



2025:DHC:10305-DB



\$~38

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

+ **W.P.(C) 17627/2025 & CM APPL. 72785/2025**

SAHIL PADMA SHINDE

.....Petitioner

Through: Major Kavish Aggarwala, Mr. Shubham Kumar, Mr. Shubham Raghuvanshi, Mr. Uttam Kumar, Mr. Amit, Mr. Paras Jaiswal and Ms. Manini Kaur, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi, CGSC with Ms. Laavanya Kaushik, Ms. Khyaati Bansal and Ms. Priya Khurana, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

%

20.11.2025

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. The petitioner challenges the decision of the respondents to treat him as medically unfit for recruitment as Assistant Commandant in the Indian Coast Guard on the ground that the axial length of his eyes is in excess of the permissible limit.

2. Admittedly, there is concurrence of opinion in this regard by the Detailed Medical Examination and the Review Medical Examination. The actual reports have been provided to us. In the Detailed Medical



Examination, the axial length of the petitioner's left eye was found to be 25.64 mm and the axial length of the petitioner's right eye was found to be 25.49 mm. In the Review Medical Examination, the axial length of the petitioner's left eye was found to be 25.46 mm and the axial length of the petitioner's right eye was found to be 25.63 mm.

3. The prescribed maximum axial length of the eyes, as per the applicable visual standards is 25.5 mm. Indeed, the petitioner also does not dispute this position and has placed on record the information obtained under the Right to Information Act, 2005, which has communicated this standard to him.

4. The standard is not under challenge. Even otherwise, as it deals with medical standards for entry into a paramilitary force, there can be no basis for the Court to interfere with it.

5. Mr. Shubham, learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner also submits that the axial length prescribed for entering into the Army is different. There is no principle known to law that the medical standards applicable for entry into the Army should be the same as those applicable for entry into the paramilitary forces or even for that matter that the medical standards applicable to one paramilitary force would apply to others. The nature of duties of various paramilitary forces are different. Given their difference in nature of duties, it is but natural that different medical standards would apply.

6. The petitioner seeks entry into the Coast Guard, for which as we have already noted, the prescribed maximum axial length is 25.5 mm.



2025:DHC:10305-DB



7. We have already held in *Staff Selection Commission v Aman Singh*¹ following *KM Priyanka v UOI*² that where there is concurrence of opinion between the DME and the RME with respect to the medical status of the candidate, no third opinion can be directed to be obtained.

8. There is no reason to take a different view in this case. Accordingly, the writ petition is devoid of merit and is dismissed in *limine*.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

NOVEMBER 20, 2025/pa

¹ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 7600

² 2020 SCC OnLine Del 1851

