



CWP-27893-2025

-1-

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

109

CWP-27893-2025

Date of Decision: 30.09.2025

Kamal Kumar**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present: - Mr. Harnoor Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents to consider him for the post of Constable and issue him appointment letter.

2. The petitioner, pursuant to Advertisement No.1/2016 dated 31.05.2016, applied for the post of Constable. The selection process was completed during 2016-17. On account of interim order of this Court, 195 posts were kept reserved. This Court vide order dated 30.04.2024 passed in *CWP No.25491 of 2023* directed the respondent to fill up 195 posts lying vacant on account of interim order of this Court. The petitioner is claiming that his height was wrongly measured, thus, he could not be offered appointment letter.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner despite repeated requests was not informed of ground of rejection of his

**CWP-27893-2025****-2-**

candidature. He was entitled to 14 marks as per his height. His total marks should be 28. He is entitled to the post advertised.

4. During the course of hearing, Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, who on advance notice is present in Court on behalf of respondent-State, submitted calculation sheet showing that petitioner was awarded 13 marks on account of his height being 5'10.5". Height of candidates was remeasured in the light of directions of this Court. Even if petitioner is awarded 14 marks, his name would not figure even in the waiting list.

5. In the wake of statement of learned State counsel, the grievance of the petitioner that he was not informed of his marks and reason of non-selection stands redressed.

6. In the backdrop, this Court is of the considered opinion that no further interference is warranted. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

30.09.2025*Mohit Kumar*

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