

S/L 08
21.05.2026
Court No.04
B.K.N

M.A.T. 2004 of 2025
With
CAN 1 of 2025
CAN 2 of 2025
Union of India & Ors.
Vs.
Anishur Rahaman & Ors.

Mr. Siddhartha Labiri,
Mr. Tapan Bhanja

...for the Appellants.

Mr. Debasish Kundu,
Mr. Bidan Modak

...for the Respondent/Writ Petitioner.

Re: CAN 1 of 2025

1. It is submitted by the learned advocate for the appellants that on account of an inadvertent typographical error the number of days of delay has been mentioned in the application as 27 instead of 35.
2. An application for condonation of delay (35 days) has been filed.
3. In view of the nature of order proposed to be passed, the respondents did not raise any objection to the condonation application.
4. The delay is condoned.
5. The application for condonation bearing CAN 1 of 2025 is allowed.

Re: M.A.T. 2004 of 2025

6. According to the learned advocate for the Union of India/Appellants, the Apex Court in the case of ***Union of India & Ors. Vs. Atul Kumar Verma & Ors. in Civil Appeal No(s) 4423-4426/2026 SLP (C)***

Nos. 13390-13393/2026 and Diary No. 68753/2025 has already settled the controversy pending in the present case.

7. As per decision of the Apex Court, a candidate who participated in the process of recruitment of constables (GD) in the force and his height if found/measured as 169.5 centimetres and above, then 0.5 would have to be ignored and 169.5 and more would have to be rounded off to the next higher centimetre. Such candidate cannot be disqualified on ground of less height, if they are 169.5 centimetres or above.
8. The Hon'ble Apex Court passed such order in an appeal in identical circumstances as arising for consideration in the present case.
9. The learned advocate for the appellants fairly submits that since none of the writ petitioner was found to be below 169.5 cm. during their height measurement, therefore, nothing survives in the present appeal.
10. The learned advocate for the Appellants thereafter submits that the Union of India is in the process of seeking review of the order dated 13th April, 2026 passed in the above noted case by the Hon'ble Apex Court. It would not be appropriate for this Court to comment on such submission. We, therefore, refrain from making any observation in respect of such submission.

11. Since the appeal has become infructuous in view of the above noted decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court, the same is accordingly disposed of.
12. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.
13. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)