



2025:DHC:4138-DB



\$~96

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI*****Date of decision: 21.05.2025***+ **W.P.(C) 6936/2025 & CM APPL. 31394-96/2025****STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION AND ORS.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC,
Ms. Ayushi Srivastava, Mr. Amit
Tiwari, Advs

versus

RAHUL PUNIA

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Esha Mazumdar,
Ms. Muskan Sharma, Advs.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR****NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

1. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 14.05.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, 'Tribunal') in O.A. No. 1952/2024, titled ***Rahul Punia v. Staff Selection Commission & Ors.***, allowing the OA filed by the respondent herein while simply placing reliance on the earlier Judgment dated 10.05.2024 passed the learned Tribunal in OA No.519/2024, titled ***Teekaram Singh Meena vs. SSC and Ors.***
2. While we could have remanded the matter back to the learned



Tribunal, however, taking into account the fact that in the present case the respondent is seeking employment with the Delhi Police and that uncertainty in this regard is going to prejudice not only the respondent but also the petitioners, we have proceeded to examine the petition on merits as well.

3. The respondent had applied for the post of Constable (Executive)(Male) with Delhi Police pursuant to the Advertisement issued on 01.09.2023. The Detailed Medical Examination Board declared the respondent 'unfit' for appointment finding him to be suffering from '*Hypertension BP-160/98mm of Hg*'.

4. Aggrieved of the said finding, the respondent applied for Review Medical Examination.

5. The Review Medical Examination Board directed the admission of the respondent in the BSF Hospital, wherein his readings were taken on regular intervals from 02.02.2024 to 05.02.2024. It was found that his average Blood Pressure was 139/83 mm/hg (stage-1 Hypertension). Based on the said finding, the Review Examination Medical Board, *vide* its report dated 06.02.2024, declared the respondent 'unfit' for appointment finding him to be suffering from '*Stage-I Hypertension*'.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the learned Tribunal has erred in placing reliance on a purported report of another Government Hospital which declared the respondent medically fit for appointment. He submits that the opinion of the Medical Boards appointed by the petitioners cannot be brushed aside merely by relying upon the subsequent report of a Government or private hospital. In the



present case, the Medical Board has conducted a detailed examination of the respondent by having him admitted to the BSF Hospital between 02.02.2024 to 05.02.2024 and taking repeated measurements of his Blood Pressure. He submits that therefore, the Impugned Order is liable to be set aside.

7. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent, who appears on advance notice of this petition, places reliance on the ‘Guidelines for Review Medical Examination in Central Armed Police Forces and Assam Rifles’ dated May 2015 issued by the Government of India wherein, as far as the examination of the Blood Pressure is concerned, in paragraph XIV (2), it has been provided as under:

“XIV. EXAMINATION OF HEART & VASCULAR SYSTEM

xxx

2. Examination of Blood Pressure. (Normal Range Systolic 100-140 mm of Hg, Diastolic 60 to 90 mm of Hg) Candidate should not be rejected on the basis of single high reading. In case the blood pressure is recorded to be higher than 140 mm systolic and/or 90 mm Hg diastolic, at least 2 more recordings should be taken in lying position at an interval of 2-3 hours before declaring him unfit. BP should be recorded in both arms. The candidate should be asked to relax and should not be subjected to strenuous/stressful activity immediately prior to the recording. (Elevated blood pressure defined as the average of three consecutive sitting blood pressure measurements separated by at least 10 minutes, diastolic greater than 90 mmHg or systolic pressure measurements greater than 140 mmHg, is disqualifying.

(Emphasis supplied).”



8. The learned counsel for the respondent submits that, therefore, it is only where the average Blood Pressure of the candidate is found to be above 140mm Hg systolic and 90 mm Hg diastolic, that such candidate is to be declared 'unfit' for appointment.

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

10. A reading of the above clause of the Medical Guidelines would show that the normal range of systolic Blood Pressure is 100-140 mm Hg while for diastolic Blood Pressure is 60-90 mm of Hg. In the present case, the respondent's average Blood Pressure was found to be 139/83 mm Hg, which would be within the normal range as stipulated in the above Medical Guidelines.

11. Keeping in view the above, we do not find any merit in the petition and we dispose of the present writ petition along with the pending applications by directing the petitioners to comply with the direction issued by the learned Tribunal, within a period of four weeks from today.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

MAY 21, 2025/Arya/ik

Click here to check corrigendum, if any