



\$~116

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

+ **W.P.(C) 17729/2025 CM APPL. 73285/2025**

BALWANT SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Garg, Mr. Uday Garg, Ms.
Anusha Garg and Mr. Soumil Singh
Rawat, Advs.

versus

STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION AND

ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vinod Sawant, Law Officer,
CRPF with Insp. Athurv and Mr.
Ramniwas Yadav, CRPF
HC Jitendra Kr. Mishra, B.S.F.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

13.01.2026

1. This petition has been filed with the following prayers:

“a) Quash the rejection of the Petitioner vide DME report dated 18.09.2025 (the Petitioner does not have a copy of the same since it was taken from him by the officials of the Respondents while applying for the RME) and RME report dated 19.09.2025, whereby, the Petitioner was wrongly declared unfit due to ‘Distant Vision’ by the respondents

b) Direct the Respondents to declare the petitioner medically “fit ” by applying the ‘Revised Guidelines for Recruitment Medical Examination in Central Armed Police Forces and Assam Rifles, 2015’ framed by the Ministry of Home Affairs and revised vide its OM dated 31.05.2021 and issue joining letter to the Petitioner as per his merit and preference in the recruitment to the post of SI (GD) in Delhi Police and CAPFs Examination, 2024, with retrospective seniority along with his batchmates and all other consequential benefits;

Or in the alternative

c) Direct the respondents to get the petitioner re-examined by a newly constituted RME Board/Army Hospital having the Experts/Specialists in Ophthalmology and if the petitioner is found medically fit as per the



relevant Guidelines, appoint the petitioner as per his merit and preference in the recruitment to the post of SI (GD) in Delhi Police and CAPFs Examination, 2024; and
d) Pass any other orders or directions as may be deemed fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice.”

2. The case set up by the petitioner is primarily that the petitioner has been declared as ‘unfit’ on ground of distant vision for recruitment to the post of Sub-Inspector (SI) in Delhi Police/CAPF.
3. The submission of Mr. Garg, learned counsel for the petitioner, is that as per the norms for eligibility a person with a vision of 6/9 in both the eyes is treated as fit. It is also noted that as per the initial medical board undertaken by the respondents, the reading of the findings suggest that the petitioner has a distant vision of 6/12 in both eyes.
4. Mr. Garg has relied upon the examination undertaken by the petitioner at AIIMS wherein his unaided eye sight has been assessed at 6/6.
5. Having seen the findings in the three examinations i.e., initial examination by the respondents, the Review Medical Board (RMB) recording the vision at 6/9 and also the medical examination undertaken at AIIMS which assessed the vision at 6/6, it would be appropriate that a further examination of the petitioner is undertaken at the Army Hospital Research and Referral (R&R) by three doctors being experts in the field of Ophthalmology. The petitioner shall be examined on the date and time which shall be informed to the petitioner by the Medical Superintendent of the Army Hospital Research and Referral. On such examination, the result of the same shall be given to the respondent no. 1/Staff Selection Commission (SSC) who shall then proceed in accordance with law.
6. It goes without saying that the only reason for not appointing the



petitioner is because of the distant vision. If the opinion given by the Army Hospital Research and Referral suggests that the petitioner is fit, further action shall be taken within four weeks thereafter.

7. It is also made clear that while deciding the eligibility of the petitioner on the issue of eyesight, the norms as notified by the Office Memorandum dated 31.05.2021 for ex-servicemen provided under table 5 shall be kept in mind.

8. The date and time as fixed by the Army Hospital Research & Referral be informed to the petitioner as well as the counsel for the petitioner atleast two days in advance.

9. The respondent no.1/SSC shall forward the result of the examination of the petitioner by the initial board, Review Medical Board and AIIMS to the Medical Superintendent, Base Hospital, R&R.

10. The present petition is disposed of, pending applications are dismissed, as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

JANUARY 13, 2026/msh