



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 21ST DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 36419 OF 2025 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

BAVARAMMA
D/O. BASAVANTRAYA PATIL
AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS
R/AT HAGARATAGI VILLAGE
HAGARATGI POST, SHORAPUR
YADAGIRI DISTRICT-585237

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SANCHAN JAI NANDAN., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL
AND TRAINING (DOPT)
REP. BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL
PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS
3RD FLOOR. A WING, SHASTRI BHAWAN
NEW DELHI, DELHI-110011.
2. THE STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION
REP. BY ITS CHAIRMAN
OFFICE AT BLOCK NO-12, CGO COMPLEX
LODHI ROAD, NEW DELHI-110003.
3. THE PRESIDING OFFICER,
REVIEW MEDICAL BOARD (RME)
CT/GD SSC-2025, BANGALORE CENTRE

Digitally signed by
MALATHI
CHALUVA IYENGAR
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



BSF COMPLEX, YELAHANKA
BENGALURU-560063.

...RESPONDENTS
(BY SMT. ANUPAMA HEGDE, CGC FOR R1 TO R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER WRIT QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER ENDORSEMENT DATED: 22.11.2025 ISSUED BY R3 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A AND DIRECT THE R3 TO DECLARE PETITIONER WITH ROLL NO. 9005003291 AS QUALIFIED IN RME FOR POSTS NOTIFIED VIDE NOTIFICATION DATED 05.09.2024 BY R2 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-B AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, challenging the endorsement dated 22.11.2025 vide Annexure-A, whereby the petitioner has been declared as not qualified for the post of Constable (GD) in the Central Armed Police Forces.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the second respondent issued a notification dated 05.09.2024 vide Annexure-B for filling up the posts of Constable (GD) in the Central Armed Police Forces. Pursuant to the said



notification, the petitioner had applied for the said post and appeared for the Computer-Based Test and was successful. Thereafter, as per the notification, the Physical Standard Test was conducted, wherein she stood qualified. Subsequently, she was referred for Detailed Medical Evaluation (DME). The DME declared her unfit on account of cut marks on her left forearm. Thereafter, she was referred for Review Medical Evaluation (RME). The RME, in turn, referred the case for the opinion of a doctor from NIMHANS, Bengaluru, and the said opinion is produced at Annexure-R5. The relevant portion of the same is extracted below:

"Currently, no history of any psychiatric symptoms or any personality trait that would be of concern or any self-harm risk."

3. Thereafter, by the impugned endorsement, the petitioner's case has been rejected on the ground that she is unfit.



4. As per the Revised Uniform Guidelines for Review Medical Examination, in cases where the Review Medical Board rejects the candidature of any candidate, the finding shall be corroborated by a confirmatory test, investigation, or the opinion of a Specialist or Super Specialist from a Government Hospital. The relevant portion is extracted below:

"6. Guidelines for Review Medical Boards:

.....

(d) Review Medical Board may obtain opinion of concerned specialists or super specialists of Govt. Medical College and Hospital in case of any doubt. Therefore, in cases of rejection in review medical examination, clinical findings should be corroborated within confirmatory tests/investigations/opinion of specialists/super specialists of Govt. Hospitals/Medical Colleges/Govt. approved private medical centers, whichever and wherever applicable."

5. The opinion of the specialist doctor is extracted above. In the said report, the specialist has not stated whether the petitioner is fit or unfit for recruitment to the



said post. Even the impugned endorsement is not in corroboration with the report submitted by the specialist. Therefore, the writ petition deserves to be allowed.

6. Accordingly, the following order:

- (i) The writ petition is allowed.
- (ii) The impugned endorsement dated 22.11.2025 issued by the third respondent vide Annexure-A is quashed.
- (iii) The respondents are directed to re-do the RME for the petitioner from a Specialist from the NIMHANS Hospital, and take a decision in accordance with law, not later than six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-
(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE