



2025:DHC:143-DB



\$~74

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

Date of decision: 13.01.2025

+ W.P.(C) 328/2025, CM APPL. 1550/2025

RAHUL KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Kaushik and Mr.
Himanshu Sharma, Advs.

versus

CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shekhar Kumar, Mr.
Anubhav Tyagi and Mr.
Chetan, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, challenging the Review Medical Examination Report dated 11.11.2024, declaring the petitioner unfit for appointment in the Physical Standard Test (in short, 'PST') due to Bifid Uvula (Congenital Abnormality) in the selection process for the post of Constable (GD) in the Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs), Secretariat Security Force (SSF), and Rifleman (GD) in Assam Rifles Examination- 2024.

2. The petitioner has applied for the said post pursuant to the Notice dated 24.11.2023, issued by the respondents. Clause 18 of the said advertisement reads as under:

"18 Court's Jurisdiction: Any dispute in regard to this recruitment will be subject to courts having jurisdiction over the place of Regional Office concerned of the Commission where the candidate has appeared for the

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: NEELAM
Signing Date: 15.01.2025
17:35:16

W.P.(C) 328/2025

Page 1 of 2



2025:DHC:143-DB



Computer Based Examination.”

3. Admittedly, the petitioner has not appeared for the Computer Based Examination in Delhi. His PST was also not conducted in Delhi.

4. This Court, on an objection of the respondents for lack of territorial jurisdiction for adjudicating a petition raising a similar issue, in its Order dated 25.07.2024, passed in W.P.(C) 8480/2024, titled ***Uttam Kumar v. Union of India Through Its Secretary and Others***, has held as under:-

“8. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, we are of the considered view that once the advertisement pursuant to which the petitioner had applied contained a specific clause providing for territorial jurisdiction of the Court/Tribunal situated in the area where the test was held.

9. The petitioner cannot now be permitted to argue that the clauses mentioned in the advertisement are not binding on him. We are, therefore, of the opinion that this Court does not have territorial jurisdiction to entertain the present writ petition. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of, by granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the Court having territorial jurisdiction.”

5. Being bound by the above Judgment, we dispose of the present petition, reserving the liberty of the petitioner to approach the Court of competent jurisdiction. Pending application also stands disposed of.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

SHALINDER KAUR, J

JANUARY 13, 2025/SU/SK/IK

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)