

S/L 13
15.05.2026
Court No.18
SD

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 2758 of 2026

Sourav Biswas

Vs.

Union of India & Ors.

Mr. Sagnik Chatterjee

Ms. Ananya Neogi

Mr. Sayan Mukherjee

Ms. Anushka Ghosh

...for the Petitioner.

Mr. Ajit Kumar Chaubey

Mr. Madhu Jana

...for the Respondent.

1. Exception of the petitioner to the report of the respondents filed in Court today be kept with the records.

2. The petitioner participated for recruitment as Constable-GD in Central Armed Police Forces. He has been declared medically unfit by the Detailed Medical Examination Board due to divergent squint in the left eye.

3. The Review Medical Board reiterated the same ground and declared the petitioner medically unfit.

4. Thereafter the petitioner got himself medically examined in State Government hospital and obtained a fit certificate in his favour.

5. The petitioner is aggrieved by the manner in which he has been medically examined by the Detailed Medical Examination Board and the Review Medical Examination Board.

6. It has been submitted that the findings of the Review Medical Examination Board has not been

recorded in accordance with clause 42 of the guidelines for recruitment medical examination.

7. Prayer has been made to reevaluate and reexamine the physical fitness of the petitioner by an independent medical board.

8. Submission of the petitioner is opposed by the learned advocate representing the respondents. Reliance has been placed on the report filed by the respondents wherein it has been mentioned that the review medical examination of the petitioner was conducted by a different Board comprising of four medical officers including an ophthalmologist. The Board got the petitioner examined by an eye specialist, a co-opted member of the Board, and after detailed clinical examination the eye specialist opined that the petitioner suffers from divergent squint in the left eye.

9. As per paragraph 6, sub-paragraph of the revised uniform guidelines for recruitment medical examination, any degree of squint is a ground for rejection.

10. The authority has opined that the aforesaid medical condition of the petitioner will remain as a liability for continuous effective service in CAPF as such service requires recruitment of candidates free from medical conditions/physical defects/infirmity that may lead to loss of man-hours on the ground of medical unfitness, necessary treatment or hospitalization.

11. As per the Recruitment Rules, the decision of the Review Medical Board is final and no appeal can be entertained.

12. As it appears that the expert doctors of the recruiting authority detected the aforementioned defect in the petitioner which is a ground for disqualification of candidature, accordingly, the Court is not inclined to interfere with the said finding.

13. As the petitioner participated for recruitment in the Central Armed Police Force, the medical certificate relied upon by the petitioner obtained from the State Government Hospital in support of the submission that he does not suffer from any such defect, cannot be accepted.

14. The standard of fitness of a civilian is not the same as required in the armed forces where strict and stringent methods to assess physical fitness are resorted to.

15. In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the instant writ petition. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

16. Parties to act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

17. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)