

Form No. J(2)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
(Appellate Side)

W.P.A. NO 705 OF 2026

SOURAV MANDAL

VS.

UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS

BEFORE: THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA

For the Petitioner

:Mr. Debasish Kundu, Adv.
Mr. Bidan Modak, Sr. Adv.

For the UOI

:Mr. Ajit Kumar Chaubey, Adv.
Mr. Madhu Janu, Adv.

Hearing concluded on

: 29.01.2026

Judgment on

: 29.01.2026

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 Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs). Petitioner qualified in written test and physical standard test but in review medical examination held on 1st December, 2025 petitioner

was declared unfit as petitioner had foreign body granuloma over right ring finger.

3) It is submitted by learned advocate representing the petitioner that petitioner had undergone operation on 9th December, 2025 in Bankura Sammilani Medical College and Hospital and after operation petitioner was fit to be appointed in the post of Constable (GD). It is also submitted that prior to operation deformity which petitioner had in his right ring finger impaired normal functioning/ free movement of the finger.

4) Reliance is placed on clause 11 (4)(a) of Revised Uniform Guidelines For Review Medical Examination in Central Armed Police Forces and Assam Rifles of May, 2015 and it is contended that for body surface swelling as petitioner had in his right ring finger one month period after operation is provided. It is further submitted that petitioner after participating in review medical examination on 1st December, 2025 had undergone operation on 9th December, 2025 which is within the period of one month for being cured requiring further medical examination of the petitioner.

5) Learned advocate representing the respondents has opposed this writ petition based on review medical examination report dated 1st December, 2025 and clause VII (3)(c) of revised guidelines of May, 2015. It is also submitted that clause 11(4)(a) is not applicable in case of petitioner as petitioner after participating in review medical examination had undergone operation which is impermissible.

6) It is not disputed by the petitioner that he had deformity over right ring finger i.e. granuloma which impaired normal functioning/free movement of that finger as a result whereof petitioner had undergone operation on 9th December, 2025 in order to get cured.

7) Under clause 11(4)(a) of revised guidelines of May, 2015 for body surface swelling post operation period is one month in the event operation is performed prior to medical examination of the candidate. In the present case, petitioner had undergone operation admittedly on 9th December, 2025 whereas review medical examination was held on 1st December, 2025. Therefore, on the date of detailed medical examination conducted on 28th November, 2025 and review medical examination on 1st December, 2025 petitioner had granuloma, as such there is no anomaly in the review medical examination report dated 1st December, 2025. If petitioner had undergone operation prior to medical examination and thereafter participated in medical examination in connection with selection process for the post of Constable (GD) under CAPFs situation would have been different and that would have attracted clause 11 (4)(a). But in the instant case as petitioner had undergone operation after review medical examination benefit of clause 11 (4)(a) cannot be extended to the petitioner.

8) Hence, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

9) Writ petition stands dismissed.

10) There shall be no order as to costs.

11) Urgent photostat certified copy of this judgment and order, if applied for, be given to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Saugata Bhattacharyya, J.)