HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 672/2021

1. Shakti Singh Son Of Late Shri Jainarayan, Aged About 62 Years
2. Mahendra Singh S/o Late Sh. Jainarayan, Aged About 64 Years
3. Jaidayal S/o Sh. Jainarayan, Aged About 78 Years,
4. Amilal since deceased

   4/1. Shri Rakesh S/o Lt. Shri Amilal

   4/2. Shri Sunil Kumar S/o Lt. Shri Amilal

   4/3. Smt. Santosh Devi D/o Lt. Shri Amilal,
   Petitioner No.1 to 4 are son of Lt. Shri Jainarayn and Petitioner No.4/1 to 4/2 all are residing at Haznaka, Tehsil Kotkasim, District Alwar, Rajasthan.

   Petitioner No.4/3v is residing At Village Majra, District Mahendragarh, Haryana

----Petitioners

Versus

1. Smt. Raj W/o Mahendra Lal (Retired Ips), Harayana State Cadre, Physically Resident Of House No. 928, Sector No. 8, Panchkula, Hariyana (In The Plaint And In The Impugned Order, Resident At Village Haznaka, Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar, Rajasthan Has Been Just To Usurp Jurisdiction Of Trial Court At Kotkasim Alwar District And The Disputed Agricultural Land Is Situated At Village Haznaka)
2. Tarachand S/o Heera Lal
3. Harisingh S/o Late Sh. Bholu
4. Hariram S/o Late Sh. Bholu
5. Hariprakash S/o Late Sh. Bholu
6. Harikaran S/o Late Sh. Bholu
7. Bhagat Singh S/o Late Sh. Haripal
8. Nikhlesh S/o Late Haripal, R/o Village Nashopur
9. Dulichand S/o Jadha Chamar
10. Deendayal S/o Jodha Chamar

11. Heeralal S/o Harphool Singh
All No.3 to 10 are Resident Of Village Nashopur, Tehsil Kotkasim, Distt. Alwar Rajasthan
12. Bheem Singh S/o Harphool Singh
13. Bhupendra Singh S/o Harphool Singh,
14. Ghanshyam S/o Harphool Singh,
15. Rajendra, S/o Netram
All no.12 to 15 are residing at Shiv Nagar In Front Of Kishanlal Public College, Delhi Road, Rewadi, Distt. Rewadi, (Haryana)
16. Santosh W/o Late Lalchand,
17. Diksha D/o Late Lalchand, by the time filing of suit she was minor hence, represented by her natural mother Santosh Devi, but now she has became major.
18. Ratan Lal S/o Late Netram
All no.16 to 18 are residing at Village Jadthal.
19. The State of Rajasthan, Through Land Holder Tehsildar, Mundawar, Distt. Alwar, Rajasthan

---All 2 to 19 are formal defendant/respondents

20. Board Of Revenue, Through Its Registrar Ajmer

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Shiv Charan Gupta
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Saransh Saini

JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR DHAND

Order

08/07/2025

Reportable

"Cross-examination is the greatest legal engine ever invented for the discovery of truth."

-John Henry Wigmore

Every person in India has the right to a fair trial. This is a fundamental right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This, in essence, is what makes cross-examination important. Cross-examination is a fundamental component of the legal process and plays a pivotal role in the Indian Legal System.

Cross-examination allows the rival party to the litigation to thoroughly analyze and challenge the evidence brought forward by the other side's witness. Cross-examination is a statutory right and denying the opportunity for cross-examination might violate the fundamental right to a fair trial. Cross-examination seeks out the truth. Separation of lies from the truth is essential during cross-examination. Instant case is one of the glaring example of its own kind where without affording any opportunity to the defendants, the suit was decided against them on the false pretext that their counsel had waived the right to cross-examination by claiming that the earlier cross-examination done with the witnesses was sufficient, despite the fact that no such cross-examination was ever conducted with any of the witnesses during the proceedings before the Revenue Courts or Sub-Divisional Officer.

1. The Revenue Courts in India play a pivotal role in adjudicating disputes related to land ownership, tenancy rights, mutation, partition, declaration of *khatedari* rights and right of way, land revenue, etc. These Courts are presided over by the administrative officers rather than judicially trained

Judges, who often function as the first point of access to justice for millions of rural citizens and rustic villagers residing in rural areas. However, their rights are hampered by procedural delays, due to inadequate legal knowledge among the officers posted in these Revenue Courts and lack of standardization. The instant case is a glaring example of procedural lapse occurred in the present case where the suit, filed by the respondents, has been decreed without affording the petitioners an opportunity to cross-examine the respondents' witnesses.

2. By way of filing this writ petition, a challenge has been led to the impugned judgment dated 07.10.2020 passed by the Board of Revenue (hereinafter referred as 'the Board') by which the judgment dated 20.06.2019 passed by the Revenue Appellate Authority (hereinafter referred as 'the RAA') has been quashed and set aside.

3. By passing the judgment dated 20.06.2019, the RAA quashed and set aside the judgment dated 11.05.2018 passed by the Sub Divisional Officer (for short 'the SDO') by which the suit filed by the respondents was decreed. The RAA quashed and set aside the judgment passed by the SDO on the ground that no opportunity of cross-examination was provided to the petitioners. Hence, the matter was remitted to the SDO by granting opportunity of cross-examination to the petitioners and for fresh adjudication of the matter, on its merits.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that a suit for correction of entries was filed by the respondents against the

petitioners before the SDO, wherein, statements of two witnesses namely Rajendra S/o Sugan Singh (PW-1) and Rajendra S/o Netram (PW-2) were recorded but no opportunity of cross-examination was granted to them. Counsel submits that in the order dated 23.02.2018 it was noted by the SDO that counsel appearing on their behalf Mr. Sarjeet Choudhary had put a note in the order-sheet that whatever cross-examination has been done with the witnesses on earlier occasion, be read as it is. Counsel submits that Mr.Sarjeet Choudhary was engaged as their counsel by the petitioners. Counsel submits that subsequently, an application was submitted by the petitioners on 02.04.2018 before the SDO seeking an opportunity to carry out cross-examination with the above two witnesses, however, the SDO rejected the application on the same day holding that similar applications have been submitted on multiple occasions merely to delay the proceedings and to waste the precious time of the Court. Counsel submits that these facts were duly appreciated by the RAA, while passing the order of remand and issuing direction to the SDO to grant an opportunity of cross-examination to the petitioners and decide the matter afresh. Counsel submits that under these circumstances, there was no reason or occasion available with the Board to set aside the judgment dated 20.06.2019 passed by the RAA. Hence, interference of this Court is warranted.

5. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents opposed the arguments raised by the counsel for the petitioner and

submitted that the Board has not committed any error in quashing and setting aside the judgment dated 20.06.2019 passed by the RAA, as sufficient opportunity was afforded to the petitioner to cross-examine the two witnesses namely Rajendra S/o Sugan Singh (PW-1) and Rajendrar S/o Netram (PW-2). Counsel submits that a bare perusal of the statements of the two witnesses clearly indicates that an opportunity for cross examination was undoubtedly granted, however, counsel for the petitioner chose not to avail the same, instead he himself had put a note in the order-sheet dated 23.02.2018 that whatever cross-examination conducted on the earlier occasions, should be treated as final and the same has to be read as it is. Counsel submits that thereafter, several dates were fixed for recording the evidence of the petitioner and even multiple opportunities were granted by imposing cost upon them and in between the proceedings, no such application was submitted by the petitioner seeking an opportunity to cross-examine the above two witnesses. Counsel submits that the sole purpose of the petitioner was to deliberately delay the disposal of the suit. Counsel submits that once the petitioner has produced his defence evidence, then thereafter, he is not entitled to get the opportunity to cross-examine the plaintiff witnesses. Counsel submits that all these facts were duly appreciated by the Board, while setting aside the judgment passed by the RAA. Counsel submits that Mr.Sarjeet Choudhary was the counsel engaged by the petitioner and his *vakalatnama* is available on the record.

Hence, interference of this Court is not warranted and the petition is liable to be quashed and set aside.

6. In support of his contentions, he has placed reliance upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Ayaaubkhan Noorkhan Pathan vs State Of Maharashtra & Ors** reported in **AIR 2013 SC 58.**

7. Heard and considered the submissions made at the Bar and perused the material available on record.

8. Perusal of the record indicates that a suit for correction of entries was filed by the respondents against the petitioners before the SDO. Perusal of the statements of the witnesses namely Rajendra S/o Sugan Singh (PW-1) as well as Rajendra S/o Netram (PW-2) (hereinafter referred as PW-1 and PW-2 respectively), reflects that the same were recorded on 23.02.2018 and the statements reflect that the opportunity of re-examination was granted, but the same was not availed. The statements of the above two witnesses nowhere indicate that the opportunity of cross-examination was granted to the petitioners. There is a difference between the word "cross-examination" and "re-examination" as per the mechanism provided under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. First, witness's statement is recorded in the form of examination-in-chief. Thereafter, the other side conducts the cross-examination of such witness and if such witness wants to depose in addition to what he has deposed in examination-in-chief or wants to clarify any part of his testimony given during the examination-

in-chief, he may do so upon an opportunity of re-examination afforded to such witness.

9. In the instant case, no opportunity of cross-examination was ever granted to the petitioners and straightaway the word re-examination was mentioned in the statements of these two witnesses.

10. This fact is not in dispute that some dates were granted to the petitioners for leading their evidence and even cost was also imposed upon them and then an application was filed with slight delay of around two months before the SDO for granting an opportunity of cross-examination to the petitioner. The learned Sub Divisional Officer rejected the said application dated 02.04.2018 on the very same day, indicating in the order-sheet that several repeated applications have been filed, on the earlier occasions, by the petitioner merely to delay the proceedings and to waste the precious time of the Court.

11. Perusal of the entire record indicates that not a single application except the present one was ever filed by the petitioner seeking liberty to cross-examine the aforesaid witnesses and the same was rejected on the very same day i.e. on 02.04.2018. The party to the litigation has a statutory right to cross-examine the witnesses of the rival side. But in the instant case, the petitioners have been deprived of such statutory right to cross-examine with the respondents' witnesses PW-1 and PW-2.

12. It appears that the SDO was not acquainted and fully familiar with the provisions and procedure contained under the

Indian Evidence Act, which resulted in the petitioners being denied the opportunity for cross-examination. This fact was well appreciated by the RAA, while remanding the matter to the SDO, granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

13. A serious dispute has been raised by both the sides about engaging Mr.Sarjeet Choudhary as lawyer by the defendants/petitioners. This Court is not going into this controversy. Reliance has been placed by the counsel for the respondents on the order-sheet dated 23.02.2018 that Mr.Sarjeet Choudhary, Advocate has put his signatures on the note that he had relied on the cross-examination done with the witnesses in the earlier suit i.e. prior to amendment in the suit. Perusal of the record indicates that no such opportunity for cross-examination has ever been granted to the petitioners and they have not availed any such opportunity. Hence, they have been deprived from the opportunity to cross-examine the plaintiffs-respondents' witnesses PW-1 and PW-2.

14. Cross-examination is a crucial element of the adversarial system of justice. It provides each party with the opportunity to scrutinize the evidence, produced by the opposite side. It is a stage, in trial, which allows one party to question a witness called by the other side to test their credibility and to evaluate the accuracy of their testimony.

15. The process of cross-examination in Indian is governed by the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, specially under Section 137. This Section deals with the provisions of examination-in-chief of the witness, then cross-examination with him by the rival

side and if necessity arises, this witness may re-examine him. Section 137 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 being relevant for the present purpose is reproduced as under:-

> **"Section 137.**
>
> **137. Examination-in-chief.-**The examination of a witness by the party who calls him shall be called his examination-in-chief.
>
> **Cross-examination.**-The examination of a witness by the adverse party shall be called his cross-examination.
>
> **Re-examination.**-The examination of a witness, subsequent to the cross-examination by the party who called him, shall be called his re-examination."

Hence, it is clear that cross-examination is an integral part and parcel of the principles of natural justice, as has been held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Maneka Gandhi vs. Union of Indian** reported in **1978 (1) SCC 248**.

16. Justice must not only be done but must also be seen to be done. It is trite that requirement of giving reasonable opportunity of being heard before an order is made by an administrative, quasi judicial or judicial authority, particularly when such an order entails adverse civil consequences. These consequences may involve violations of property, personal rights and substantive deprivations for the affected party. This fundamental right to be heard should not be compromised in the pursuit of administrative expediency or swiftness. Consequently, the proceedings and decisions of administrative and quasi-judicial bodies should be characterized by actual and demonstrable fairness.

17. Hence, it is clear that denial of opportunity of cross-examination is violative of the principles of the natural justice and a party to the litigation cannot be deprived from the benefit of this statutory right. But in the instant case, no opportunity of cross-examination was ever provided to the petitioners and the suit was decreed against them by the SDO. This fact was considered and appreciated by the RAA, hence, the RAA deemed it just and proper to remit the matter to the SDO for making compliance of the statutory provision of Section 137 of the Indian Evidence Act, by providing an opportunity of cross-examination to the petitioners.

18. Hence, the RAA has not committed any error in quashing and setting aside the judgment passed by the SDO and the matter was rightly remanded to the SDO to decide the suit afresh, after affording the petitioners due opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses PW-1 & PW-2. This Court finds that the Board has unnecessarily disturbed the order passed by the RAA inasmuch as there was no need and reason to interfere with the order of remand passed by the RAA.

19. In view of the discussions made herein above, the impugned judgment dated 07.10.2020 passed by the Board stands quashed and set aside. The judgment dated 20.06.2019 passed by the RAA stands upheld.

20. Looking to the fact that the suit has been filed by the respondents in the year 2002, it is expected from the SDO to make all possible endeavours to decide the suit expeditiously,

as early as possible, preferably within a period of 18 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

21. With the aforesaid observations, the instant writ petition stands disposed of. The stay application and all pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

22. This Court has taken a judicial note of this fact that several officers posted in Revenue Courts are not acquainted with the procedure contained under the Code of Civil Procedure as well as the Indian Evidence Act and that is why, procedural lapses occur when they conduct trial of the cases. The reason behind the same is that they are not law graduates and having no legal background. Hence, they are not acquainted/familiar with the aforesaid procedure, which is required to be followed while deciding a suit filed by the party.

23. It is worthy to mention here that the decision in a suit before the Revenue Courts directly affects/determines the rights of the contesting parties and if the Revenue Courts fail to adhere to the mandatory provisions contained under the statutory Acts, then how the party to the litigation would be in a position to get their rights determined in a proper way.

24. The officials of the Administrative Services and the Revenue Departments are being appointed as the Presiding Officers in the SDO Courts and the Appellate Authority in the Courts of Additional Collector, RAA, Divisional Commissioner and Board of Revenue, in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, 1955 and the Rajasthan Land Revenue Act, 1956. No formal training is imparted to

them. But they are being assigned with the important assignments of discharging the function at par with a Judicial Officer, which includes deciding of revenue suits, passing of interlocutory orders and also hearing of first and second appeals and revisions arising out of the orders passed by the subordinate Revenue Courts. Though, such an important task is entrusted to these officers in the Revenue and Administrative Department, but no training is imparted to them, much less judicial training.

25. It is worthy to note here that under several Revenue and Tenancy Acts and Rules, numerous quasi-judicial functions are entrusted to the officers of the Revenue Courts and Revenue Appellate Courts without giving them any formal training. These Officers pass orders/judgments under the provisions of the Revenue and Tenancy Act, CPC and Evidence Act by recording evidence and considering the pleadings of the parties, including the judgments cited by their counsel for the respective parties, which are the important assignments for such officers.

The orders passed by these Officers go a long way to streamline and determine the rights, title and interest of the parties to the litigation intensely impacting not only their lives but also the lives of next generations of such litigants.

26. It is apt to mention here that the High Courts appoint Judicial Officers, including Civil Judges and Additional District Judges, by issuing notifications & conducting written and viva-voces tests of the eligible candidates. After selection, the High

Courts are imparting comprehensive trainings to them in the Judicial Academy on various aspects. Several programs are designed to fine tune the adjudicatory skills of these judicial officers. The Judicial Academies have also been established and are functioning for the said purpose. It is note worthy to state that the National Judicial Academy conducts seminars, workshops, training sessions, etc. on various legal topics for these judicial officers to keep them fully informed about legal trends and emerging legal issues.

27. The Revenue Officers are discharging various kinds of quasi-judicial functions under various Revenue Laws and various Rules related to lands and the orders/judgments passed by these officers and their appellate authorities are subject to judicial scrutiny by this Court under judicial review enshrined under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and under supervisory jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Thus, these officers posted in the Revenue and Appellate Revenue Courts are discharging important quasi-judicial functions pertaining to property rights of the citizens residing in rural areas. But these officers do not receive any kind of training on the basic concepts of the adjudicatory process, both procedural and content wise.

28. Under the Revenue and Tenancy Law, officers posted in the Revenue Courts have been assigned with the responsibility to try and decide the suits, and to pass judgments and decrees which involves complex questions of law and appreciate the principles of law and evidence led by both the sides, after

following the mandatory provisions contained under the CPC, Indian Evidence Act, etc. However, these officers often lack a legal background and the necessary legal acumen, as they are not law graduates and have not undergone any written and oral examinations, conducted by the appointing authority.

29. It is noteworthy to mention that the Law Commission of India in its 186th Report made certain prospects for appointment of officers in the offices of Quasi-Judicial Authority, who are having requisite knowledge and expertise in the field. The Law Commission had considered various aspect including inexperience of the quasi-judicial officers posted at various Quasi-Judicial Authorities. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **A.P. Pollution Control Board vs Prof. M.V. Nayudu** reported in **1999 (2) SCC 718**, also considered this aspect and directed both the State and the Central Government to consider this aspect and appoint the persons with requisite knowledge and experience in the relevant field in various quasi-judicial forums.

30. This Court in the case of **Umakant Sharma vs. Om Prakash Sharma and Others** has taken a judicial notice of this fact while deciding **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.840/2025** and has held in para 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28 as under:

> "24. Before parting with this order, this Court is constrained to observe and take a judicial notice that in Revenue Courts the Presiding Officers are posted from the Administrative Services, who typically do not possess any legal background as they neither have studied law nor have

undergone formal legal training. They have not gone through the procedural laws, such as the Civil Procedure Code, the Indian Evidence Act, or local statutes like the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, the Rajasthan Land Revenue Act, and other related land laws and Rules. As a result thereof, they are not well-versed with the procedures that must be followed, while adjudicating revenue suits pending before the Revenue courts. On many occasions, this Court has noticed that the Revenue Courts and their Appellate Courts commit procedural mistakes in deciding the suits and appeals, without following the mandatory provisions contained under the CPC. Suits are decided by the Revenue Courts without framing the issues, without recording the evidence of the parties in the litigation and the appeals are decided by the Appellate Courts without forming the points for determination. The practical process is openly flouted by these Courts on account of lack of knowledge about the procedure laid down under the law. The Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts are considered to be performing quasi-judicial functions as they handle matters that are not strictly judicial but require a degree of fairness and objectivity in decision making, much like the Judicial Courts do. The Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts act as a bridge between the administrative and the judicial functions, applying the principles of fairness and justice to a specific set of matters related to land revenue, etc.

25. Hence, it is the high time and right time to establish an "Administrative Judicial Academy" for such Officers of Administrative Services. The

need to impart training to such Officers, both 'pre-service' and 'in-service', has been felt for a long time and has been neglected by the Government of Rajasthan so far, having disastrous consequences to development of State and justice to public at large. Training course for the Officers of Administrative Services is considered imperative to improve their efficiency. Some kind of training is necessary and useful to enhance their legal acumen and knowledge. Officers must be trained in framing issues, recording evidence presented by the litigating parties, and drafting judgments at both trial and appellate levels. They should also imparted training for enhancing the art of writing interlocutory orders. They should be familiarized with the various stages of a suit and the procedures outlined in the CPC. Furthermore, along with methods for disposing of the matters at each stage.

26. Presently, newly appointed Judicial Officers undergo a year-long training at the State Judicial Academies across the country and serving Judicial Officers participate in the periodic workshops organized at the National and State Judicial Academy, then why the Officers posted in the Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts should not be sent for such like trainings. Most of these Officer are neither law graduates nor having acquaintance with the procedure to be adopted by these Courts, while deciding the suits, appeals and revision and misc. application etc. Hence, this Court deems it appropriate that the Officers of

Administrative Services should also receive structured training at an Administrative Judicial Academy. Such training would equip them with practical knowledge of the procedures governing the trial of revenue suits and the adjudication of appeals arising from judgments and orders passed by the Revenue Courts.

27. The following steps are required to be taken by the State Government for the benefit of the Officers posted at the Revenue Courts and the Revenue Appellate Courts:-

(i) Establish an Administrative Judicial Academy for organizing mandatory training program for the newly appointed and in-service Administrative Officers.

(ii) Conducting research on judicial reforms, for management and access to justice.

(iii) Promoting judicial innovation, through seminars, colloquium, and workshops.

(iv) Develop a comprehensive curriculum that blends theory with practical training of procedural laws, including framing of issues, recording of evidence, and writing judgments, mediation and the use of technology in Courts.

(v) Sensatizing the Officers to take every possible steps for expeditious disposal of the matters, without granting unnecessary and unwarranted adjournments and make all possible endeavours for speedy disposal of the cases.

28. In an age where justice must not only be done, but seem to be done swiftly and fairly, a well-training administration is essential and the same is need of the hour. The role of Administrative Judicial Academy for practical

> training of the Presiding Officers posted in the Revenue Courts and the Revenue Appellate Courts would certainly play a vital role in shaping competent, ethical and technology savvy officers in more crucial ways than ever. With strategic reforms, increased resources and a learner-centric approach, such academy can emerge as a torch bearer in their judicial education and play a transformative role in the administration of justice delivery system."

31. While deciding the case of **Umakant Sharma (supra),** this Court had issued direction to the State i.e. the Chief Secretary, Government of Rajasthan; the Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue, Government of Rajasthan; and the Principal Law Secretary, Government of Rajasthan, to establish an "Administrative Judicial Academy" for conducting training programs for the officers posted in the Revenue Appellate Courts. The reason behind issuing the aforesaid direction was obvious that these officers are neither law graduates nor having any knowledge of the procedural framework followed by this Court while deciding suits, appeals, revisions and misc. applications, etc. Certainly, the training provided by the Administrative Judicial Academy would equip them with practical knowledge of the procedures governing the trial of revenue suits and the adjudication of appeals arising from judgments and orders of the Revenue Courts.

32. It has been noticed by this Court on several occasions that a significant number of revenue suits and miscellaneous applications are pending before the Revenue Courts coupled

with many old appeals pending before the Revenue Appellate Courts for two to three decades. Unfortunately, these old matters are not accorded priority in disposal, resulting in decisions being delayed beyond the lifetime of the original litigants. Thus, the cases instituted by the grandparents are often decided only after passing of one or two generations, with their grandchildren finally hearing the judgments. Such a casual approach of these Revenue Courts is required to be changed by taking some urgent and concrete steps. It is both the right time and high time for the Government of Rajasthan to take all appropriate steps to ensure the effective administration of justice in the Revenue Courts.

33. Since, we are living in the 21st Century Era, the poor functioning of the Revenue and the Appellate Revenue Courts cannot be allowed to proceed like a snail's pace and the same can no longer be tolerated, hence, the Government must address the following issues with a sense of urgency and take necessary proactive and corrective measures without further delay:

(i) The Revenue Courts of Rajasthan are required to be developed as Fully Digital Institutions with the litigants as the centrality of the entire legal system. The judgments passed by the Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts are required to be uploaded online.

(ii) To modernize the functioning of the Revenue Courts with digitization, there is a need to create a **Rajasthan Revenue Courts Data Grid** or **Virtual Justice Clock**, which would display real-time statistics on pendency of the cases and promote timely and expeditious disposal of the cases.

(iii) In order to ensure proper dispensation of justice and resolution of disputes in accordance with law, it is essential to provide and impart structured training to the Officers, posted in the Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts, who are entrusted with quasi-judicial functions inasmuch as such training would help in preventing the procedural irregularities, as observed in the present case and would further enhance the overall effectiveness and fairness of judicial proceedings.

(iv) A dedicated Administrative Judicial Academy should be set-up at the State level for continuous professional development of the officers posted in the Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts.

(v) A Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) should be formulated and implemented for the Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts to ensure expeditious disposal of the cases. Uniform procedural guidelines must be framed for these Courts and adopted across the State to promote consistency and transparency in the judicial functioning.

(vi) A mechanism is required to be formulated to ensure time bound disposal of the cases in the Revenue Courts and Appellate Revenue Courts and there should be an effective monitoring system over their functioning at higher level including at the Divisional Headquarters level. A quota system is required to be introduced, mandating disposal of a specified number of cases, particularly old targeted cases, on priority basis and accordingly, the same should be reflected in the Annual Confidential Reports (ACRs) of these officers.

(vii) Like Civil Courts, the Revenue Courts and Appellate Revenue Courts should be directed to promote the Alternate Disputes Resolution Mechanism encouraging mediation and conciliation in Revenue Disputes, especially in the matters of mutation and partition, to reduce the burden of litigation and facilitate amicable settlement.

(viii) An online portal be introduced as the 'Revenue Cases Computerized Management Systems' (RCCMS) which will effectively track the disposal and quantity of revenue judgments.

(ix) Law Journals containing judgments related to Revenue & Procedural Law along with Legal Handbooks and Pocket guides of procedural laws and key sections of the Rajasthan Tenancy and Revenue Acts with relevant provisions of the CPC and the Evidence Act should be provided to the field officers, posted in the Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts.

(x) The Government should consider amending the relevant Rules and introduce a procedure for conducting comprehensive examination for posting of the officers in the Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts to check and test their legal acumen in Revenue and Procedural Laws like CPC, Indian Evidence Act etc.

34. The Revenue Court system, though historically administrative in character, must now evolve to meet the demands of modern justice. A shift towards a more

judicialized, legally awared and technologically integrated system is essential. Legal training is not merely an academic exercise but an essential foundation for fairness, efficiency and credibility in revenue adjudication. By institutionalizing legal teaching & education and implementing procedural reforms, the State of Rajasthan can ensure that rural litigants, often the most vulnerable section of the society, receive timely, fair and equitable justice in revenue matters.

35. Let a copy of this order be sent to the Chief Secretary, Government of Rajasthan; the Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue, Government of Rajasthan; and the Principal Law Secretary, Government of Rajasthan, to advice the Government to amend the relevant Rules incorporating provisions for conducting a comprehensive examination with respect to posting of the officers in the Revenue Courts and the Appellate Revenue Courts, and also take appropriate steps to ensure needful compliance of the directions issued in para No.33 of this order.

36. List this matter again on 01.09.2025 along with S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.840/2025 to see compliance of this order.

(ANOOP KUMAR DHAND),J

KuD/65