



2025:DHC:957-DB



\$~43

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI***Date of decision: 13.02.2025*****+ W.P.(C) 1622/2025
DIVYA****.....Petitioner****Through: Mr.Raghunath Pathak,
Mr.Aditya Narayan Tripathy,
Ms.Shweta Priya and
Mr.Anjani Kumar Mishra,
Advs.****versus****UNION OF INDIA & ANR****.....Respondents****Through: Ms.Iram Majid, CGSC with
Mr.Mohd. Suboor and Mr.M.
Seham Khan, Advs.
DC Sandeep Chaudhary, ITBP****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 finding of the Review Medical Examination Board dated 21.12.2024, by which the petitioner has been declared 'unfit' for appointment to the post of Assistant Commandant under the Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) (Assistant Commandant Examination, 2024) on the ground that she suffers from 'anemia'. Her hemoglobin level at the time of the initial medical examination was found to be 8.6 gm (dl), while at the time of the Review Medical Examination, it was found to



2025:DHC:957-DB



be 8.3 gm (dl).

2. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner later got herself examined at the Civil Hospital, Kosli (Rewari), on 13.01.2025, wherein her hemoglobin level was found at 13.3 gm (dl). Even earlier, on 31.12.2024, she got her Hematology Analysis Report done, which reported her hemoglobin level to be 12.1 gm (dl). The petitioner had thereafter again got herself examined at the Referral Hospital, Greater Noida, where she was declared 'fit'.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, given the above contradictory reports, the petitioner should be referred to an Independent Medical Board for further examination.

4. On 10.02.2025, when this petition was first listed before this Court, the learned counsel for the petitioner had submitted that, in fact, anemia is not a ground for the rejection of a candidate under the Medical Guidelines applicable to the examination in question. We had asked the learned counsel for the respondents to take instructions on the same.

5. Today, the learned counsel for the respondents has stated that the medical standards prescribed under the advertisement in question, also make the Revised Uniform Guidelines for Recruitment Medical Examination for Recruitment of GOs and NGOs in the CAPFs & AR dated 20th May, 2015 applicable thereto. She submits that, in terms of Clause 10 (a) thereof, the hemoglobin range for a female candidate cannot be below 10 gm %. She submits that, in the present case, both, the Initial Medical Examination and the Review Medical Examination



2025:DHC:957-DB



Board, found the hemoglobin level of the petitioner to be below the prescribed threshold. She submits that no reliance can be placed on the subsequent Medical Examinations that have been conducted by the petitioner on her own. She places reliance on the Judgment of this Court in ***Rajnish v. Union of India & Ors.***, 2025:DHC:660-DB, in support of her submission.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner, however, on the other hand, reiterates that, given the contradictory reports that have later been obtained by the petitioner, the petitioner should be given another chance of having herself examined through a Review Medical Board. He places reliance on the Judgment of this Court in ***Chetan v. Union of India & Anr.***, 2023 SCC OnLine Del 2263.

7. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

8. As far as the levels of hemoglobin are concerned, the advertisement in question had in Note (1) thereof, made the Medical Examination Guidelines dated 20th May, 2015 applicable to the medical examination.

9. Clause 10 (a) of the Medical Guidelines dated 20th May, 2025, reads as under:

“ 10. INVESTIGATIONS:

xxxx

- a. *Hemoglobin: (Normal Range – 12 – 16 gm% for male, 10 – 14 gm% for female). However candidates with more than 18 gm% will be considered unfit. Hemoglobin below 12 gm% for male*



2025:DHC:957-DB



and below 10gm% for female will be considered as disqualified.”

10. In view of the above, the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner could not have been declared ‘unfit’ for appointment merely because her hemoglobin level was found to be as 8.6 gm (dl) and 8.3 gm (dl), cannot be accepted.

11. As far as the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the hemoglobin level of the petitioner in her later examination was found to be above 10gm% and, therefore, the petitioner should be subjected to another medical examination, we are of the opinion that the medical examination of a candidate cannot be an endless exercise. The petitioner must meet the required standards at the time of the Initial Medical Examination. If a candidate is dissatisfied with the report of the Initial Medical Examination, he/she is granted another opportunity in the form of a Review Medical Examination. In the present case, the petitioner has failed to meet the prescribed standards at both stages. Merely achieving these standards at a later stage would not make her eligible for appointment.

12. Accordingly, we do not find any merit in the present petition. The same is dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

SHALINDER KAUR, J

FEBRUARY 13, 2025/sg

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