



2025:DHC:7910-DB



\$~62

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

+ **W.P.(C) 13719/2025 & CM APPL. 56346/2025**

AJAY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhinay and Ms Kirti
Vyas Advs.

versus

INDIAN COAST GUARD & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Puneet Yadav, SPC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER(ORAL)

08.09.2025

%

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the cancellation of his candidature for recruitment to the post of Navik (General Duty) in the Indian Coast Guard.

2. The petitioner applied for the said post consequent on Recruitment Advertisement 02/2025 issued by the Indian Coast Guard between 11 February 2025 and 25 February 2025.

3. The petitioner cleared all stages but was found medically disqualified on the ground that he has an ingrown toenail.

4. Apropos the petitioner's suffering from the condition of ingrown toenail, there is a concurrence of opinion between the Initial



Medical Board and Review Medical Board.

5. The petitioner relies on the fact that he has had himself examined by various other hospitals including the AIIMS, which have opined that he does not suffer from an ingrown toenail.

6. The issue of whether, in the face of concurrent findings of two medical boards, a candidate can seek a right to be re-examined, merely because he has obtained favourable medical opinions from other hospitals has been examined by this Court earlier.

7. Following the decision in *Km. Priyanka v Union of India*¹, the Division Bench of this Court has, in its decision in *Staff Selection Commission v Aman Singh*², held that the mere fact that an outside medical opinion is in favour of the petitioner, does not entitle him the right to a fresh medical examination. It is only if the petitioner is able to establish that the medical boards which examined him did not follow a prescribed protocol, or where the medical board itself referred the petitioner to an external medical opinion and has failed to take it into consideration, or where the condition is such as requires specialists such as ophthalmological ailments, orthopaedic ailments and the like, and there is no specialist on the medical board, that a right to a fresh medical examination accrues.

8. This case does not fall within any of these exalted categories.

¹ 2020 SCC Online Del 1851

² 2024 SCC Online Del 7600



2025:DHC:7910-DB



9. In view of the concurrent findings of the Medical Board and the Review Medical Board, we regret our inability to come to the aid of the petitioner.

10. The petition, therefore, does not merit issuance of notice and is accordingly dismissed *in limine*.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

SEPTEMBER 8, 2025/AT