



\$~15

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

Date of decision: 05.08.2025

+ W.P.(C) 1924/2025 & CM APPL. 9034/2025, CM APPL. 9035/2025

STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Ms. Radhika Bishwajit Dubey
(CGSC) with Ms. Gurleen Kaur
Waraich, Mr. Kritarth
Upadhyay, Mr. Vivek Sharma,
Ms. Khushi and Mr. Saksham
Sharma, Advs.

versus

GAURAV RANA

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Esha Mazumdar, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioners, challenging the Order dated 27.08.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 3331/2024, titled ***Gaurav Rana v. Staff Selection Commission & Anr.***, whereby the learned Tribunal allowed the O.A. filed by the respondent herein, with the following directions:

“7. In our considered view, the ratio of the aforesaid Order applies to the facts of the present case as well. Accordingly, the OA is also disposed of with a direction to the competent authority



amongst the respondent to conduct a fresh medical examination of the applicant by way of constituting an appropriate medical board in any government hospital except the hospital which has already conducted the initial and the review medical examination. Appropriate orders with respect to the candidature of the applicant on the basis of the outcome of such an independent/fresh medical examination be passed thereafter under intimation to the applicant.

8. The aforesaid directions shall be complied with within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. In the event the applicant is being declared medically fit, subject to his meeting other criteria, he shall be given appointment forthwith. The applicant, in such an eventuality, shall also be entitled to grant of all consequential benefits, however, strictly on notional basis. No costs.”

2. To give a brief background of the facts leading to the present petition, the respondent had applied for the post of Constable (Executive) Male pursuant to the advertisement issued by the Staff Selection Commission (hereinafter referred to as the ‘SSC’) for the Delhi Police Examination, 2023. Having successfully qualified in the other stages of the examination, he was called for a medical examination.

3. The Detailed Medical Examination Board (hereinafter referred



to as the 'DME') declared him 'unfit' for appointment on the ground of "*Knock Knees and Bilateral Inversion of Ankle Joint*", vide report dated 19.01.2024.

4. Aggrieved by the said finding, he applied for a review. The Review Medical Examination Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'RMB') again declared him 'unfit' for appointment on the ground of the presence of "*Knock Knees.*"

5. Aggrieved thereby, the respondent approached the learned Tribunal.

6. The learned Tribunal, merely placing reliance on its earlier order, allowed the O.A. and directed the petitioners to conduct a re-medical examination of the respondent.

7. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioners have filed the present petition.

8. This Court, while issuing the notice in the present petition and staying the operation of the Impugned Order, observed that despite a concurrent finding by both the DME and the RME Boards, a fresh medical examination had been directed merely on the basis of a report provided by an external hospital.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner reiterates that both the DME and the RME found the respondent to be suffering from '*Knock Knees*'. The report of the RME was also supported by the respondent's X-ray reports. She submits that despite these concurrent findings, the learned Tribunal directed a fresh examination of the respondent, thereby rendering the recruitment process endless.

10. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent



submits that the respondent got himself examined at the Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, where he was declared medically 'fit'.

11. We are afraid, that we cannot accept the submission of the learned counsel for the respondent.

12. As noted hereinabove, in the present case, both, the DME and the RME, had given a concurrent opinion that the respondent was suffering from '*Knock Knees*'. This finding was also supported by the X-ray reports.

13. We have consistently emphasized that the determination of a candidate's medical fitness, especially for posts in the Central Armed Police Forces and the Delhi Police, lies within the domain of the recruiting authorities. The scope of judicial interference with the findings of a Medical Board is limited and ought not to be exercised casually. These reports cannot be disregarded merely because a Private or even a Government Hospital has given a contrary opinion. The recruitment process should not be rendered open-ended.

14. Accordingly, we find that the learned Tribunal erred in interfering with the selection process in the present case. The Impugned Order is, therefore, set aside.

15. The petition is allowed in the above terms.

16. There shall be no order as to costs.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

AUGUST 5, 2025/ys/bs/VG/DG