

\$~17

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 5175/2015 & CM No. 9385/2015**
MINTON SONI Petitioner

Through: Mr. H.K. Shekhar, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR Respondents
Through: Ms. Saroj Bidawat, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE DEEPA SHARMA

ORDER
% **13.10.2015**

The petitioner contends that his candidature to the post of Constable in the Delhi Police has been arbitrarily disqualified. It is not in dispute that he cleared the written test and the other recruitment process and was sent for medical examination. The medical board declared him unfit on ground *interalia* of colour blindness and non-fulfilment of the visual acuity standards. The medical board was of the opinion that the petitioner's left eye had vision of 6/12 and right had 6/6 acuity. His review was accepted and he succeeded partially in the sense that the medical board decided that he was not colour blind. He has however declared to have visual acuity of 6/9 in the left eye and 6/6 in the right eye.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner

fulfils the medical standards spelt out in the advertisement to the post and states that the same merely spells out that the candidate should possess 6/6 and 6/9 acuity in the eyes. It is submitted that the petitioner answers to this description.

Counsel for the respondent points out that the petitioner is in fact left handed and that his dominant eye is therefore the left one. Contending that the medical standards were specifically spelt out in this regard vide instructions dated 07.02.2008, it was submitted that the requirement is that the acuity in the dominant eye ought to be 6/6, since that would be considered a shooting eye.

Having considered the submissions, we are of the opinion that petitioner's case is unmerited. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is left handed and therefore would require to hold a weapon and train his left eye on it. Concededly his said dominant eye does not measure to the required standard of 6/6. In these circumstances, we find no arbitrariness in the respondent's action.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

DEEPA SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 13, 2015

sapna