



LPA-2458-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

108

LPA-2458-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 25.08.2025

Sukhpreet Kaur

... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present:- Mr. Sardevinder Goyal, Advocate for the appellant.

Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, AAG, Punjab.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)**CM-6205-LPA-2025**

1. This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 161 days in filing the appeal.
2. Heard.
3. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 161 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

CM-6204-LPA-2025

1. This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 64 days in re-filing the appeal.
2. Heard.
3. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 64 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

**Main appeal**

1. The appellant has challenged the judgment passed by the Single Bench in CWP No.30905-2024 on 18.11.2024 whereby her petition seeking issuance of direction to the respondents to re-measure her height and appoint her to the post of Constable has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the height of the appellant is 5 ft.8 inches and it was wrongly measured as 5 feet 7.75 inches. If her height is taken as 5 ft.8 inches, the appellant would be entitled to get an additional mark which would enable her to score more marks than the marks obtained by the last selected candidate in her category. Learned counsel has also relied upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of **Union of India and others versus Tarsem Singh, 2008(8) SCC 648.**

3. Heard.

4. The appellant had participated in the selection process for the post of Constable in response to the advertisement issued on 31.05.2016(Annexure P-1). The result had been finalized in the year 2017. Some of the candidates had approached this Court by preferring writ petitions in the year 2017 and the Single Bench vide its judgment dated 05.07.2021 in CWP No.22985-2016 and other connected cases (Annexure P-5) had directed that the height of the petitioners therein would be re-measured. In pursuance to the directions of the Single Bench, height of the petitioners therein, was re-measured and the result is stated to have been accordingly revised. However, the appellant herein had preferred the writ petition only in the year 2024, long after the result had been finalized in the year 2017 and revised on 18.05.2022 in pursuance to the



directions of this Court. The appellant ought to have approached this Court promptly and not slept over her rights for a long time before seeking redressal of her grievance.

5. Moreover, the judgment relied upon by the counsel for the appellant in the case of **Tarsem Singh (supra)** is distinguishable from the case at hand as the respondent therein had sought revision of pay scale and it was in such circumstances, the Supreme Court had held that the delay would not defeat the claim of the respondent therein and the arrears were restricted to a period of 36 months prior to filing of the writ petition. In the instant case, the appellant is seeking appointment to the post of Constable although the recruitment had been completed in the year 2017 and the result was revised in pursuance to the orders of this Court in the year 2022. The appellant had approached this Court only in the year 2024. Reference can be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of **Sankar Mondal versus State of West Bengal and others**, bearing Civil Appeal No.1924 of 2010, decided on 15.02.2022 wherein it was held that any person, who wants to challenge the selection process, should promptly approach the Court as otherwise, third party interests are created and the selected candidates would have to be disturbed. The relevant extract thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

“6. In our view, in a recruitment process, a candidate cannot be permitted to approach for redressal, howsoever may be the genuineness of the grievance, at any stage of time as there has to be a closure to the process of recruitment. In case of an advertisement dated 1999, the appellant cannot be permitted to plead that he was waiting for seven long years for getting an appointment letter and then woke up to file the O.A. before the



State Administrative Tribunal. This itself is a ground to non-suit the appellant.”

6. In view of the above, the judgment of the Single Bench dismissing the writ petition on account of delay and laches does not suffer from any manifest illegality which would warrant interference in appeal.

7. Consequently, the Letters Patent Appeal being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

August 25, 2025
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No