



\$~13

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 1315/2026**

VIKASH

.....Petitioner

Through: Counsel (Appearance not
given)

versus

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Chetanya Puri, SPC with
Mr. Anand Awasthi, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **30.01.2026**

1. Through the present writ petition, *inter alia*, the Petitioner assails correctness of the order dated 18.12.2025 (hereafter '**impugned order**'), passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal in M.A. No. 4859/2025 in O.A. No. 3217/2023.

2. The Petitioner herein applied for the post of Constable (Executive) Male in Delhi Police, pursuant to recruitment notice issued in the year 2020.

3. On 28.06.2021, the Petitioner appeared for height measurement test where his height was found to be 169.5 cm, which was 0.5 cm short of the required height of 170 cm.

4. The Petitioner had made an application to the Competent Authority, and thereafter, he filed original application bearing no. 1698/2022 before the learned Tribunal, which was disposed of on 08.07.2022 with directions to the Respondents to dispose of the Petitioner's representation. Liberty was also granted to the Petitioner to make a comprehensive representation to the Respondents.

W.P.(C) 1315/2026

Page 1 of 3



5. The competent authority, after considering the representation, rejected the same on 02.09.2022. It was observed that the Petitioner was disqualified on account of the Petitioner's height being short of the prescribed threshold.

6. Subsequently, the Petitioner filed original application bearing no. 3217/2023, however, the same was dismissed by order dated 22.10.2024 after observing that the Petitioner had not assailed the correctness of the order dated 02.09.2022 in the said original application.

7. Pursuant to withdrawing his writ before this Court with liberty to approach the Tribunal, the Petitioner filed an application seeking recall of the order dated 22.10.2024, which was dismissed by the impugned order. Apart from taking note of the fact that the original application lacked any specific challenge to order dated 02.09.2022, it was observed in the impugned order that the same was filed beyond the prescribed period of limitation but the Petitioner never filed any application for condonation of delay.

8. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner admits that the Petitioner neither explained the delay of more than one month in filing the original application nor challenged the order dated 02.09.2022. However, he submits that the Petitioner's height has been measured by Civil Hospital, Rohtak, where his height was found to be 171 cm.

9. This Court has considered the said submissions. At the outset, it is pertinent to note that the rejection of the Petitioner's candidature was done in the month of June, 2021 and his representation was rejected on 02.09.2022, whereas the Petitioner allegedly got his height measured by Civil Hospital, Rohtak belatedly in July, 2023. There is thus a gap of about 25 months between the Petitioner's height



assessment by the competent board and by Civil Hospital, Rohtak.

10. Moreover, there is no material except the self serving measurement allegedly done at Civil Hospital, Rohtak, that too much later, to doubt the measurement recorded by the competent board. Even otherwise, it is not the case of the Petitioner that the official measuring the Petitioner's height had any bias.

11. Reliance is placed by the Petitioner upon the order passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Surendra v. Union of India & Ors. : 2025:DHC:8319-DB***, wherein the Division Bench ordered remeasurement of height of the Petitioner in that case by the Appellate Authority. Pertinently, in that case, candidature of the Petitioner was rejected in the month of August, 2025, whereafter, the Petitioner immediately filed a writ petition in the High Court and the order was passed within a period of one month. In the present case, Petitioner raised challenge to the measurement of his height after more than two years.

12. In view of the aforesaid discussion, this Court finds no ground to interfere with the impugned order, especially considering that the Petitioner has neither endeavored to explain the delay in filing the original application nor challenged the order dated 02.09.2022.

13. The present petition is, therefore, dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 30, 2026

'KDK'