

measurement of his chest. He was orally intimated that he did not qualify in PMT.

5. As the petitioner was not given the requisite number of chances, he could not clear the PMT and could not be sent up for the next stage which is Physical Endurance Test.

6. Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is a resident of Chhattisgarh and he got himself checked up in a Government hospital at Chhattisgarh on April 25, 2026 and his chest measured normally 91 cm. and on expansion the same measured 97 cm. The document evidencing qualification of the petitioner in the Chhattisgarh police recruitment process issued by the Chhattisgarh police where the petitioner appeared in a competitive examination in January, 2026 has been relied upon. It has been submitted that similar physical measurement was conducted in the police recruitment examination.

7. It has been submitted that the authority ought to have provided the requisite number of chances to prove that his chest measures as per the requirement of the advertisement.

8. Prayer has been made by the petitioner for conducting fresh PMT for evaluation of his chest measurement.

9. Submission and prayer of the petitioner is vehemently opposed by learned counsel for the Airports Authority of India. It has been submitted that PMT of the candidates was taken by a committee of doctors. A team of medical personnel comprising of specialist doctors in all the fields conducted PMT for the entire duration for which such test was conducted.

10. As the petitioner failed to record the minimum chest measurement, accordingly, he was disqualified. It has been submitted that three attempts were provided to the petitioner and all aspiring candidates for measuring their chest. The allegation of the petitioner of not providing three chances for measuring his chest has been denied.

11. It has further been submitted that PMT was conducted between April 8, 2026 and April 25, 2026. The petitioner was physically measured on April 19, 2026. Had there been any grievance on the part of the petitioner, he ought to have brought the same to the notice of the authority immediately on the self-same date. The petitioner, instead of approaching the doctors present at the time of conducting PMT, approached the Court by filing the instant writ petition.

12. Prayer has been made to dismiss the writ petition.

13. Upon hearing both the parties and on perusal of the materials annexed to the writ petition, it appears that the petitioner participated in the recruitment process in terms of the advertisement published by the Airports Authority of India. The requirement of conducting PMT as stipulated by the authority is to be followed by each and every candidate participating in the recruitment process.

14. The petitioner alleges that three chances were not provided to him for recording his chest measurement in terms of the advertisement. The said allegation of the petitioner has been denied by the respondents. Such disputed question of fact cannot be decided under Article 226 of the Constitution.

15. It is settled that a candidate, who is participating in a recruitment process, ought to abide by the terms and conditions of the recruitment notice. The recording of the physical standards of the job aspirants on the particular date and time of the examination is relevant and measurement taken by any other authority cannot be relied upon for consideration of candidature for recruitment as held by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court on September 11, 2025 in **FMA 964 of 2025, IA No. CAN 1 of 2024** in the matter of **Harun Miah -vs- Union of India & Ors.**; neutral citation **2025:CHC-AS:1810-DB.**

16. If the prayer of the petitioner is accepted, then there may be several other unsuccessful candidates who may approach the Court seeking re-evaluation of their physical measurement. Such prayer cannot be allowed by the Court.

17. The petitioner failed to record the measurement as required in PMT. A uniform procedure was followed by the authority for measuring the chest of the job aspirants. There is no reason as to why the petitioner will be provided as second chance for recording his chest measurement. The same will amount to discrimination qua the other unsuccessful candidates.

18. In a public recruitment process all the candidates are to be treated similarly and no exception can be made only because the petitioner has approached the Court for relief.

19. The Court does not find any error on the part of the respondents.

20. The writ petition, therefore, 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 necessary formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)