



2025:DHC:1348-DB



\$~54

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ W.P.(C) 2208/2025, CM APPL. 10386/2025 & CM APPL.  
10387/2025

STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ORS. ....Petitioners  
Through: Mr. Vineet Dhanda, CGSC with  
Mr. Vikrant Goyal, Ms. Shweta Shandilya  
and Mr. Saksham Sethi, Advocates

versus

MS VEERTA .....Respondent  
Through: Mr. Sachin Chauhan, Advocate

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL**

**JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

% **20.02.2025**

**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

1. The respondent applied for recruitment to the post of Constable (Exe) in the Delhi Police. Consequent to clearing the preliminary selection, the respondent was subjected to a Detailed Medical Examination<sup>1</sup>. The DME report was as under :

- “19. i) Fit N.A.
- ii) Unfit on account of (i) Defective Distant Vision 6/18,  
6/18  
(ii) Defective near Vision 6/18, 6/18
- iii) Temp. Unfit on account of N.A.”

<sup>1</sup> “DME”, hereinafter



2. Thus, the DME report recorded that the respondent was unfit for recruitment as Constable on account of defective distant vision and defective near vision.

3. It appears that thereafter, the matter was referred to an ophthalmologist, following which a Review Medical Board considered the respondent and found him unfit. The relevant entries from the Review Medical Examination<sup>2</sup> report dated 27 January 2024, reads thus :

“2. Finding of the Review Medical Examination Board :

Ophthalmology opinion taken – enclosed  
R 6/9 L 6/9, unfit R Cotton fibre within cornea  
Underwent previous refractive surgery

3. Final opinion  
(a) FIT/Unfit : UNFIT  
(b) if unfit, reason thereof Previous refractive surgery.”

4. There is, therefore, some degree of dissonance between the DME and the RME reports. While the RME report states that the respondent was found to have a cotton fibre within his cornea and was found to be suffering from vision deformity only to the extent of 6/9 in both eyes, the DME report makes no reference to any cotton fibre within the respondent’s cornea and records the vision of the respondent as 6/18 in both eyes.

5. Mr. Sachin Chauhan, learned counsel for the respondent, submits that vision of 6/9 in both eyes falls within the acceptable standards for recruitment to the post of Constable, as per the

---

<sup>2</sup> “RME”, hereinafter



2025:DHC:1348-DB



petitioner's own guidelines.

6. We are not entering into that aspect. As this is a case in which the DME and the RME reports are not alike, applying the principle laid down by us in *Staff Selection Commission v Aman Singh*<sup>3</sup>, the decision of the Tribunal to refer the matter to a fresh medical examination is unexceptionable. Without, therefore, expressing any opinion on the fitness of the respondent for recruitment to the post of Constable, we uphold the judgment of the Tribunal.

7. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

**AJAY DIGPAUL, J.**

**FEBRUARY 20, 2025/yg**

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)

---

<sup>3</sup> (2024) SCC OnLine Del 7600