



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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15424/2025

Geeta Choudhary D/o Late Sh. Joginder Pal Singh Choudhary,
Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Kheme Ka Kuva, Pal Road,
District Jodhpur

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector (Land Record), Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
3. Tehsildar, Land Record, Kudi Bhagtani, Jodhpur.
4. Dinesh S/o Shri Thana Ram, Resident Of Vishnu Yogi Dhaniya, Nandra Kalla, Via Saran Nagar, Tehsil And District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Deepak Nehra

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE NUPUR BHATI

Order

REPORTABLE

28/08/2025

1. The instant writ petition has been filed by the petitioner under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution claiming following relief(s):-

"I. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, including a writ in the nature of mandamus, thereby directing the learned Rajasthan Civil Services Appellate Tribunal, Bench at Jodhpur, to pronounce the judgment in appeal No.23/2025, which was reserved on 24.04.2025, within a stipulated time period as may be deemed just and proper by this Hon'ble Court;
II. The official respondents may be directed to pay the petitioner's outstanding salary and to continue pay the same on monthly basis. xxxxx."

2. Brief facts giving rise to the present writ petition are that the petitioner is a Patwari by profession. She was transferred at Patwar Mandal Jhalamand on 22.01.2025 pursuant to the transfer





order and thereafter, she joined at the said post. However, due to pending appeal being filed by the private respondent and also, passing of the interim order by the Rajasthan Civil Services Appellate Tribunal (for brevity "learned Tribunal"), the petitioner has neither been permitted to work, nor has she received salary since February, 2025 and despite the matter having been argued and judgment having been reserved by the learned Tribunal, the same has not been pronounced till date. Thus, being aggrieved of the above, the petitioner has preferred the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the learned tribunal has stayed the transfer order and as the petitioner is available and willing to join on the concerned post, but she not being faulty, has to unnecessarily wait for the outcome of the proceeding and since judgment in the appeal preferred by the respondent No.4 has been reserved by the Learned tribunal vide order dated 24.04.2025, the same has not been pronounced till date.

4. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioner and perused the material available on record.

5. This court finds that it is a settled proposition of law that pronouncement of judgments cannot be unreasonably delayed after conclusion of arguments, as such delay undermines the confidence of a litigant and the public at large in the judicial system. In the case of ***Anil Rai v. State of Bihar, (2001) 7 SCC 318***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court took a serious note of the practice prevalent in some High Courts of reserving judgments and not pronouncing the same for inordinately long periods. The





guidelines as contained in relevant paragraphs of the above judgment reads as infra:-

"xxxxxxxx

9. It is true, that for the High Courts, no period for pronouncement of judgment is contemplated either under the Civil Procedure Code or the Criminal Procedure Code, but as the pronouncement of the judgment is a part of the justice dispensation system, it has to be without delay. In a country like ours where people consider the Judges only second to God, efforts be made to strengthen that belief of the common man. Delay in disposal of the cases facilitates the people to raise eyebrows, sometimes genuinely which, if not checked, may shake the confidence of the people in the judicial system. A time has come when the judiciary itself has to assert for preserving its stature, respect and regards for the attainment of the rule of law. For the fault of a few, the glorious and glittering name of the judiciary cannot be permitted to be made ugly. It is the policy and purpose of law, to have speedy justice for which efforts are required to be made to come up to the expectation of the society of ensuring speedy, untainted and unpolluted justice.

10. Under the prevalent circumstances in some of the High Courts, I feel it appropriate to provide some guidelines regarding the pronouncement of judgments which, I am sure, shall be followed by all concerned, being the mandate of this Court. Such guidelines, as for the present, are as under:

(i) The Chief Justices of the High Courts may issue appropriate directions to the Registry that in a case where the judgment is reserved and is pronounced later, a column be added in the judgment where, on the first page, after the cause-title, date of reserving the judgment and date of pronouncing it be separately mentioned by the Court Officer concerned.

(ii) That Chief Justices of the High Courts, on their administrative side, should direct the Court Officers/Readers of the various Benches in the High Courts to furnish every month the list of cases in the matters where the judgments reserved are not pronounced within the period of that month.

(iii) On noticing that after conclusion of the arguments the judgment is not pronounced within a period of two months, the Chief Justice concerned shall draw the attention of the Bench concerned to the pending matter. The Chief Justice may also see the desirability of circulating the statement of such cases in which the judgments have not been pronounced





within a period of six weeks from the date of conclusion of the arguments amongst the Judges of the High Court for their information. Such communication be conveyed as confidential and in a sealed cover.

(iv) Where a judgment is not pronounced within three months from the date of reserving it, any of the parties in the case is permitted to file an application in the High Court with a prayer for early judgment. Such application, as and when filed, shall be listed before the Bench concerned within two days excluding the intervening holidays. Criminal Appeals @ SLP (Crl.) Nos.4509-4510 OF 2025 Page 5 of 6

(v) If the judgment, for any reason, is not pronounced within a period of six months, any of the parties of the said lis shall be entitled to move an application before the Chief Justice of the High Court with a prayer to withdraw the said case and to make it over to any other Bench for fresh arguments. It is open to the Chief Justice to grant the said prayer or to pass any other order as he deems fit in the circumstances."

6. The Hon'ble Apex Court has also reiterated these guidelines in the case of ***Ravindra Pratap Shahi v. State of U.P. & Ors. :***

(2025) INSC 1039, relevant paragraph of the above judgment reads as infra:-

"10. It is not that the situation with which we are dealing in these Appeals has arisen for consideration for the first time. The directions have already been issued by this Court in Anil Rai (supra). Therefore, what is required today is of adherence to the principles laid down by this Court in Anil Rai (supra). We reiterate the directions and direct the Registrar General of each High Court to furnish to the Chief Justice of the High Court a list of cases where the judgment reserved is not pronounced within the remaining period of that month and keep on repeating the same for three months. If the judgment is not delivered within three months, the Registrar General shall place the matters before the Chief Justice for orders and the Chief Justice shall bring it to the notice of the concerned Bench for pronouncing the order within two weeks thereafter, failing which the matter be assigned to another Bench."

7. In light of the afore-quoted judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of Anil Rai (supra) and





Ravindra Pratap Shahi (supra), any judgment that has been reserved should be pronounced within a reasonable time. Non-compliance with these directions would amount to a violation of the mandate of the directions laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and also the guarantee of speedy justice under Article 21 of the Constitution.

8. Resultantly, the instant writ petition filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution, is allowed. The learned Tribunal is directed to pronounce the judgment in the appeal No.23/2025 reserved on 24.04.2025 within a period of "one month" from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order, strictly in accordance with the directions laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the cases of Anil Rai (supra) and Ravindra Pratap Shahi (supra) in order to guarantee speedy justice under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

9. Stay petition as well as all other pending application(s) if any, also stand disposed of.

10. No order as to costs.

(DR. NUPUR BHATI),J

283-Surabhi/-

