



211 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-5747-2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 27.11.2025

Robina Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Vijay Dahiya, Advocate and
Ms. Neelam Choudhary, 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 orders dated 11.08.2017 (Annexures P-12 and P-13) whereby respondent rejected her candidature on the ground of height.

2. The petitioner pursuant to Advertisement No.8/2025 applied for the post of Constable (Female). She applied under General Category. She cleared different stages of recruitment process. She appeared in Physical Measurement Test on 27.09.2016. The respondent measured her height as 159.6 cm. She preferred **CWP No.22142 of 2016** before this Court which was disposed of vide order dated 01.03.2017 in terms of order dated 21.11.2016 passed in **CWP No.23875 of 2016** titled as **Sonu Singh Versus State of Haryana and Others**. The respondent did not comply with orders of this Court, thus, she preferred **COCP No.1533 of 2017**. The respondent in compliance of orders of this Court, re-measured

her height. In the second round of measurement, her height was found 159.8 cm. The respondent rejected petitioner's candidature on the ground that her height is less than 160 cm.

3. Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that petitioner was called for interview on 20.06.2017 which shows that her height was more than 160 cm. The 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 160 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 160 cm. She was asked to sign undertaking at the time of measurement. In the undertaking dated 19.06.2017, 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 at the time of first measurement, however, second measurement took place on the directions

of this Court. 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 10 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***.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

27.11.2025
Prince Chawla

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