



\$~39

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Judgment delivered on: 10.07.2023

+ **W.P.(C) 9027/2023 & CM APPL. 34375-76/2023**

YOGESH KUMAR

..... Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Appellant:

Ms. Nikita, Mr. Brijesh Yadav, Mr. Kshitiz Chhabra, Mr. Abhijit Vikram and Mr. Chirag Verma Advocates.

For the Respondents:

Mr. Jatin Singh, Mr. Keshav Sehgal, Mr. Shivam Gaur and Ms. Ramya Soni, Advocates with Mr. Hemendra Singh, DC (Law), BSF

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks quashing of the Detailed Medical Examination result dated 09.06.2023 and the Review Medical Examination dated 10.06.2023.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been rejected on the ground of 'hypertension'. It has also been



contended that “*the Revised Uniform Guidelines for review in medical examination in Central Armed Police Forces and Assam Rifles for GOs and NGOs*” dated 31.05.2021 have not been followed in this regard.

3. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned counsel appearing for the respondent.
4. With the consent of the parties, the petition is taken up for final disposal.
5. Reference may be had to the abovesaid guidelines prescribed for the Review Medical Board which, inter-alia, reads as under:

“7(e) For candidates who have been rejected on the ground of hypertension/tachycardia should have been admitted/hospitalized by the Board before giving their final opinion regarding the candidate’s fitness or otherwise. The hospitalization report should indicate whether the rise in blood pressure is of transient in nature due to excitement etc. or whether it is due to any organic disease. In all such cases X-Ray and electro-cardiographic examinations of heart and blood examinations like cholesterol/lipid profile, S. Creatinine etc. tests should also be carried out.”

6. It is not in dispute that petitioner has been declared ‘unfit’ on the ground of hypertension. It is also not in dispute that petitioner was not hospitalized by the Review Medical Board prior to giving final opinion. The Medical Board, as per the guidelines, should have also ascertained as to whether the rise in blood pressure was transient in nature due to excitement, etc. or whether it was due to an organic



disease, as required by the guidelines.

7. Since the guidelines have clearly not been followed, the opinion rendered by the Review Medical Board cannot be accepted. Accordingly, the findings of the Review Medical Board are set aside. The respondents are directed to constitute a fresh Review Medical Board which shall examine the petitioner, inter-alia, in accordance with the guidelines dated 31.05.2021.

8. The Review Medical Board be constituted within a period of two weeks from today with at least four days' advance notice to the petitioner.

9. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. It would be open to the petitioner to avail of any further remedies, if aggrieved by any such further decision of the Review Medical Board.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MANOJ JAIN, J

JULY 10, 2023

NA