



2025:DHC:11043-DB



\$~18 to 21

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

+ W.P.(C) 11705/2025

BHOSALE AKASH GAJANANPetitioner

Through: Mr. Mandeep Baisala, Mr. Ashesh Kumar, Mr. Atal Singh and Mr. Kavesh Biduhari, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Vivek Sharma SPC with Ms. Prerna Singh, Advocate with Inspector Prahlad Devenda, SI Atul.

19

+ W.P.(C) 11707/2025

HOVAL DIPAK VIKASPetitioner

Through: Mr. Mandeep Baisala, Mr. Ashesh Kumar, Mr. Atal Singh and Mr. Kavesh Biduhari, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sandeep Tyagi, SPC with Mr. S K Tyagi, Mr. Chetan Jadon, Mr. Vansh Jadon, Advocates with SI Atul, CISF

20

+ W.P.(C) 11746/2025

BALIRAM RABHAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Mandeep Baisala, Mr. Ashesh Kumar, Mr. Atal Singh and Mr. Kavesh Biduhari, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Sangita Malhotra, SPC with Mr. Rahul Kumar Sharma, Govt Pleader.

Mr. Atul Sen, SI CISF, Mr. Shivakant, AC CISF and Mr. Prahlad Devender, Insp. CISF.

21

+ W.P.(C) 11748/2025



2025:DHC:11043-DB



DINESH SINGH DAIYA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mandeep Baisala, Mr.
Ashesh Kumar, Mr. Atal Singh and Mr.
Kavesh Biduhari, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vivekanand Mishra, Senior
Panel Counsel, UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

% **05.12.2025**

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. The petitioners in these writ petitions were declared unfit for appointment to the post of Constable (GD) in the Central Industrial Security Force¹ on the ground that they suffered from defective colour vision. Prior thereto, they were examined twice, once by a Detailed Medical Examination² and, thereafter, by a Review Medical Examination³. Both the medical examinations concurrently found that the petitioners were suffering from defective colour vision.

2. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioners have approached this Court by means of the present writ petitions.

3. We have heard Mr. Baisala for the petitioners and learned Counsel appearing for the respondents.

¹ "CISF" hereafter

² "DME" hereafter

W.P.(C) 11705/2025 & conn.



4. The submission of Mr. Baisala, who appears for the petitioners in all these cases, is identical.

5. Mr. Baisala submits that the decisions of the Review Medical Board disqualifying his clients are unreasoned. Mr. Baisala places reliance on Clauses 6(c) and (d) of the guidelines of the RME in CAPFs and Assam Rifles as contained in Office Memorandum dated 31 May 2021 issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs, which read as under:

“6(c) The defect for which candidate has been declared unfit should be examined thoroughly and the findings must be supported by proper investigation reports, if applicable.

(d) Review Medical Board may obtain opinion of concerned specialists or super specialists of Govt. Medical College and Hospital in case of any doubt. Therefore, in cases of rejection in review medical examination, clinical findings should be corroborated with confirmatory tests/investigations/opinion of specialists/ super specialists of Govt. Hospitals/Medical Colleges/Govt. approved private medical centers, whichever and wherever applicable.”

6. Learned Counsel for the respondents have handed over, across the Bar, the reports of the doctors constituting the RMBs who have examined the petitioners. These reports are identical and we may, in this regard, reproduce the report in the case of Mr. Bhosale Akash Gajanan, who is the petitioner in WP(C) 11705/2025, which reads thus:

“REVIEW MEDICAL EXAMINATION REPORT

The candidate was found to have defective colour vision upon

³ “RME” hereafter
W.P.(C) 11705/2025 & conn.



2025:DHC:11043-DB



reporting at the training center. Accordingly, the individual has been referred to a Special Ophthalmic Board (Eye Board) for a detailed medical examination to rule out defective colour vision (colour blindness) Authority ADG (Medical) Email Message No. 1180 dated 27th May 2025

On examination-

The individual was clinically examined using the Ishihara's Test for colour vision deficiency (38 plates edition). The candidate was unable to correctly identify the mandatory Plates No. 22, 23, 24, and 25, and also misread several plates in the series 02-17 and 18-21.

Although the individual is able to distinguish red and green colours/objects, the overall findings indicate Colour Perception Grade IV (CP-IV) — defective, unsafe. Therefore, the individual is hereby declared UNFIT from the ophthalmological perspective due to defective colour vision (CP-IV).

The required standard for the post of Constable (General Duty) [CT(GD)] in CAPFs, NSG & AR is Colour Perception Grade III (CP-III), as per the visual standards specified in Table-3, Page 63 of the guidelines for direct entry Subordinate Officers (SO's) and Other Ranks (OR's) in CAPFs, NSG, and ARs, circulated vide Ministry of Home Affairs UO No. A VI-I/2014-Rectt (SSB), Pers.II, dated 20.05.2015.”

7. The main contention of Mr. Baisala, as also reflected in the written submissions filed by him, is that the examination for the purposes of defective colour vision has to be done applying the Ishihara test, and a finding of defective colour vision can be returned only if the candidate does not identify Plates 22, 23, 24 and 25. The findings of the RME, which we have reproduced *supra* clearly record that the petitioners could not identify the mandatory Plates 22, 23, 24 and 25 apart from the fact that they misread several other Plates as well, and that the Ishihara test was conducted.

8. As we are dealing with recruitment to paramilitary forces, we



cannot second guess the findings of the Medical Boards. We are essentially concerned with ensuring that the proper procedure has been followed and due and fair appreciation of the candidates having the medical conditions has been undertaken.

9. Even applying the standards cited by the petitioners in their written submissions, we find the Review Medical Boards have followed the said standards and have arrived at the findings that the petitioners suffer from defective colour vision. We may also note that the test was conducted by a panel of 3 doctors, out of which at least 2 are Ophthalmologists.

10. Courts have to be extremely careful while dealing with medical standards of persons who are to be recruited with the Armed Forces or the Paramilitary Forces, as candidates who may suffer from any kind of disability or physical condition, if recruited, could compromise the security of the country and its countrymen.

11. In that view of the matter, we find ourselves unable to come to the aid of the petitioners.

12. We, therefore, do not find any case for interference in these writ petitions which are accordingly dismissed.

13. We, however, reiterate our directions, contained in earlier orders passed by us as well, that in all such cases, the candidates concerned should be provided not only with the ultimate result of the DME or of the RME but also copies of all medical examinations



2025:DHC:11043-DB



conducted while arriving at the said conclusions. This would obviate the necessity for candidates to approach the courts in such matters.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

DECEMBER 5, 2025/pa