



\$~122

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

% *Date of Decision : 12.03.2026*

+ W.P.(C) 16177/2025

CT/GD SHILPA JAIN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shreevardhan Dhoot and Mr.
Amrit Rathi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH SECRETARY & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Badar Mahmood, SPC, Mr.
Ammar Ahmad, Ms. Nasreen
Khatoun, Advs., SI Rotash and Mr.
Surender Singh, CISF.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India impugning the order dated 24.09.2022 passed by the Physical Efficiency Test ['PET'] Board¹, whereby the Petitioner was declared as "Failed in 100 mtrs. race" for recruitment to the post of Assistant Sub Inspector (Executive) through Limited Departmental Competitive Examination ['LDCE'], 2020 in Central Industrial Security Force ['CISF'].

¹RTC Arakkonam, P.O. Suraksha Campus, Dist. Vellore, Tamil Nadu.



2. The Petitioner was appointed in CISF on 15.08.2009. She applied and appeared for the post of Assistant Sub Inspector (Executive) in CISF through LDCE in furtherance of notification dated 31.12.2020. She duly appeared and successfully cleared the stages (I) to (III) i.e., checking of service records, written examination and physical standard test. The Petitioner duly appeared for the Stage IV i.e., the PET on 24.09.2022 at Principal-CISF RTC Arakkonam, Suraksha Campur, Dist. Vellore, Tamil Nadu. This stage consists of four sub-stages: 800 mtrs. race in 4 minutes, 100 mtrs. race in 18 seconds, 3 feet (High Jump) in 3 chances, and 9 feet (Long Jump) in 3 chances.

3. The Petitioner qualified in the 800 mtrs. race, however, in the 100 mtrs. race, the Petitioner was declared unsuccessful on the ground that she did not complete the 100 mtrs race in the stipulated time of 18 seconds.

4. It is the case of the Petitioner that she was not informed about her time taken to complete the race nor was she provided any videographic proof when she enquired for the same.

5. It is the stand of the Petitioner that the selection process undertaken on 24.09.2022 was not transparent and the Petitioner and other candidates were not even disclosed the timing clocked by them in the race.

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioner relies upon the order passed in **W.P. (C) 1617/2023** titled as '**CT/GD Suman Yadav v. Union of India**', in the case of another constable, who had also participated in the Stage IV PET on 24.09.2022 and had raised similar contentions in the writ petition and the respondents were directed to conduct a re-test of the petitioner therein i.e., Suman Yadav.



6.1 He relies upon the said judgment and submits that similarly the Petitioner herein should be given an opportunity to have a re-test of the 100 mtrs. race and her application be proceeded with for further assessments.

6.2 He states that the Petitioner is entitled to only three attempts to secure a promotion through LCDE and this is her last permissible attempt or else she will have to wait for 15 to 20 years to attain promotion in natural course of events.

6.3 He states the Petitioner has also filed an appeal against this grievance lately on 28.09.2022.

7. This Court has enquired from the Respondents with respect to the timing clocked in by the Petitioner for the 100 mtrs. race.

8. Learned counsel for Respondents state that no data has been maintained with respect to the timing clocked in by the participants in the race including the Petitioner and the sheet merely records (✓) mark for the candidate, which qualified and (X) for the candidate which did not qualify.

8.1 He further submits that the videography of the race of 100 mtrs. has been corrupted and is unavailable. He states that in these circumstances Respondent is unable to state before this Court the specific time clocked in by the Petitioner.

8.2 He states that the recruitment process in pursuance to the LDCE-2020 has been completed. He states that the unfulfilled vacancies of the recruitment year 2020 has been converted to promotion quota as per the Recruitment Rules, 2018 and thus no vacancy remains available for the recruitment year 2020.

9. We have considered the submissions made by the parties.



10. The principal grievance of the Petitioner is that she was wrongly declared “failed” in the 100 mtrs. race conducted as part of the PET on 24.09.2022 for recruitment to the post of Assistant Sub Inspector (Executive) through LDCE-2020 in the CISF.

11. This Court has examined the check-sheet placed on record by the Respondents with respect to the PET conducted on 24.09.2022. A perusal of the said record does not indicate any overwriting in the entry corresponding to the Petitioner. The result recorded therein clearly reflects that the Petitioner was marked with an “X”, signifying that she failed to complete the 100 mtrs. race within the stipulated time frame of 18 seconds.

12. The reliance placed by the Petitioner on the order passed by this Court in **W.P.(C) 1617/2023** titled ‘**CT/GD Suman Yadav v. Union of India**’ is misplaced. As is evident, Suman Yadav approached the Court at the earliest and in the peculiar facts after examining the videography, the Court permitted re-test.

13. This Court notes that the impugned result was declared on 24.09.2022. The present petition has been filed on 08.10.2025 after a considerable delay and the Respondents have expressed their inability to produce the videography after this considerable delay. They state that the videography has been corrupted.

Thus, in the present case, the Petitioner has not been able to place any material before this Court to show that the declaration of her failure in the 100 mtrs. race was wrong. The contemporaneous record maintained by the PET Board clearly records her failure and there is no discrepancy apparent therein warranting interference.



14. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court does not find any ground to exercise its writ jurisdiction to interfere with the impugned result dated 24.09.2022.

15. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications, if any, disposed of. No order as to costs.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MARCH 12, 2026/hp/AM