

\$~2.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 944/2018 and CM No. 3954/2018 & 15078/2018.
RAVIN Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tarjit Singh, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Advocate with
Ms. Palak Rohmetra, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% **18.04.2018**

1. On the last date of hearing, counsel for the petitioner had contended that the results of the Physical Endurance Test (PET) were not conveyed to any of the candidates including the petitioner on the date when the PET was conducted. Taking note of the said submission, learned counsel for the respondents was directed to obtain instructions from the Department.

2. Today, Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, learned counsel for the respondents states that the results of the Physical Standard Essential (PSE) as also of the Physical Endurance Test are communicated to the participants on the spot and not on a later date. She submits that the petitioner did not clear the PSE. When he underwent chest expansion, it did not expand by 5 centimetres, as required in terms of the advertisement. Resultantly, he was informed right away that he did not meet the PSE.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that if the petitioner had not met PSE, then he could not have participated in the PET, which in this case he did. To substantiate the said submission, he draws our attention to

the Advertisement No.2/13 in respect of post code 37/2013 and refers to Note 1, which states that no relaxation is permissible for PSE.

4. The said submission cannot be of any assistance to the petitioner as the advertisement does not mention anywhere that if the petitioner does not fulfil the PSE, then he will not be made to participate in the PET, as both the tests were to be conducted on the same date, sequentially. We are not persuaded by the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner that because the respondents had not communicated the results of the PET to him or any of the other candidates and, they are not in a position to produce his video reel/footage for the said PET.

5. The present petition is accordingly dismissed as meritless alongwith the pending applications.

HIMA KOHLI, J

PRATIBHA RANI, J

APRIL 18, 2018

na/ap