



CWP-13081-2026

1

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

(126)

CWP-13081-2026

Date of Decision : 04.05.2026

Rambir

...Petitioner

Versus

Registrar General, Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Vishal Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravish Bansal, Advocate
for the respondent-High Court.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner's request for change of date of Physical Endurance Test was declined by the respondent, through the impugned communication dated 22.04.2026 (Annexure P-9). This caused grievance to the petitioner, and propelled him to knock the door of this Court, by invoking inherent jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, submits that the instant writ petition is purely based on equity, as he does not have any intention to derail the ongoing selection process. He has drawn the attention of this Court towards his medical condition, as prior to the date of Physical Endurance Test i.e. on 20.04.2026, he suffered a fracture on his right femur, upper shaft region. In order to further substantiate his arguments, he submits



that he is ready to undergo any medical test, to eradicate any question of having suffered a fracture on 20.04.2026. He further submits that he has already cleared the written examination and has been called for Physical Endurance Test, which is merely a qualifying exam, therefore, no prejudice would be caused to the respondent in case, one opportunity is afforded to the petitioner, at this stage, to appear for the Physical Endurance Test. Finally, he placed reliance upon the judgment passed by Delhi High Court, in ***W.P. (C) No.10182-2024***, titled '***Narmeta Manooj Kumar vs. Union of India and others***' decided on 24.10.2024, wherethrough, considering the circumstances therein, where the petitioner had suffered a knee fracture, a similar relief has been granted.

3. On advance notice of the petition, Mr. Ravish Bansal, Advocate, has caused appearance on behalf of the respondent, and opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner.

4. He submits that the Physical Endurance Test, which commenced from 23.04.2026, has already been over on 29.04.2026. He further submits that total 2278 candidates were called for Physical Endurance Test, i.e. 10 times to the advertised posts, who cleared the written examination, and each day 400 candidates were called for the said test, and 452 candidates remained absent, which includes the present petitioner, and some of the candidates were denied the opportunity to take Physical Endurance Test, as they appeared late, on the ground. He next submits that in case, the prayer of the petitioner is accepted being a mercy chance, then it will open a pandora's box. He, in addition, submits that since the Physical Endurance Test, was to be conducted through a third party agency, therefore, they will have to arrange a lot of infrastructure i.e. ground, mats, staff, CCTV camera etc., and this will create a



lot of complications, in smooth completion of the ongoing selection process. He also submits that the dates, which were advertised, were for all the candidates, who have been called for Physical Endurance Test, and it cannot be changed for a single candidate. He specifically mentioned that at least 17 out of 452 candidates, has made a request for change of date of Physical Endurance Test, on various grounds. However, all were rejected uniformly, adopting the same yardstick. Therefore, there is no discrimination with the petitioner and the said decision on the part of the respondent, was to maintain transparency in the ongoing selection process.

5. This Court has considered the submissions made by both the parties, concerned.

6. Succinctly put, the respondent/department advertised 300 vacant posts of Peon on its establishment and applications were invited upto 20.09.2024. The mode of selection, as prescribed in the advertisement require all the candidates to firstly, appear in a written test of 100 marks, comprising 50 Multiple Choice Questions (02 marks each) pertaining to general knowledge, general awareness, current affairs and numerical ability with no negative marking. After the written test, candidates equivalent to 10 times (category wise), except the PWD category of the advertised vacancies, in order of their merit in the written tests would be called for Physical Endurance Test, which was only qualifying in nature. The test would consist of three activities, namely, 800 meter race, long jump and high jump. The criteria for conducting the Physical Endurance Test, was also described in the advertisement, which is extracted hereinafter :-



Physical Endurance Test							
Race (Qualifying only)	Distance (In meters)	Qualifying Parameter in seconds as per age					
		18-30 years	30-35 years	35-40 years	40-45 years	45-50 years	50 years and above
Male candidates	800m	270 sec.	310 sec.	350 sec.	390 sec.	430 sec.	470 sec.
Female candidates	800m	290 sec.	330 sec.	370 sec.	410 sec.	450 sec.	490 sec.
Long Jump (To be qualified in three attempts)	Age Wise Break-up and Distance in meters	Qualifying Parameter in meters as per age					
		18-30 years	30-35 years	35-40 years	40-45 years	45-50 years	50 years and above
Male candidates		2.95 m	2.80 m	2.65 m	2.50 m	2.35 m	2.20 m
Female candidates		1.74 m	1.60 m	1.45 m	1.30m	1.15 m	1.00 m
High Jump (To be qualified in three attempts)	Age Wise Break-up and Height in meters	Qualifying Parameter in meters as per age					
		18-30 years	30-35 years	35-40 years	40-45 years	45-50 years	50 years and above
Male candidates		1.14 m	1.10 m	1.05 m	1.00 m	0.95 m	0.90 m
Female candidates		0.90 m	0.85 m	0.80 m	0.75 m	0.70 m	0.65 m

7. From perusal of the above, it reflects that Physical Endurance Test was qualifying in nature. Anyone, who failed to meet the standard, would be declared as disqualified.
8. In the instant case, unfortunately, the petitioner suffered fracture on 20.04.2026, whereas, the Physical Endurance Test was conducted w.e.f. 23.04.2026 to 29.04.2026. The petitioner made a request on 20.04.2026, for extension of time, on account of fracture suffered by him, which was declined, and later on, he was allowed to appear on 29.04.2026. In the instant petition, the request was made for conducting Physical Endurance Test, *qua* the petitioner, as and when he is declared fit by the Doctor concerned.
9. This Court does not find any reasons to pass *mandamus*, upon the respondent, to deviate from the ongoing selection process, in the circumstances, as explained above. The selection process has its own sanctity, and requires transparency. Affording relaxation to one candidate, would require relaxation for everyone, who could not appear in the Physical Endurance Test, due to various reasons. Furthermore, only 17 out of 452



other candidates are unable to make any application, till date, believing that such relaxation is not possible. In case, the petitioner is allowed such relaxation, the respondent/department would require to create fresh infrastructure, for conducting Physical Endurance Test, that too, only for one candidate.

10. The prayer of the petitioner is also tested on the touchstone of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India. This imposed the obligation upon the recruitment agency to strictly adhere to the notified recruitment conditions, and to maintain the transparency in the ongoing selection process. The respective recruitment agencies are bound by the advertised procedure, and the same cannot be altered midstream, that too considering the difficulty (may be general or *bona fide*). Even, the petitioner’s alone difficulty cannot be examined by the recruitment agency. For this purpose, the recruitment agency is required to extend this option for all those candidates, who failed to appear for the Physical Endurance Test, on account of one reason, or the other. However, the selection criteria adopted and advertised does not empower the recruitment agency to conduct such exercise. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that such asked for direction cannot be passed, upon the respondents.

11. Consequently, the instant writ petition being devoid of merits, is **dismissed**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

May 04, 2026
Manpreet