



2025:DHC:9112-DB



\$~1 (SPL. DB)

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3776/2025**

**SHIKHAR PRASAD**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhay Kumar Bhargava  
and Mr. Satyaarth Sinha, Ms. Shradha  
Mewati and Mr. Kumar Gaurav, Advs.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj,  
CGSC with Mr. Kushagra Kumar and Mr  
Amit Kumar Rana, Advs.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL**

**ORDER (ORAL)**

% **10.10.2025**

**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

**REVIEW PET. 443/2025 & CM APPL. 52110/2025**

1. We do not find that any case for review is made out in the present review petition, for the following reasons.

2. Firstly, Mr. Bhargava has sought to reargue, entirely, the submission that the case of a person who has only one testis remaining owing to an Orchidectomy which took place in the past, during which one of the two testes were removed, is not covered by the applicable medical guidelines.

3. We have dealt with this aspect in our judgment. Ordinarily, such an argument would not be allowed to be re-agitated in a review



petition. Nonetheless, in view of Mr. Bhargava's submissions, we have re-examined the rules. The Rule, which we have quoted in para 10 of our judgment, clearly states at the very outset thus:

“(e) Scrotum: Look if *both the testes* are in the in the scrotal sac and of normal size.”

4. Clearly, therefore, the existence of both the testis is a pre-requisite for entry into the CAPF. A person who has only one testis is *ipso facto* excluded from consideration.

5. The second submission advanced by Mr. Bhargava is predicated on the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Divyanshu Singh v Union of India***<sup>1</sup>. That was a case of a person who was suffering from glaucoma, whose glaucoma was cured. In those circumstances, the Supreme Court said that the disqualifying ailment no longer survived.

6. This case cannot even be remotely likened to the present case. In the present case, the petitioner, even at the time of examination had only one testis. That was not a curable condition in the first place. As such, the judgment in ***Divyanshu Singh*** does not apply.

7. We, therefore, find no cause to review our decision. The review petition is accordingly dismissed.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J.

OCTOBER 10, 2025/dsn

---

<sup>1</sup> Order dated 29 May 2025 in SLP (C) 13758/2025