



2025:DHC:2871-DB



\$~107

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
*Date of decision: 24.04.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 5265/2025

STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION (HDQRS) & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with  
Ms. Paiya Singh, GP and Ms.  
Rebina Rai, Advocates.

versus

NEELAM

.....Respondent

Through: *Nemo*

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)**

**CM APPL. 23944/2025 (Exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**W.P.(C) 5265/2025 & CM APPL. 23945/2025**

2. This petition has been filed challenging the Order dated 03.09.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, 'Tribunal') in Original Application No. 3421/2024, titled *Neelam v. Staff Selection Commission (Hdqrs.) & Anr.* (hereinafter referred to as 'OA'), allowing the OA filed by the respondent herein with the following directions:

*"4. In view of the above submissions, the OA is allowed and the respondents are directed to allow the applicant to appear for the re-review*



2025:DHC:2871-DB



*medical examination to be conducted by them as per the directions issued by this Tribunal in OA 1857/2024 and also in the present case.”*

3. The respondent herein had applied for the post of Constable (Executive) Female pursuant to the Advertisement dated 01.09.2023, issued for the recruitment of Constable (Executive) (Male and Female) in the Delhi Police Examination-2023.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the learned Tribunal has failed to appreciate the fact that the Detailed Medical Examination ('DME') Board, *vide* its report dated 22.01.2024, had declared the respondent '*unfit*' for appointment on account of her suffering from the following disability:

*19. ii) Unfit on account of (1) Anemia {HB – 9.2 gm% (N) >10 gm%}  
(2) Hematuria (RBC – 20-25/hpf (N)-0-2/hpf)*

5. The Review Medical Examination ('RME') Board, *vide* its report dated 24.01.2024, however, while clearing the respondent from '*hematuria*', declared her to be unfit for appointment on the ground of '*Anemia*', finding her haemoglobin to be *10.8 gm%*, while also stating that the range required for the same for females is *11.5 gm%* to *14 gm%*. He submits that these reports should not have been interfered with by the learned Tribunal in a casual manner.

6. We do not find any merit in the above submission.

7. There is a discrepancy in the very standard being applied by the DME and the RME; while the DME states that the haemoglobin should be more than *10 gm%*, which was found to be the case for the respondent as far as the RME is concerned, the RME applied the

