

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No. 2215 of 2026

24th August, 2026

Mahesh Chandra

--Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Deep Prakash Bhatt, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. Narayan Dutt, learned Standing Counsel along with Mr. Maneesh Bisht, learned Brief Holder for the State.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

At 2:30 PM

1. The case of the petitioner is that his father, who was serving as an Additional Sub-Inspector in the Police Department, died on 19.05.2024. Thereafter, petitioner applied for compassionate appointment and requested appointment to the post of Police Constable.

2. Petitioner was directed to appear in the Physical Fitness Efficiency Test for the post of Constable. According to the petitioner, he successfully qualified in the said test.

3. Petitioner has also placed on record the Physical Fitness Efficiency Test report dated 14.03.2026 as annexure-6 to the writ petition. It is his contention that an interpolation was subsequently made in Column No.3 of the said report so as to show him as having failed the test. It is further submitted that the said report is inconsistent with the letter dated 14.03.2026 issued by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Bageshwar, to the Chief Medical Officer, Bageshwar.

4. Learned State counsel, on the basis of the instructions, submits that videography of the Physical

Fitness Efficiency Test of the petitioner was conducted and preserved in a pen drive. According to the State, the videography clearly demonstrates that the petitioner could not complete the requisite number of chin-ups and, therefore, he was declared disqualified in the Physical Fitness Efficiency Test.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner had qualified in the Physical Fitness Efficiency Test. It is submitted that the petitioner had initially been treated as qualified, as is evident from the letter dated 14.03.2026 issued by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Bageshwar, to the Chief Medical Officer, Bageshwar, requesting that the medical examination of the petitioner be conducted.

6. Petitioner has challenged the letter dated 07.04.2026, issued by the Superintendent of Police, Bageshwar, whereby the petitioner was asked to indicate whether he was willing to accept appointment to a Class-IV post in the department. Petitioner claims that his candidature for appointment as Constable was wrongly rejected on the ground that he had not qualified the Physical Fitness Efficiency Test.

7. In order to appreciate the controversy raised by the petitioner and the stand taken by the State, this Court considered it appropriate to examine the videography of the Physical Fitness Efficiency Test produced by the State in a pen drive.

8. Office was, accordingly, directed to make necessary arrangements for playing the videography contained in the pen drive during the lunch hours today in the presence of learned counsel for the parties. The matter was put up at 2:30 p.m. today.

9. During the lunch hours, the Court, in the presence of learned counsel for the petitioner and learned State counsel, watched the videography contained in the pen drive on a laptop arranged by the Office.

10. Petitioner, namely, Mahesh Chandra, was duly identified by his learned counsel during the viewing of the videography.

11. On viewing the videography of the Physical Fitness Efficiency Test, particularly the chin-up exercise, this Court found that the petitioner did not complete the requisite five chin-ups.

12. From the videography, it was apparent that the petitioner successfully completed only one chin-up, while two chin-ups were only partially completed. Petitioner failed to complete the fourth and fifth chin-ups.

13. Thus, on a consideration of the videography produced by the State and viewed in the presence of learned counsel for the parties, this Court found substance in the stand taken by the State that the petitioner did not fulfill the requisite standard prescribed for the Physical Fitness Efficiency Test.

14. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

15. Having personally viewed the videography in the presence of learned counsel for both sides, this Court finds that petitioner failed to complete the requisite five chin-ups. Consequently, the declaration of the petitioner as disqualified in the Physical Fitness Efficiency Test cannot be said to suffer from any illegality or arbitrariness. Accordingly, no interference is warranted in the matter. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

16. However, this order will not come in the way of the respondent/State in considering compassionate appointment to the petitioner against any other suitable post.

17. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
24.08.2026

AK

AK