

S/L 34
20.04.2026
Court No.18
SD

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 28778 of 2025

Priyanka Mistri Halder & Ors.

Vs.

The Union of India & Ors.

Mr. Tanmay Basu
Mr. Sayan Banerjee
Mr. Aparajita Mitra
Mr. Rajib Sadhukhan

...for the Petitioners.

Mr. Tapan Bhanja
Mr. Gourab Karmakar

...for the Union of India.

1. The petitioner participated for recruitment as Constable (GD) examination 2025 in CAPF. Her candidature stood rejected as she was found unfit on account of multiple parallel cut marks on her left forearm indicating suicidal attempt. The petitioner is aggrieved by the same.

2. It has been submitted that the authority cannot specify that the cut marks are because of suicidal attempt on the part of the petitioner. Prayer has been made to provide appointment to her.

3. The report affirmed by the Deputy Inspector General (Communication) mentions that the petitioner has more than twenty parallel cut marks in her left forearm indicating suicidal intent/attempt.

4. Mental and nervous instability is a general ground for rejection of candidature. Multiple parallel cut marks is evident of deliberate self-harm which is a general ground of rejection of the candidature.

5. According to the authority, the nature of the petitioner is such that there is serious risk of similar harm of self in future also whenever she may be exposed to stressful situation which occurs frequently during operational duties in paramilitary forces. Such candidates are not considered fit for paramilitary forces as they have easy access to weapons and explosives.

6. The report categorically mentions that recruitment to the disciplined forces involves safety and security, internal and external. The standard of fitness and rigour of examination are higher and stricter. The authority has rightly rejected the candidature of the petitioner.

7. Upon hearing the parties and upon perusal of the documents placed before this Court, the Court is inclined to accept the stand of the respondents that the petitioner may not be fit for performing duties in the paramilitary forces. She has a risk of her own life as also she may risk the life of others who may be there in the forces.

8. In view of the above, the Court is not inclined to exercise jurisdiction in the matter.

9. The writ petition fails and stands dismissed.

10. Exception on behalf of the petitioner to the report of the respondent no.4 filed in Court today be retained with the records.

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

(Amrita Sinha, J.)