

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Present :- Hon'ble Justice Amrita Sinha

WPA 29927 of 2025

Md. Asif
Vs.
Union of India & Ors.

For the writ petitioner	:-	Mr. Debasish Kundu, Adv. Mr. Sudepto Kumar Basu, Adv. Mr. Bidan Modak, Adv.
For UOI	:-	Mr. S.N. Dutta, Adv. Mr. Anindya Sundar Das, Adv.
Heard on	:-	06.05.2026
Judgment on	:-	06.05.2026

Amrita Sinha, J.:-

1. The petitioner participated in the recruitment process of Central Armed Police Forces, 2025. He was declared medically unfit by the Detailed Medical Examination Board on the ground of high blood pressure, accessory nipple and under weight. The petitioner was physically examined by the Review Medical Examination Board and he was declared unfit on account of inferior ischemia changes and accessory nipple.
2. The petitioner got himself checked up by the State Government hospital where he was declared medically fit.

3. Challenging the manner in which medical examination of the petitioner was conducted, the instant writ petition has been filed.
4. A report was called for from the respondent authority which has been filed and an exception thereto has also been filed by the petitioner.
5. Specific contention of the petitioner is that the respondent authority did not abide by the medical guidelines pursuant to which the medical examination ought to have been conducted. Accessory nipple is present in his body since his birth. The same is not a deformity. The same does not interfere with his regular activities.
6. It has been submitted that the ECG report relied upon by the authority ought to have been co-related clinically. The same has not been done.
7. It has further been submitted that the report of the State Government hospital ought to be taken up for consideration as the doctors of the State Government hospital have the same educational degree and the knowledge of medicine similar to that of the doctors physically examining the petitioner by the recruiting authority.
8. Reliance has been placed on the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 29th May, 2025 in Civil Appeal No.7254 of 2025 (Divyanshu Singh v. The Union of India & Ors.) where the Court directed the candidate to be medically examined by the Medical Board of AIIMS, New Delhi.

9. It has been argued that the case of an unemployed youth seeking appointment ought not to be brushed aside lightly. The authority is interfering with the right of the petitioner to be considered for appointment.
10. Prayer has been made to either re-examine the petitioner medically by an independent authority or to accept the medical report given by the doctor of the State Government hospital upon setting aside the medical report of the Review Medical Examination Board of the recruiting authority.
11. Submission and prayer of the petitioner is opposed by the learned advocate representing the respondents. It has been submitted that a person appointed in Central Armed Police Forces will be required to perform duty under extreme pressure and weather condition. Physical fitness of the candidate employed in the Armed Forces has to be checked up in a very strict manner so that the health of the member does not interfere with the duty assigned to him.
12. It has been contended that the petitioner was examined medically first by the Detailed Medical Examination Board and thereafter by the Review Medical Examination Board and on both occasions, he has been declared unfit by expert doctors.
13. Report by any other doctor cannot be accepted and the report of the experts of the recruiting authority ought to prevail over the report of an outsider examiner. It has been further contended that the medical

guidelines for recruitment have been scrupulously followed by the authority.

14. Prayer has been made not to interfere with the report of the medical experts of the recruiting authority.
15. I have heard and considered the rival submissions made on behalf of both the parties and have perused the materials placed before the Court.
16. In the instant case, the petitioner is aspiring for appointment in Central Armed Police Forces – a disciplined body. The recruiting authority has its own specified/codified medical guidelines which are required to be followed for the purpose of conducting medical examination of a candidate intending to be recruited in the disciplined forces.
17. Submission made by the learned advocate for the petitioner is that the report of an outside medical practitioner may be considered for examining the physical health of a job aspirant in Central Armed Police Forces by disregarding the report of the experts of the recruiting authority cannot be accepted by the Court.
18. A candidate participating in recruitment process of the disciplined Force would be bound by the recruitment Rules of the said Force and the medical guidelines relating to the said Force. The authority took the opinion of the medical experts twice; first by the Detailed Medical

Examination Board where the petitioner was declared medically unfit on three grounds, thereafter by the Review Medical Examination Board and he was found unfit on two conditions; first, inferior ischemia changes and second accessory nipple. The ground of high blood pressure found by the Detailed Medical Examination Board was not accepted by the Review Medical Examination Board.

19. The authority conducted ECG of the petitioner and the ECG graph has been annexed to the report. The observation mentioned in the said graph signed by a cardiologist of a diagnostic centre specifically mentions of inferior ischemia. The said abnormality was to be correlated clinically.
20. Learned advocate for the petitioner contends that the clinical correlation of the ECG graph was conducted and the petitioner has been found to be fit by doctors of JNM Hospital.
21. On a perusal of the OPD Patient Card dated 1st December, 2025 issued in favour of the petitioner by the Surgical Male Department of the College of Medicine & JNM Hospital, WBUHS, Kalyani, Nadia, it appears that the patient was checked up for obtaining opinion for accessory nipple. The doctors opined that the petitioner was medically fit as regards accessory nipple. Opinion of JNM Hospital was not taken as regards the inferior ischemia changes as contended by the petitioner.

22. It appears that the ECG graph of the petitioner was checked up by the medical experts of the recruiting authority and inferior ischemia changes were confirmed.
23. The medical guidelines mentioning the grounds for rejection clearly mentions that valvular or other disease of heart and any congenital abnormality so as to impede efficient discharge of training/duties are the grounds for rejection.
24. According to the authority, accessory nipple is a congenital abnormality and the same causes constant friction in an abnormal area of the body while wearing combat gear while training and hard duties. There is an established positive association between an accessory nipple and coronary heart disease.
25. Submission of the petitioner that he completed the test run within the prescribed time period is an indication that he is absolutely fit cannot be accepted by the Court. At the time of conducting the test run, the petitioner was certainly not wearing any combat gear. He must be wearing his regular dress.
26. The authority has opined that with the combat gear, there may be a chance of constant friction if there is an abnormal area in the body. Such opinion of the expert authority cannot be ignored.
27. As regards the inferior ischemia changes, the petitioner may not face any problem at present; but it cannot be ruled out that the said

ground, which is a ground for rejection, will not interfere with his duties in the armed forces.

28. The principles that apply in the case of recruitment to disciplined Forces involved with safety and security, internal and external, such as the Paramilitary Force, or the Police, are distinct and different from those which apply to normal civilian recruitment. The standard of fitness and the rigour of the examination to be conducted are undoubtedly higher and stricter.
29. Submission of the learned advocate for the petitioner that the authority ought to have taken further specialist opinion if there is any doubt is also not accepted by the Court. It does not appear that there was any doubt in the mind of either the Detailed Medical Examination Board or the Review Medical Examination Board as regards the inferior ischemia changes and accessory nipple of the petitioner. The expert doctors of the authority were more than certain that the petitioner was unfit for the job. Accordingly, there is no question of obtaining further opinion from any specialist or super-specialist of the Government Medical College or Hospital.
30. Contention of the petitioner that he ought to have been admitted/hospitalized by the Board before his rejection on the ground of hypertension also cannot be accepted in view of the reason that hypertension was not the ground of rejection of the petitioner's candidature.

31. Learned advocate for the petitioner argues that the submission made in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the report of the respondents are contradictory to each other.
32. Such submission also cannot be accepted by the Court in view of the fact that hypertension was not the final ground for rejection of his candidature. The candidature of the petitioner stood rejected on the ground of accessory nipple and inferior ischemia changes detected in his ECG report.
33. The Court is not an expert on medical issues and it will not be proper to substitute the views of the medical experts of the recruiting body by its own views.
34. In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the instant writ petition.
35. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
36. All parties shall act on the basis of a server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.
37. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)