

Form No. J.(2)
Item No. DL/22
adeb - AR (CT)
Ct. No. 2

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

Before:
THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA

W.P.A. 444 OF 2026

Sabuj Pramanik
VS.
Union of India & Ors.

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Subhankar Bose, Adv.
For the Union of India	:	Mr. S.N. Dutta, Adv. Mr. Anindya Sundar Das, Adv
Heard on:	:	22. 01.2026
Judgment on:	:	22.01.2026

SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA, J:

1. Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.

2. Petitioner participated in the selection process for being appointed as Constable (GD). In review medical examination which was conducted on 4th December, 2025 petitioner was declared unfit as petitioner was diagnosed with tachycardia.
3. Learned advocate representing the petitioner disputes review medical examination report dated 4th December, 2025 on placing reliance on medical report dated 11th December, 2025 issued by a Doctor of R.G. Kar Medical College and Hospital. According to the petitioner from the said report dated 11th December, 2025 it can be perceived that petitioner was not suffering from tachycardia.
4. Learned advocate representing Union of India has opposed this writ petition and in reference to review medical examination report dated 4th December, 2025 it is pointed out that on the date of review medical examination pulse rate of the petitioner was measured 115 per minute. Attention of this Court has also been drawn to medical report dated 11th December, 2025 wherein pulse rate of the petitioner was recorded 106 per minute. It is submitted that there is no anomaly in the report based on review medical examination held on 4th December, 2025 and it is a case of tachycardia so far petitioner is concerned. It is also submitted that in terms of the relevant

provisions of Revised Medical Guidelines in case of tachycardia candidate ought not to be declared fit.

5. On perusal of medical report dated 11th December, 2025 issued by a Doctor of R.G. Kar Medical College and Hospital it does not appear that petitioner was not suffering from tachycardia and it was not certified that petitioner was found fit. Rather petitioner was advised to come with medical reports for further examination in order to find out whether petitioner is fit or not. It is striking that in medical report dated 11th December, 2025 pulse rate of the petitioner was measured 106 per minute.
6. In terms of Clause XIV(1) of Medical Guidelines it is provided that a candidate with persistent tachycardia (more than 100 pulse rate per minute) and bradycardia (less than 50 per minute) will be declared disqualified.
7. As no medical certificate is produced which is found to be contrary to the review medical examination report dated 4th December, 2025, Court has to rely upon said review medical examination report dated 4th December, 2025 specially when medical report dated 11th December, 2025 also suggests pulse rate of the petitioner at the material point of time was more than 100 per minute.
8. Hence, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

9. Writ petition stands dismissed.
10. Urgent photostat certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties, upon usual undertakings.

(SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA, J.)