

W.P.A. 28498 of 2025

Dipankar Pal
Vs.
Union of India & Ors.

Mr. Debasish Kundu
Mr. Bidan Modak
Ms. Arpita Kundu
...for the Petitioner

Mr. Partha Ghosh
Mr. Josojee Mukherjee
...for the respondents

1. In terms of the order dated 8th January, 2026 report dated 2nd February, 2026 signed by Deputy Inspector General (Commandant) on behalf of Inspector General, Frontier Headquarter BSF, South Bengal is filed today and same is taken on record.
2. Petitioner participated in the selection process for being appointed as Constable (GD) under Central Armed Police Forces. In review medical examination petitioner was declared unfit due to left ventricular hypertrophy.
3. In the report it is disclosed today Review Medical Board comprised of three medical officers. Review Medical Board examined the

petitioner blood pressure and pulse at sufficient interval as per norms. Petitioner was also sent for specialist opinion, consequently petitioner was examined in JNM Hospital, Kalyani and theism diagnostics Kolkata. After recording BP and Pulse as per guideline it was found to be within normal limit and board ruled out hypertension and tachycardia.

4. However, the investigation report specially ECG, revealed borderline left ventricular hypertrophy. According to respondents as per sub-Clause 3 of Clause 6 of Revised Medical Guidelines indication of valvular and other diseases of heart is a ground for rejection of candidature for the post of Constable (GD).
5. On perusal of ECG report which is annexure R2 to the report it appears that petitioner has borderline left ventricular hypertrophy. Therefore, sub-Clause 3 of Clause 6 of Revised Medical Guidelines squarely applies.
6. Prayer is made on behalf of the petitioner to file an exception to this report which is not required since issue involved in this writ petition hinges on health condition of the petitioner which needs to be assessed based on medical investigation reports. Factually

there is no scope to improve the case so far petitioner is concerned since medical issue is involved and court is not medical expert.

7. In aforesaid conspectus writ petition stands dismissed.
8. Urgent photostat certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties, upon usual undertakings.

(Saugata Bhattacharyya, J.)