentions advanced by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and material on record, this Court deems it just and proper to stay the operation of the order impugned dated 04.06.2025, till further orders or till the petitioner attains the age of 65 years, whichever is earlier.

However, this order will not come in way of the respondents in moving an application under Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India, if so advised.

List the matter after two weeks as prayed.

(MAHENDAR KUMAR GOYAL),J

YOGESH/29