

30-03-2026
Item No.22
Subrata
Bhattacharyya
AR(C)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

WPA No.544 of 2026
Anjali Shaw
-vs-
Union of India & Ors.
With
CAN No.1 of 2026

Mr. Gunjan Kumar Singh
Mr. Vijay Varma
Ms. Anita Das
Ms. Rushali Buiragi ...for the petitioner

Ms. Chandreyi Alam
Ms. Runu Mukherjee ...for the respondents

1. The petitioner participated for recruitment as Constable (General Duty) in CAPF, SSF, rifleman GD in AR and Sepoy in NCB. She has been declared unfit by the Detailed Medical Examination Board and the Review Medical Examination Board on the ground of multiple hesitation cut marks on the left forearm. She was referred to the psychiatry OPD.
2. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that till there is a positive finding that the petitioner is mentally unstable her candidature ought not to be rejected.
3. Prayer has been made to conduct psychiatric test of the petitioner.
4. Learned advocate for the respondents oppose the prayer of the petitioner. The report filed by the DIG(P SO) for the Inspector General, FTR HQ BSF South Bengal signed on February 24, 2026 has

been relied upon.

5. The report of the Department of Psychiatry, College of Medicine of JNM Hospital relied upon by the petitioner suggests that she requires individual counselling.
6. The report relied upon by the respondents mentions that 18 number of parallel cut marks were found in the ventral surface of her left wrist. Her pulse rate was also found increased because of deliberate self-harm/nervous instability. The reasoning given by the petitioner did not corroborate with the cut marks.
7. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was mentally stable and the cut marks are not self-inflicted, but the petitioner, for reasons best known, has not disclosed the reason for such cut marks in the exception filed by the petitioner to the report filed by the respondent.
8. The respondents opined that the self-inflicting harm behavior shows emotional and mental instability which may aggravate in the difficult and hostile terrain where CAPFs personnel are deployed. It requires high level of mental and physical standard to cope with the stressful strict regimental life away from family under a strict disciplinary code around 300 days in a year.
9. The CAPFs personnel are required to function under the shadow of the gun and deployed at high altitudes, snow bound areas, deserts and other terrains. The cut marks implied unsuccessful suicide attempt and potentially lethal action. A risk factor for future attempts to suicide always remains.

10. Upon hearing the parties and on perusal of the materials placed before this Court, the Court is minded to accept the stand taken by the respondents. There is high possibility that the petitioner may not be able to adapt to the stressful situation under which she may be required to work. The mental condition of the petitioner may not be suited for engagement in CAPF.
11. Mental or nervous instability is a ground for rejection of candidature.
12. The petitioner was participating for recruitment in the combatised force. Any candidate who, according to the authority, is not mentally fit and stable cannot be engaged in a combatised Force.
13. Till the authority is satisfied that a candidate is cent percent fit both physically and mentally, such person cannot be permitted to be engaged in the combatised force.
14. Hence, the Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
15. Consequently, CAN No.1 of 2026 is disposed of.
16. All parties are to act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.
17. Certified copy of this order, if applied for, shall be made available to the parties.

[Amrita Sinha, J]

