

2. The petitioner has averred in the writ petition that after inordinate delay she had been declared ineligible on the ground of erroneous recording of physical measurement. Challenging the same she approached the West Bengal Administrative Tribunal by filing OA No. 1336 of 2014.

3. By order dated 6th August, 2015 the Tribunal directed the authority to conduct fresh measurement. In compliance of the said order she was directed to appear for re-measurement on 4th October, 2015. The petitioner claims that she cleared the same but due to financial hardship, she was constrained to discontinue processing her recruitment at that stage.

4. In response to the fresh recruitment notice published in the year 2024 she applied for the post of constable once again. The petitioner participated in the Physical Measurement Test and Physical Efficiency Test scheduled on 10th January, 2026. Though she qualified in the Physical Measurement Test but failed in the Physical Efficiency Test.

5. It has been submitted that the petitioner was unable to complete the run because of an unforeseen household accident which rendered her temporarily immobile.

6. Submission is that the petitioner qualified in the recruitment process initiated in the year 2013-14. The inability of the petitioner to qualify the same all over again in January, 2026 should not stand as a disqualification against her for getting appointment.

7. It has been submitted that as the petitioner qualified in the Physical Measurement Test and Physical Efficiency Test in earlier recruitment process, accordingly, the authority ought to consider her case for recruitment.

8. Prayer has been made by the petitioner to give her one more chance to appear in the Physical Efficiency Test. Representation filed the petitioner with the above prayer is alleged to be kept pending.

9. Prayer has been made to direct the authority to consider her request for providing her a further opportunity to appear in the Physical Efficiency Test.

10. The aforesaid prayer of the petitioner is opposed by the respondents.

11. Upon hearing the parties and on perusal of the materials placed before this Court, it appears that the earlier recruitment process which was initiated in the year 2013-14 concluded long ago. The petitioner was not selected for appointment in the said process. She practically gave up her claim for appointment by not processing her case further.

12. The petitioner participated in the fresh recruitment process initiated by the authority in the year 2024. The fresh recruitment process is no way connected to the earlier recruitment process which stood concluded long back. In the fresh process she participated in the Physical Measurement Test and the Physical Efficiency Test which was conducted on 10th January, 2026.

13. Though she qualified in the Physical Measurement Test but failed in the Physical Efficiency Test. The reason for such failure is alleged to be an unforeseen household accident which rendered her temporarily immobile.

14. The prayer of the petitioner for conducting fresh Physical Efficiency Test cannot be accepted because if such prayer is accepted, then there

may be several such candidates who may have failed in the Physical Efficiency Test on the scheduled date who may approach the Court for similar relief.

15. The test was conducted on a particular date and the efficiency of a candidate on the said date was considered. There may be several reasons for not performing to an optimum level on a particular date. That does not mean, that the candidate will be given another chance to appear in the said test all over again.

16. Giving second chance to a job aspirant to participate in a public competitive recruitment examination after being unsuccessful at a particular stage is completely unheard of. If such prayer is accepted, then the recruitment process will never come to an end as somebody or the other will always be unsuccessful and approach Court for conducting re-examination.

17. A public recruitment process cannot be pushed towards uncertainty. A candidate cannot be given further chance to prove her efficiency even though she may have qualified in the written and the physical measurement test.

18. The tests are conducted for the purpose of selecting the best eligible candidate. The standard of the Physical Efficiency Test cannot be permitted to be compromised by the authority. No provision of law has been placed before the Court allowing multiple or more than one

opportunity to a job aspirant to appear in the Physical Efficiency Test after failing to clear the same in the first attempt.

19. In view of the above, the prayer of the petitioner cannot be allowed. No direction can be passed for consideration of the prayer of the petitioner seeking a further date for conducting Physical Efficiency Test.

20. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

21. Parties to act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

22. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)