



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 28643 OF 2025 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

SREENI S
S/O SOMAN
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS
NO. 19-60/76B NEDUMPALANJI VEEDU
PANAVILAI, KOLLEMCODE, VILAVANCODE
KANYAKUMARI, TAMIL NADU-629160.

...PETITIONER

(BY *SMT. MEENAKSHI A N, ADVOCATE FOR
SMT. SHRAVANI SHARMA., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. REGIONAL DIRECTOR KKR
STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION
1ST FLOOR, "E" WING. KENDRIYA SADAN
KORAMANGALA, BENGALURU
KARNATAKA-560034.
2. THE MEMBER OF RECRUITMENT BOARD
CRPF PALLIPURAM GROUP CENTRE
CRPF PALLIPURAM
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
KERALA-695316.
3. DIRECTORATE GENERAL (DIG)
CUM APPELLATE AUTHORITY
SUB RRC AT GC CRPF PPM(PALLIPURAM)
(PET/PST BOARD) RECRUITMENT OF CT (GD)
IN CAPFS, SSF AND RIFEMAN(GD)
ASSAM RIFLES EXAM 2025
CRPF PALLIPURAM GROUP EXAM CENTRE

Digitally signed by
MALATHI
CHALUVA IYENGAR
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

**Corrected vide Chamber order dated: 27.02.2026*



CRPF PALLIPURAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
KERALA-695316.

4. STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION
BLOCK NO. 12, CGO COMPLEX
LODHI ROAD, NEW DELHI-110003.
5. DIRECTORATE GENERAL
CRPF (RECRUITMENT BRANCH)
EAST BLOCK-07, LEVEL-4, SECTOR-01
R.K. PURAM, NEW DELHI-110066
(MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS).

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. A CHANDRACHUD., CGSPC. FOR R1 TO R5)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED: 26.08.2025 AT ANNEXURE-F AND G PASSED BY THE R-2 AND 3 HEREIN AND DIRECT THE R-1 TO CONSIDER THE PETITIONER AS HAVING QUALIFIED WITH THE MINIMUM PHYSICAL STANDARDS AS FAR AS THE HEIGHT IS CONCERNED BASED ON THE PHYSICAL FITNESS CERTIFICATE AT ANNEXURE-J AND J1 AND PREVIOUS YEARS SLIP-ON QUALIFICATION ON HEIGHT ISSUED BY THE R-2 AT ANNEXURE-H AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India challenging the order dated 26.08.2025, vide Annexures F and G, passed by respondent Nos. 2 and 3 respectively, whereby the height of the petitioner has been



measured as 169.4 cms and 169.3 cms, whereas the qualifying height prescribed for male candidates is 170 cms. Hence, his case was not considered for appointment as Constable.

2. The respondent–Central Government issued a notification dated 05.09.2024, vide Annexure-A, inviting applications for the post of Constable (GD) in the Central Armed Police Forces. Pursuant to the said notification, the petitioner applied for the said post. As per the notification, the selection process consists of three stages: (i) Computer-Based Examination, (ii) Physical Standard Test (PST) / Physical Efficiency Test (PET), and (iii) Medical Examination / Document Verification.

3. The petitioner successfully cleared the Computer-Based Examination and was consequently permitted to participate in the Physical Standard Test. As per the notification, the minimum height prescribed for male candidates is 170 cms. The respondents measured the height of the petitioner using a Radio Frequency Identification



Device, which is a digital equipment for height measurement. As per Annexure-F, the petitioner's height was measured as 169.4 cms. On the same day, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the appellate authority. As per Annexure-G, upon re-measurement by the appellate authority, the petitioner's height was recorded as 169.3 cms.

4. Since the petitioner was declared unsuccessful in the Physical Standard Test, his candidature was not considered further. Thereafter, the petitioner underwent medical examination at certain private hospitals, wherein his height was measured as 171 cms, as evidenced by Annexure-J. Another certificate, produced as Annexure-J1, shows that upon examination at Kanniyakumari Medical College, the petitioner's height was again measured as 171 cms. Hence, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition challenging Annexures F and G issued by the respondents.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has raised the following contentions:



(i) Firstly, in the previous year, pursuant to a notification issued by the respondents for the post of Constable (GD), the petitioner had applied and, during the Physical Standard Test conducted therein, his height was measured as 170 cms. In support of this contention, Annexure-H has been produced.

(ii) Secondly, while conducting the Physical Standard Test, the respondents first subjected the petitioner to the running race, and thereafter measured his height. Therefore, there is a reduction in height.

(iii) Thirdly, it is contended that a person's height varies at different times of the day. The petitioner's height, as measured by the respondents, falls short by only 0.6 cms. Owing to this scientific reason, the petitioner ought to have been permitted another opportunity for measurement, or alternatively, such a marginal difference ought to have been rounded off to 170 cms. In support of this contention, reliance is placed on the order passed by



the Madras High Court in W.P.Nos.13657 and 14840 of 2024 and connected matters, disposed of on 11.06.2024. The relevant paragraphs are extracted below:

"3.5. In continuation of the said arguments, when the matter was further heard today, Mrs.Gayathri Vasudevan, produced the relevant materials. She would firstly rely upon an article published in the International Journal of Anatomy and Research, titled as "Diurnal variation of height in South Indian Adolescent Subjects" to contend that the height of any individual will vary even with reference to the time of measurement. The relevant portion in the said article reads as follows:-

"The mean height difference in male taken between 0900 hrs and 1600 hrs is 10.43mm and the mean height difference in female 6.13mm. (Table 3)"

3.6. Ultimately, the following conclusion was arrived at the said article, which reads as follows:-

"Diurnal variation in linear height of an individual may substantially affect the reliability of height data and careful consideration should be given to the time of measurement and also take in to account of the gender difference."

.....



4.1. Though it can be seen that there is no specific study with reference to Indian conditions, the measurements taken in this case itself demonstrate that there can be a variation of height even if it is meticulously measured using a standard digital equipment. It is because of two factors as one advances in age on account of its changes in linear dimensions of the skull, vertebral column, pelvis and the legs, height of an individual varies. Second, on account of diurnal variations, even depending on the time in which the measurement is taken, the height may differ.

.....

5. Therefore, by following the dictum of the Full Bench of this Court, the Writ Petitions deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are allowed on the following terms:-

(i) The impugned disqualification slip dated 06.05.2024 issued by the 5th respondent shall stand quashed;

(ii) The petitioner's height has to be rounded off and declared as 163 cm and the respondents have to consider the petitioner as having qualified with the minimum physical standards as far as the



height is concerned. The petitioner qualifies in the other physical standards;

(iii) Then the respondents therefore shall include the petitioner for oral test scheduled to be held on 13.06.2024 and depending on the further selection process, if the petitioner is successful, include him in the select list as per merit, in accordance with law;"

(iv) Fourthly, in similar circumstances, a number of candidates who participated in the Physical Standard Test and failed in the height measurement approached the Madras High Court in W.P. No. 33420 of 2025 and connected matters, disposed of on 28.10.2025, wherein the Madras High Court directed the respondents to conduct the Physical Standard Test afresh using approved digital machinery to measure the correct height of the petitioners therein. The present petitioner is similarly situated; however, he has not been provided with one more opportunity for measurement of height, which violates the rights guaranteed to him under Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Hence, she sought for allowing the writ petition.



6. Per contra, the learned CGPSC appearing for the respondents raised the following contentions:

(i) Firstly, with regard to Annexure H relied upon by the petitioner, it is contended that in the recruitment process of the previous year, during the Physical Standard Test, the height of the petitioner was measured as 170 cms using the manual method. In the present recruitment process, the respondents are using a digital method, namely, the Radio Frequency Identification Device, for measuring height. The same digital device has been uniformly used for all candidates. Therefore, the petitioner cannot place reliance on Annexure-H.

(ii) Secondly, the petitioner is seeking re-measurement of height based on Annexures J and J1, which have been issued by private medical hospitals. It is not pleaded as to whether the measurements were taken manually or digitally. Further, the document produced as Annexure-J contains overwriting at several places. Therefore, the same cannot be a ground for re-examination of the petitioner.



(iii) Thirdly, the respondents have provided a mechanism for filing an appeal against the Physical Standard Test before the appellate authority. The petitioner has availed of the said remedy. Even upon appeal, there was a shortfall in height, as reflected in Annexure-G. Therefore, the petitioner cannot seek yet another opportunity for measurement. In this regard, reliance is placed on the judgment of the High Court of Delhi in **SHRAVAN KUMAR RAI VS. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS** reported in **2020 SCC Online Delhi 924**.

(iv) Fourthly, with regard to the order of the Madras High Court relied upon by the petitioner, it is contended that in that case, the candidate had not availed the appellate remedy provided under the notification. Hence, the Court directed a second Physical Standard Test. Therefore, the said order is not applicable to the facts of the present case. It is further contended that the other judgment relied upon by the petitioner is also not applicable to the facts of this case. Accordingly, dismissal of the writ petition is sought.



7. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the writ papers.

8. As per the notification vide Annexure-A, the petitioner participated in the Computer-Based Examination and was successful. Thereafter, he was permitted to participate in the Physical Standard Test. As per the notification, the minimum height prescribed for male candidates is 170 cms. In the previous year, the respondents were using the manual method to measure the height of candidates. In the present recruitment, they are using a digital instrument, namely, the Radio Frequency Identification Device. The same device has been used for all candidates. Accordingly, petitioner's height was measured at 169.4 cm.

9. The notification provides a remedy of appeal. Pursuant to the same, the petitioner approached the appellate authority. The appellate authority conducted the re-measurement vide Annexure-G and issued a slip



recording the petitioner's height as 169.3 cms. As per Condition No.24 of the said notification, the decision of the appellate authority is final. Therefore, the petitioner cannot seek one more opportunity for examination of height.

10. Annexure-H produced by the petitioner pertains to the notification issued in the year 2023. Admittedly, during that period, the respondents were using the manual method for measuring height. In the present recruitment, the respondents are using a digital device for all candidates and no malafides are attributed. Therefore, the petitioner cannot be granted another opportunity.

11. Even with regard to Annexures J and J1 issued by private medical institutions, it is not pleaded whether the measurements were conducted using a digital device. Further, Annexure-J contains overwriting on the measurements. The notification clearly provides that against the authority conducting the measurement of



height, an appeal can be preferred, and the decision of the appellate authority shall be final.

12. If the contention of the petitioner is accepted, there would be no finality to the selection process. When the competent authority has conducted the measurement using a digital device, the notification itself provides a remedy by way of appeal to address any possible error. The petitioner has not alleged any malafides against medical examination or team conducted the Physical Standard Test. In this regard, the Delhi High Court in **SHRAVAN KUMAR RAI (supra)** has observed as follows:

"4. We have recently in judgment dated 15th July, 2020 in W.P.(C) 3930/2020 titled Priti Yadav Vs. Union of India, in the context of medical test for recruitment in the officer cadre of Indian Air Force, Rules wherein provide for examination by Medical Board, Appeal Medical Board and Review Medical Board, held as under:-

"8. We have today again considered whether the petitioner is entitled to yet another chance and are unable to find any justification for the same. We



have already in the order dated 6th July, 2020 observed that fitness for serving requisite duties in the Air Force is a matter of opinion and if in the opinion of the authorities constituted under the Rules of the Air Force the petitioner is unfit, a report of a medical practitioner of another organization which does not intend to recruit the petitioner and which will not be affected by the medical unfitness of the petitioner, cannot be the basis for interfering with the assessment by the Air Force. It cannot be lost sight of that just as in justice delivery, appeal provisions are provided to eliminate the possibility of human error, so have a sufficient number of opportunities of preferring an appeal and thereafter preferring a review have been provided in the matter of medical examination and just like the decision making before the Courts cannot be indefinite, so can the decision making with respect to medical fitness in the Air Force, cannot be indefinite. There has to be a finality in decision making, as is there in the justice delivery system. It cannot be lost sight of that no mala fides are attributed with respect to any of the medical examinations or to the team of medical professionals conducting the medical examination. It is the medical practitioners of the Air Force and Defence Services, who have themselves undergone the requisite trainings and discharge the functions



of the organization, who are best suited to form an opinion as to the medical fitness of the candidates to be recruited and once they have so formed their opinion, there can be no interference therewith, at the mere asking of a rejected/disgruntled candidate."

What has been held in the context of Air Force, equally applies here. Once the Rules provide for the report of the Medical Board and Review Medical Board to be final, every candidate declared medically unfit, cannot, at the mere asking, be granted another opportunity as is found to be sought in innumerable cases coming up before the courts. Medical opinion, like a legal opinion, can vary from professional to professional and once the Rules provide for finality and are found in the present case to have provided for a review, to eliminate the possibility of human error, that finality has to be accepted, unless a case for interference is made out.

5. In the present case, not only is there definite finding of the Review Medical Board, of the status of the lungs of the petitioner and which when subjected to extreme stress, as they will be subjected to during employment with the CRPF, not being able to perform but the petitioner himself has



not chosen to give any particulars or records of any past infection as has been suspected or of treatment of such infection in the past at any point of time. It is quite evident from the findings of the Review Medical Board that the petitioner was examined thoroughly and was found to have lungs which were opined by the doctors of CRPF, with which the petitioner is to serve, to be incapable of taking extreme stress.

6. Moreover, in the present case the private medical opinion taken by the petitioner on 14th June 2020 is also in consonance with the opinion of the Review Medical Board to the extent identifying pleural thickening with fibrotic lesions and hypoattenuation pattern in certain sections of the lungs of the petitioner. The difference between the opinion of the Review Medical Board and of the Private practitioner consulted by the petitioner only is as to the lung capacity of the practitioner and in which respect, as aforesaid, the opinion of the respondents CRPF with whom the petitioner is to serve, is to be respected.

7. We have in judgment dated 22nd May 2020 in W.P. (C) No.3237/2020 titled Dhiraj Milind Dhurve vs. UPSC, in the context of medical examination test in Central Armed Police Forces



(CAPFs) and which includes respondents CRPF, held, that the candidates found medically unfit cannot seek a change of the terms subject to which they have taken the examination and which terms uniformly apply to all candidates. It was held that the principle of 'Rules of the Game cannot be changed after the game has begun applies, with only a few of all those found medically unfit, who approach the court, being permitted another round of medical test.

8. We have also considered whether the present is a case of inconsistency between the report of the Medical Board and Review Medical Board. Though the petitioner himself has not pleaded that he was not suffering from a chest infection at the time of being examined by the Medical Board on 21st December, 2019, it is significant that there is a gap of more than four months between the Medical Examination and the Review Medical Examination and during which time an acute infection can be cured with medication. As per the Rules of the respondents CRPF, for applying for Review Medical Examination, the petitioner, along with the application for review, was required to file the Medical Certificate from a specialist medical practitioner of concerned field, as per the proforma prescribed. The petitioner has not



produced before us, the Medical Certificate which must have been obtained before preferring the review petition. Therefrom also, adverse inference has to be drawn against the petitioner. The opinion of the private diagnostic centre approached as late as on 14th June, 2020 also confirms what has been found by the Review Medical Board, that is, 'pleural thickening with fibrotic lesions with hypoattenuation pattern of the lungs'."

13. From the above discussion, it is very clear that the petitioner is not entitled for re-measurement of his height.

14. In view of the above, the writ petition is devoid of merit. Accordingly, it is dismissed.

In view of dismissal of the petition, all pending applications stand disposed of.

Sd/-
(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE