



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

CWP-4261-2022

Date of Decision: 28.11.2025

Ritu

...Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravi Partap Singh, DAG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of reports dated 03.01.2022 and 03.02.2022 (Annexures P-3 and P-6) whereby respondent rejected her candidature on the ground of height.

2. The petitioner pursuant to Advertisement No.04/2020 applied for the post of Constable (Female) in HAP Durga-1. She applied under General Category. She cleared different stages of recruitment process. She appeared in Physical Measurement Test on 03.01.2022. The respondent measured her height as 157.0 cm. She preferred ***CWP No.324 of 2022*** before this Court which was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 23.03.2022. The respondent issued a notice for re-measurement of height on 03.02.2022. In the second round of measurement, her height was found 157.0 cm. The respondent rejected

petitioner's candidature on the ground that her height is less than 158 cm.

3. Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that respondent with *mala fide* intention wrongly measured her height and rejected her candidature. The respondent did not use stadiometer. This Court may get her height measured from an independent agency.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel submits that petitioner was subjected to measurement of height on two occasions. Both times, her height was found less than 158 cm. The process of measurement of height was conducted in the presence of a Sports Officer and Doctor. The entire process was videographed. The petitioner duly signed undertaking confirming that her height was measured independently.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. From the perusal of record, it is evident that petitioner was twice subjected to height measurement. On both occasions, her height was found less than 158 cm. She was asked to sign undertaking at the time of measurement. In the undertaking dated 03.02.2022, she confirmed that her height was measured and measurement was recorded in her presence by concerned Officer. She also recorded that she was fully satisfied with the measurement and accepted the result. There was possibility of coercion or misunderstanding in the first measurement, however, it was impossible in second measurement. The petitioner was well aware of her rights. There was no possibility of coercion or misuse of process of law. The Court is not oblivious of the fact that with the passage of time, slight change in height may take place.

7. The petitioner during the course of hearing claimed that her

height should be re-measured. There is meagre difference in height required and measured. There could be mistake on the part of respondent. This Court in many cases has directed authorities to re-examine height, however, in the instant case, at this belated stage, it is difficult to ask any third agency or respondent to re-measure the height. A period of 05 years from the date of advertisement has passed away and selection process stands completed.

8. In view of the above discussion and findings, the instant petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly ***dismissed***.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

28.11.2025
Prince Chawla

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