



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.2502 OF 2026

Shidhodhan Bhimrao Shinde,
Age – 21 Years, Occ. Student,
r/o. Pangargaon, Mudkhed,
Dist. Nanded

..Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Union of India
Ministry of Home affairs,
Through Its Secretary.
North Block, New Delhi-110001.
2. The Union of India,
Ministry of Personnel,
Public Grievances & Pensions,
Through Its Secretary,
North Block, New Delhi - 110 001.
3. Central Forensic Science Laboratory,
HW4P+HXP Krishna Complex,
38/4, Mundhwa, Kharadi Road,
Yashwant Nagar, Kharadi Road,
Pune 411 011.
4. Staff Selection Commission,
Through Its Chairman,
Block No. 12, CGO Complex,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003
5. Central Reserve Police Force,
Through Directorate General,
Block No.-1, C.G.O. Complex,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110 003

..Respondents

Mr.Vrishabh Patil, Advocate h/f. Mr.Satej Jadhav, Advocate for petitioner
Mr.Rahul Bagul, Senior Panel Advocate for respondent nos.1 to 5

**CORAM : SMT.VIBHA KANKANWADI &
AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, JJ.**

DATE : APRIL 23, 2026

JUDGMENT :-

1. **Rule.** Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with the consent of the learned counsel appearing for both the sides.
2. The petitioner has approached this Court under Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking directions to the respondents to declare his result for the recruitment to the post of Constable (GD) in Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) and SSF, Rifleman (GD) in Assam Rifles and Sepoy in Narcotics Control Bureau, pursuant to the advertisement issued on 05.09.2024. It is the case of the petitioner that he possessed all the requisite qualifications prescribed for the said post. The petitioner duly applied and was permitted to appear for the written examination and having cleared the same was also called for the physical efficiency test, physical standard tests and document verifications. During the document verification process, the biometric details of the petitioner were found to

be not matching with those recorded earlier in the recruitment database. Despite such observation, the petitioner was permitted to appear for the medical examination which was duly conducted by the respondents. Even, upon subsequent biometric tests, the mismatch persisted. Consequently, the petitioner was initially declared unfit and was directed to undergo medical re-examination.

3. The petitioner thereafter underwent medical re-examination and was declared fit and eligible for selection. The verification of documents and the medical examination process was thus completed. Notwithstanding his successful completion of all stages of the recruitment process, the respondents withheld the result of the petitioner solely on the ground of biometric mismatch, even though the final result for other candidates was published on 15.01.2026.

4. According to the petitioner, the biometric mismatch is not a fault attributable to him. The forensic report regarding the verification of biometric data, forwarded by the respondents to the forensic department, is still awaited for a considerable time without any progress. The petitioner has therefore approached this court seeking directions to

expedite the process of obtaining the forensic report and or to direct the respondents to publish his result so that he may participate in the forthcoming training programme likely to commence within a few weeks.

5. The learned Advocate appearing for the respondents submitted that the results in relation to biometric mismatch are still awaited, and therefore, the result of the petitioner could not be declared till the receipt of the forensic report. During the course of the hearing, the petitioner's Advocate also brought to the notice of this Court that the similarly situated candidates have preferred Writ Petition No.975 of 2025 and other companion matters before the Bombay High Court, Nagpur Bench and those petitioners were also appearing in the same examination and for the same position. Their results were also withheld only due to the reason of biometric mismatch. He relied upon paragraph 8, 9 and 10 which reads thus:

“8. Having considered the rival submissions, it appears that it is a matter of record that the petitioners' candidature was considered by the respondents, thereafter, the written examination conducted is also successfully cleared by the petitioners herein. Resultantly, the physical and document verification was carried out. However, but for Biometric mismatch which is conducted by the respondents themselves, which is according to us is not attributable to

the petitioners herein, the petitioners have been otherwise declared successful. Therefore, in our considered view, the respondents are not justified in withholding the results since the recruitment process has commenced in the month of November 2023 and after lapse of substantial period, the respondents are not justified in withholding the results of the petitioners, to which petitioners are legitimately entitled for, in the wake of petitioners' successfully clearing the written examination so also further act of medical re-examination conducted by the respondents. Therefore, we direct the respondents to declare the result of the petitioners within a period of four weeks from today.

9. Needless to state that the candidature of the petitioners deserves to be considered on their respective merit and if the petitioners are otherwise qualified.

10. The writ petitions are allowed. Rule is made absolute in the above terms with no order as to costs."

6. Upon making a query with the respondent's advocate, whether the facts of the present petition and the facts before the Nagpur bench in the above order are similar, he agreed and fairly submitted that all the petitioners therein are similarly situated to the one which is before us in the present petition.

7. In light of the order dated 30th June 2025, passed by the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court, Nagpur bench in Writ Petitions No.975

of 2025, 976 of 2025 and 977 of 2025, this court finds that the facts and issues involved in the present petition are identical and the ratio of the said judgment squarely applies to the present case.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed in terms of paragraphs 8, 9 and 10, extracted above. The respondents are directed to declare the result of the petitioner within 4 weeks from the date of this order.

9. Rule made absolute in above terms, no orders as to costs.

[AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.]

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.]

KBP

.....