


News

After the stay order reportedly disappears from the record, the Rajasthan High Court demands an investigation of the tribunal's operations.



A government teacher claimed that a stay order granted in his favor against the cancellation of his promotion was later replaced on the record by another order denying him relief [**Sharvan Lal Khorwal v. State of Rajasthan**], prompting the Rajasthan High Court to order an investigation into the operation of the **Rajasthan Civil Services Appellate Tribunal (RCSAT)**.

After determining that the Tribunal Registrar's explanation for the disparity was inadequate, Justice Ravi Chirania issued an order on April 17 directing the State government to carry out an investigation.

The Registrar's attempt to attribute the problem to an anonymous clerk was deemed by the Court to be "**highly unreasonable**" and "**false on the face of the record.**"

The Secretary of the State's Department of Personnel was also instructed by the Court to

determine if the anonymous clerk had been used as a scapegoat or was genuinely involved in the case.

Sharvan Lal Khorwal, a government school teacher, filed a petition against an order that revoked a promotion he had received over nine years prior.

Khorwal claimed that the RCSAT heard his case on July 15, 2025, and awarded a stay in open court. He said that the tribunal's website also indicated the granting of temporary protection.

He allegedly found a different ruling dated August 8, 2025, which just issued notices and denied the issuance of any interim relief, in the case file when he later requested a certified copy of the order. He added that on August 8, the issue had not yet been brought before the Tribunal.

Disappointed, Khorwal filed a complaint with the Rajasthan High Court, claiming that the August 8 order was passed behind his back and was wholly unlawful and wicked.

In March, a bench made up of Justice Anand Sharma noted that the charges raised significant concerns about the Tribunal's operation and instructed its Registrar to submit an affidavit outlining the situation.

Anand Sharma, Justice

The Registrar's reply was deemed inadequate by Justice Chirania during the subsequent hearing in April. The Registrar had stated that a clerk's error had caused the grant of stay to appear incorrectly in the cause list.

The Court ordered the Department of Personnel to carry out an investigation and submit a report on the following hearing date after noticing that the clerk was not even named in the affidavit.

Additionally, it requested that the State take disciplinary action against the Registrar and any other officials found to be at fault.

According to material on the High Court's website, the case will be listed again on July 1.