



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

**CWP No. 30695-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision:13.11.2025**

Kuldeep Kaur

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Brijesh Khosla, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to the respondents to decide her representation dated 04.09.2025.

2. The petitioner, pursuant to Advertisement No.1/2016, applied for the post of Constable. The respondent declared result which came to be challenged in CWP No.22985 of 2016 and connected petitions. The writ petitions came to be disposed of vide order dated 05.07.2021. Few candidates filed CWP No.25491 of 2023 which was disposed of on 30.04.2024 with a direction to fill up 195 posts lying vacant. The petitioner made representation dated 04.09.2025 seeking appointment.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that actual height of petitioner is 5'7" whereas respondents wrongly measured 5' 6". Apart from other questions, question of height was pending before this Court in a bunch of writ petitions including CWP No. 22985 of 2016. The matter was finally adjudicated on 05.07.2021 and State was directed to re-measure height of petitioners. The respondent did not re-measure height of the petitioner. She was not disclosed marks of her height, thus, could not prefer writ petition. A Division Bench of this Court in *Ved Pal Mor vs. State of Haryana, 1999(1) SCT 76* has held that rule of delay does not govern the administrative action. Whenever an authority finds that an error has been committed, it has undoubted jurisdiction and discretion to rectify the mistake.

4. From the perusal of record, it is evident that advertisement was issued in 2016 and selection process completed in 2017. Many candidates feeling aggrieved from the selection list preferred writ petitions before this Court. Multiple issues were raised before this Court which vide judgment dated 05.07.2021 disposed of all the petitions with different directions which included direction to respondents to re-measure height of petitioners. It was made clear that it would be one time re-measurement. The respondent pursuant to aforesaid order, re-measured height of petitioners therein and revised result. Final result was declared in 2022. The petitioner did not file petition along with others who had approached this Court in 2016-2017. This Court decided aforesaid bunch of petitions on 05.07.2021. The petitioner did not wake up and has preferred instant petition in 2025. The selection process has already completed and at this belated stage this Court does not find it appropriate to direct the respondents to re-measure height of

the petitioner and thereafter revise the final result. The selection process needs to be concluded. If such like petitions are entertained, there would be no end of selection process.

5. The petitioner is placing reliance on judgment in *Ved Pal Mor (Supra)*. The said judgment is inapplicable to instant case because, at this stage, in the absence of material on record, it cannot be concluded that there was error on the part of respondents.

6. In the wake of above discussion and findings, the instant petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

7. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

13.11.2025
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No