



2026:PHHC:062240



2026:PHHC:062240

CWP-7474-2017

:1

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

213

**CWP-7474-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : 23.04.2026**

MOHIT YADAV

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA

Present :- Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Jindal, Additional A.G., Haryana.

Deepinder Singh Nalwa, J. (Oral)

1. In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for issuance of a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for appointment in Haryana Police on the post of Male Constable (General Duty).

2. Brief facts of the case are that the Haryana Staff Selection Commission (hereinafter referred to as 'the Commission') issued an advertisement on 19.07.2025 (Annexure P-1) advertising posts of Male Constable (General Duty). The petitioner belongs to BC(B) category. In pursuance to the above said advertisement 19.07.2015, the petitioner applied in BC(B) category for appointment on the post of Male Constable



2026:PHHC:062240



2026:PHHC:062240

CWP-7474-2017

:2

(General Duty). The physical examination was conducted by the respondents in the case of the petitioner on 19.07.2016. The petitioner appeared in the physical examination and was successful. Thereafter, the petitioner was called for the written examination which was held on 28.08.2016. The petitioner duly cleared the said written examination conducted by the Commission. Thereafter, the petitioner was called for the physical measurement test on 23.10.2016, the petitioner duly appeared in the same. In the physical measurement test, the height of the petitioner was assessed by the Commission as 168.5 cms. As the petitioner did not possess the minimum requisite height of 169 cms as per the rules, as such, the case of the petitioner was not considered for appointment.

3. The petitioner served a legal notice dated 20.03.2017 (Annexure P-3); however, as per the petitioner, no decision was taken on the said legal notice.

4. Aggrieved against the action of respondents in not considering the case of petitioner for appointment on the post of Male Constable (General Duty), the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that the height of the petitioner was more than 169 cms as such, he was entitled to be considered for appointment on the post of Male Constable (General Duty).

6. Learned State counsel submits that as per the applicable rules, the minimum height required for appointment on the post of Male Constable (General Duty) is 169 cms. He submits that in the physical measurement test



2026:PHHC:062240



2026:PHHC:062240

CWP-7474-2017

:3

conducted on 23.10.2016, the height of the petitioner was assessed as 168.5 cms. which was less than the requisite height, as per the rules, i.e. 169 cms. Learned State counsel further submits that as per the general instruction issued by the respondents dated 24.09.2016 (Annexure R-2/1), if any candidate has any objection, he would submit the same before the authority. Learned counsel submits that no objection was raised by the petitioner in regard to assessment of his height by the respondent-Commission and in fact the petitioner also gave an undertaking on 23.10.2016, the date of physical measurement test, that the petitioner is satisfied with the measurement assessed by the respondent-Commission.

7. In light of the above said facts, learned State counsel contends that there is no illegality in the action of the respondents in not considering the case of the petitioner for appointment on the post of Male Constable (General Duty).

8. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties at some length, the only issue involved in the present writ petition is as to whether the petitioner is entitled to be considered for appointment on the post of Male Constable (General Duty). It is not in dispute that physical measurement test was conducted in the case of petitioner on 23.10.2016 and height of the petitioner was assessed as 168.5 cms. by the respondent-Commission. It is also not in dispute that for the purpose of eligibility, the minimum height required, as per the applicable rules is 169 cms. Further, it is also not in dispute that the petitioner never filed any objection in regard to assessment of his height assessed by the respondent-Commission and had, in fact, the



2026:PHHC:062240



2026:PHHC:062240

CWP-7474-2017

:4

petitioner furnished an undertaking that he is satisfied with the measurement assessed by the respondent-Commission and he accepts the same.

9. In regard to the contention raised by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that his height was more than 169 cms is concerned, no evidence/material has been led by the petitioner to show that height of the petitioner was 169 cms as above. There is no allegation of mala fide alleged against the respondents. As the petitioner had not raised any objection in regard to assessment of his height by the respondent-Commission and had given an undertaking that he is satisfied with the measurement assessed by the respondent-Commission, therefore, the respondent-Commission has rightly not considered the case of the petitioner for appointment on the post of Male Constable (General Duty).

10. In view of above, this Court finds no merit in the writ petition and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)
JUDGE

23.04.2026

Rimpal

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No