



2025:DHC:9255-DB



\$~2

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

+ **W.P.(C) 15709/2025 & CM APPL. 64317/2025**

SUNEEL RAWAT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Veer Singh, Mr.
Shubham Singh, Mr. Uday Ram Bokadia,
Ms. Pratiksha Jain, Ms. Mamta Jain, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Chandan Deep Singh, SPC
for UOI with Ms. Sadhana Sandhu, GP

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT(ORAL)

%

16.10.2025

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. The petitioner aspires to the post of Sub-Inspector in the Delhi Police and Central Armed Police Forces. He applied, pursuant to Recruitment Notice dated 4 March 2024, issued by the Staff Selection Commission, for recruitment in that regard. He cleared all stages of selection process.

2. However, in the Detailed Medical Examination¹ which took place on 18 September 2025, he was declared unfit on the ground that he suffered from Scoliosis, Knock Knee and Non-Homogeneous Nodular Opacities in the right upper zone of the chest.

Signature Not Verified ¹“DME” hereinafter

Signed By: PREETI W.P.(C) 15709/2025
Signing Date: 17.10.2025
19:39:19

Page 1 of 4



2025:DHC:9255-DB



3. He was thereafter subjected to a Review Medical Examination², which took place thereafter. A day earlier, the petitioner was subjected to a CT Scan. The final impression of the CT Scan, reads thus:

“Benign solitary pulmonary nodule with tiny internal calcification in apical segments of right upper lung field as described above.”

4. On the basis of the aforesaid report, the RME also declared the petitioner unsuitable for recruitment, on account of the existence of a Solitary Pulmonary Nodule in the right lobe of his lung.

5. We had called on the respondent to take instructions. Today, Mr. Chandan Deep Singh, learned SPC, has handed over to us, a copy of the CT report of the petitioner’s chest, dated 23 September 2025. We have already reproduced the final impression contained in the said report.

6. Mr. Ajay Veer Singh, learned Counsel for the petitioner, fervently contends that the ailment on the basis of which the petitioner was found unfit is not one of the disabilities notified for disqualifying a candidate for recruitment as Sub-Inspector in Delhi Police and Central Armed Police Forces.

7. He has drawn our attention to the stipulations on page 39 regarding the medical standards, as contained in the notice for the examination, which reads thus:



“12.11 **Medical standard (For all posts):**

12.11.1 **Medical Examination:** All the candidates who qualify in Paper-II will be medically examined by the Medical Officer of the CAPFs or any other Medical Officer or Assistant Surgeon belonging to Grade-I of any Central/ State Govt. Hospital or Dispensary. Review Medical Examination (RME) of the candidates, who are found to be unfit during Detailed Medical Examination (DME), will be conducted in continuation of DME preferably on the next day of DME. Decision of Re-Medical Board/Review Medical Board will be final and no appeal/representation against the decision of the Re-Medical Board/Review Medical Board will be entertained.

12.11.2 **Eye sight:** The minimum near vision should be N6 (better eye) and N9 (worse eye). The minimum distant vision should be 6/6 (better eye) and 6/9 (worse eye) of both eyes without any correction like wearing glasses or surgery of any kind to improve visual acuity. In right handed person, the right eye is better eye and vice versa.

12.11.3 The candidate must not have knock knee, flat foot, varicose vein or squint in eyes and they should possess high colour vision.

12.11.4 *They must be in good mental and bodily health and free from any physical defect likely to interfere with the efficient performance of the duties.”*

8. Clause 12.11.4 of the aforesaid notice clearly disqualifies any candidate who is not in good mentally and bodily health or suffering from any physical defect for entitlement for recruitment as Sub-Inspector in Delhi Police and Central Armed Police Forces.

9. As there are concurrent findings of the DME and RME of the existence of a benign solitary pulmonary nodule with calcifications in the right upper lobe of the petitioner’s lung, we are not in a position to render any assistance to the petitioner in this case.

10. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has emphasized the fact that



2025:DHC:9255-DB



the nodule is benign. However, a nodule in the chest is a nodule in the chest, and is etiologically attributable to infection, or some like cause.

11. The standards which are required to be satisfied by candidates seeking recruitment to Armed Forces, are qualitatively much higher than those for recruitment to civilian posts. This Court cannot sit in appeal over the discretion of the respondents in that regard unless it is arbitrary, perverse or violative of any norms or statutory requirements. No such infirmity plagues the decision of the respondent in the present case.

12. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

OCTOBER 16, 2025/rjd