



\$~115

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

Date of Decision : 28.01.2026

+ W.P.(C) 1064/2026

SANEE YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Bhavya Sharma, Mr. Nitin Yadav, Mr. Shailesh Kumar Yadav, Mr. Prakhar Awasthi and Mr. Shiv Yadav, Advs.

versus

STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sahil Munjal, SPC, Ms. Rhea Gandhi and Ms. Nancy, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed with the following prayers:-

“i. Issue a writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction quashing and setting aside the findings of the Review Medical Examination dated 22.11.2025 insofar as they declare the Petitioner overweight;

ii. Issue a writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to subject the Petitioner to a fresh medical examination by an independent medical board, after allowing a reasonable time gap;”



2. The facts as noted from the petition are that, a recruitment notification inviting application for the post of Constable (GD) in Central Armed Police Force (“CAPF”) and SFF, Rildeman, GD in Assam Rifles and Sepoy in Narcotics Control Bureau Examination, 2025 was published by Staff Selection Commission (“SSC”).

3. The petitioner appeared for the written examination and cleared the same for the next stage PET. On 26.08.2025, the PET was conducted at 95 Bn, Border Security Force, Bhondsi, Gurugram, Haryana-122102. On 21.11.2025, the petitioner was called for Detailed Medical Examination wherein, he was declared unfit on account of being overweight by 15 kgs. The petitioner was informed that his Review Medical Examination (“RME”) would be conducted the very next day. On 26.11.2025, the RME examined the petitioner and declared him unfit on account of being 15kgs overweight.

4. Ms. Bhavya Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the respondents should have provided adequate time for the petitioner to appear before the Review Medical Board, to enable him to correct the deficiencies like overweight, vision etc.

5. She by relying on *Peddinti Siva v. Indian Coast Guard, 2025 SCC OnLine Del 9645*, submits that this Court in the said judgment has held that Review Medical Examination (RME) cannot be reduced as an empty formality. She also submits that the sole reason for the petitioner to be declared unfit was on the account of his weight, which by its very nature is a curable and remediable defect. Neither the DME nor the RME has recorded any finding as to whether the alleged overweight condition is curable or permanent in nature.

6. During the course of arguments, she has also handed over the Office



Memorandums with regard to RME and Guidelines for Recruitment Medical Examination in Central Armed Police Force and Assam Rifles. She has also relied upon the judgment of this Court in the case of *Ashwani v. Union of India & Ors., 2017 SCC OnLine Del 12141*.

7. We are not impressed with the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. The primary submission is that the petitioner should have been given some time for appearing before the Review Medical Examination ('RME').

8. In this regard, we may state, the petitioner appeared in the written examination on 17.02.2025. He appeared in the PET on 26.08.2025 and for Detailed Medical Examination (DME) on 21.11.2025, when he was found unfit on account of 15 Kgs overweight.

9. Suffice to state that, while issuing the recruitment notification, the respondents specified the requirement of weight and height for the different age groups. In the case in hand, the required weight for the height of the petitioner was also mentioned. In any case, he was overweight by 15 Kgs, which aspect is not contested. He had at least more than a year from the date of the recruitment notice to reduce his weight. Even from the date on which he appeared in the Physical Examination Test (PET) which was held on 26.08.2025, he had more than 3 months time to reduce his weight but he did not work on himself to ensure that, he is within the weight limit, so as to be fit for the DME.

10. In such circumstances, the petitioner approaching the Court challenging the holding of RME on the very next date i.e., 21.11.2025 by contending that, he should have been given some time, is not appealing.

11. The learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment of



the Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of *Peddinti Siva v. Indian Coast Guard through its Director General & Ors.*, 2025 SCC OnLine Del 9645.

12. We find that the Court in the said case has not considered the aforesaid facts as brought out by us in the above paragraphs. That apart, in the said judgment, the deficiencies noticed for the candidate in the DME was a minor ailment which was only known to the candidate during the DME stage. This Court opined that the said ailment was capable of cure therefore, the candidate was granted reasonable time to achieve fitness. In this background, the Court directed fresh medical examination of the party and opined that there should be a reasonable gap between DME and RME. It is not such a case here.

13. That apart the RME as the name suggests is only to review the outcome of the DME in the eventuality any error is found, the same can be corrected. It cannot be construed to mean that, it would be akin to a fresh examination.

14. We are of the view in the facts of the case; the petition is without any merit and is liable to be dismissed. We order accordingly.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

JANUARY 28, 2026

rk