



Serial No.01
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP (C) No. 187 of 2017

Date of Order: 30.06.2026

Shri Kamesh Kumar Roy,
S/o Shri Rampalak Roy,
R/o Nongrimmaw,
East Khasi Hills District,
Shillong, Meghalaya

.....Petitioner

-VERSUS-

1. Union of India represented
by Secretary Home, New
Delhi.
2. Deputy Inspector General
of Police (Recruitment)
Central Reserve Police
Force, Dte,
New Delhi.
3. Deputy Inspector General
of Police, Group Centre,
Central Reserve Police
Force, Khatkhati,
Assam.
4. Inspector General of Police,
National Employment
Service, Head quarter,
Central Reserve Police
Force, Shillong,
Meghalaya.
5. Presiding Officer,
Recruitment Board at
Group Centre (GC),
Central Reserve Police



Force, Khatkhati,
Assam.

.....Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. Bhattacharjee, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s) : Mr. K.P. Bhattacharjee, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Dr. N. Mozika, DSGI. with
Ms. R. Fancon, Adv.

ORDER (Oral)

Heard Mr. K.P. Bhattacharjee, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, and also Dr. N. Mozika, learned DSGI, assisted by Ms. R. Fancon, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 1–5.

The petitioner, who was a candidate for the post of Tradesman (Cook) in the CRPF Recruitment 2015 (North Eastern Zone), has filed the instant writ petition challenging the outcome of the test wherein he was declared unfit in the trade test. The communication dated 31.01.2017, by which the details of the marks obtained by the petitioner were disclosed, has also been put under challenge in this writ petition.

In response to the advertisement floated by the CRPF for filling up of vacancies of several posts in Northeastern States, including the State of Meghalaya, the petitioner offered his candidature for the post of Tradesman (Cook). However, the candidature of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that the domicile certificate produced by him was not valid. The petitioner challenged the said rejection of candidature by way of filing W.P. (C) No. 130 of 2016 and was successful in getting the order of rejection of candidature set aside.



Pursuant to above, the petitioner was called for physical test on 30.11.2016. Upon petitioner completing the physical test, he was directed to appear in the written examination on 05.12.2016. The petitioner appeared in the said test and was declared qualified, and on the same day he was asked to appear for the trade test. It was the trade test where the petitioner was found unfit, as he could secure 14 marks out of a total 50 marks. The petitioner challenged the above decision by raising a plea of *mala fide* in the writ petition.

However, in the rejoinder filed by the petitioner in response to the affidavit-in-opposition of the respondents, a different stand was taken and a plea was raised that petitioner was not given sufficient time to appear for the trade test as compared to the other candidates who took part in the recruitment drive.

It is the contention of the petitioner that since he was not given enough time to prepare, his performance suffered and he could not acquire the qualifying marks.

The respondents on the other side, opposed the plea of the petitioner and submitted that the trade test needed no prior preparation as it is the reflection of the expertise of trade which a candidate already has in him. It is further contended that the situation of the petitioner cannot be equated with that of other candidates insofar as the grant of time for holding the trade test is concerned. The arrangements for the trade test for other candidates were made keeping in mind the administrative convenience and not for the purpose of granting more time to the candidates for the preparation of the trade test. It is also contended that since the petitioner was the only candidate when he was considered for the trade test, there was no requirement to hold the trade test on a different date.

Perusal of the case record reveals that this writ petition was filed in the month of July, 2017, and no interim order was passed in the matter directing a post of Tradesman (Cook) to be kept vacant. Since then, almost 8 years have



lapsed, and no urgency was shown by the petitioner to get this writ petition disposed of at the earliest. The plea raised by the petitioner also does not appear to be very convincing, as it is not a case that he was not afforded with any opportunity at all. The trade test, which was in respect of cooking ability of the petitioner, shows that the petitioner did not perform well and was not able to score good marks. He secured only 14 out of a total of 50 marks while the qualifying mark was 20. The scheme of test prescribed for Tradesman (Cook) does not show that it needed any immediate prior practice for preparation by a candidate taking part in the test. Thus, the plea of the petitioner that he was not given sufficient time to prepare for the trade test does not hold water. Furthermore, the petitioner has also not challenged the communication made vide Memo No. R-II-1/2014-GC KKT-EC-5 (T/T) dated 27.01.2017 by which he was held to be unfit in trade test in this writ petition.

For what has been discussed above, the writ petition filed by the petitioner is devoid of merit and is hereby dismissed.

No costs.

Judge

Meghalaya
30.06.2026
Abhinandan, P.S