



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

106

CWP-32258-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 31.10.2025

RENU

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Naveen Jhanjolia, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Addl. A.G, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 23.10.2024 whereby respondent has rejected her candidature for the post of Female Constable against advertisement No.8/2015.

2. The petitioner pursuant to advertisement No.8/2015 applied for the post of Constable (Female). She is possessing Master's Degree in Public Administration and belongs to BCA Category. She cleared written test and participated in physical measurement test. Her height was measured as 166.8 cm. She was awarded 12 marks for height and was not selected due to higher cut-off. She scored 47.25 marks whereas last selected candidates in her category scored 47.75 marks.

3. The petitioner pursuant to advertisement No.4/2020 applied for the post of Constable (Female). She cleared written test and her

height was measure on 18.10.2021. Her height was found 167.3 cm. She claims that her height against advertisement No.8/2015 was wrongly measured. She was entitled to 13 marks whereas was awarded 12 marks. She filed *CWP-1161-2022* before this Court which was disposed of vide order dated 04.12.2023 with a direction to consider her claim. The respondent did not comply with orders of this Court and she filed *COCP-881-2024* which was disposed of because respondent complied with orders of this Court by passing impugned order dated 23.10.2024 whereby representation of the petitioner has been rejected.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent wrongly measured height of the petitioner at the time of physical test conducted in 2016. The report of 2021 vindicates stand of the petitioner. The respondent has passed a detailed and speaking order with respect to claim of the petitioner. Relevant extracts of impugned order dated 23.10.2024 read as:-

“Further the petitioner prayed that there is difference in height recorded by Commission in different recruitment, the Commission for better transparency, efficiency and satisfaction of the candidates called the petitioners and other similarly situated candidates for PMT. The difference occurred in height of candidates during first and second PMT is basically due to standing Posture of a candidate while getting his/her height measured. Further, it is pertinent to mention here that there are so many other reasons of variation in height of same candidate at different intervals of time like different Standing/Static positions as shown in picture below:- The details of these reasons is as under:

Sway Lumbar Thoracic Forward Good
Back Lordosis Kyphosis Head Posture

Further, if a candidate has done exercise or stretching before getting his/her height measured then it leads to impact on height result. Due to compressed spine, height of some candidates shows variation in height at different intervals of time.

For example, sitting in a chair all day results in tight hamstrings in the back of the thigh. That can make it harder to extend your leg or straighten your knee all the way.

Further, it is pertinent to mention here that at the time of Physical Measurement of a candidate alongwith the representatives of Commission, Trained coaches from Government Departments and various Doctors from Civil Hospital are present and in presence of these members only height of candidate is measured and then the said PMT slip of candidate is also signed by the representatives of Commission, Coach and Civil Doctor. Further, the PMT of candidates is conducted openly in presence of all candidates and if any cheating on part of Commission in height recording is committed then the other candidates who are present then and there must have objected but there is no such complaint etc. against the Commission.

That, in view of explanation mentioned above, the reasons for height variation are quite obvious in which candidate cheats in various modes so that enhanced height is recorded. But most common reason of height variation is standing posture of a candidate for which candidate is himself/herself is responsible. Thus, the Commission and other recruitment agencies are using the said machines for PMT and those machines are certified ones and thus are completely reliable.

Hence, as per the PMT report the height of the petitioner was measured 166.8 CMs and 12 Marks was

awarded to her as per the criteria mentioned above. Hence, the petitioner was rightly granted 12 marks for her height and was rightly not selected in the final result due to the lesser marks.

Accordingly, the request of the petitioner cannot be considered in view of the terms and conditions of advertisement and Punjab Police Rules and the representation is accordingly decided”

5. The reasons advanced by respondent seems to be plausible because in 2016 height of the petitioner was found 166.8 cm and in 2021 as 167.3 cm. Difference in the height measured in 2016 and 2021 is miniscule. For the reasons assigned in the impugned order, the said difference was quite possible.

6. In the impugned order, it is noticed that 12 marks are awarded for height of 166 cm and 13 marks for 169 cm. If all the contentions of petitioner, for the sake of adjudication, are accepted still she was entitled to 12 marks because 13 marks were available for height of 169 cm. There is no controvert to said fact.

7. There is another aspect of the matter. The petitioner is claiming 13 marks with respect to advertisement of 2015. She did not raise objection till her height was measured in 2021. It appears that she was satisfied with measurement conducted in 2016. She wants to make hay while the sun shine.

8. In the wake of above factual position, this Court is of the considered opinion that the instant petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed

9. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

October 31, 2025
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No