



2025:DHC:347-DB



\$~84

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

Date of decision: 22.01.2025

+ W.P.(C) 14107/2024 & CM APPL. 59007/2024
STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ORS.

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms.Saumya Tandon, CGSC
with Mr.Gaurav Singh Sengar
& Mr.Prakhar Tripathi, Advs.
Dr. Pranjal Dubey, CRPF.

versus

MOHIT

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR**

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioners, challenging the Order dated 14.05.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, in OA No. 1132/2024, titled *Mohit v. Staff Selection Commission & Ors.*, allowing the said Original Application filed by the respondent herein and directing the petitioners herein to get the re-medical examination of the respondent herein conducted by a duly constituted Medical Board to determine his medical fitness for appointment to the post of Constable (Executive) (Male) in the Delhi Police Examination, 2023.

2. The respondent herein was declared 'unfit' for appointment by the



Detailed Medical Examination Board on 18.01.2024 on account of “*defective distant vision and haemorrhoids*”. However, in the Review Medical Examination dated 22.01.2024, he was declared unfit for appointment only on the ground of “*ext. haemorrhoids at the 11, 12, and 4 o'clock positions + nt*”.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners has drawn our attention to Rule 24 (Appendix) (Note) (vi) of the Delhi Police (Appointment and Recruitment) Rules, 1980, to submit that only particular nature of haemorrhoids has been stipulated as a cause for declaring the candidate unfit for appointment. The relevant portion of the said Rule reads as follows:-

“THE DELHI POLICE (APPOINTMENT & RECRUITMENT) RULES, 1980

xxxxx

24. Medical examination of candidates.-

xxxxx

Appendix

xxxxx

Note:- The following points should not be overlooked:-

xxxxx

(vi) In veterate, cutaneous, disease, fistulic condylemata, haemorrhoids prolasus ani, varix or vari-cocole, undescended testicie, techvcarida.”

4. As there was a clarification required regarding the above clause, we had requested the petitioners to have a doctor present to guide us on the same.

5. Dr. Pranjal Dubey from the CRPF is present virtually today. He has explained that the disqualification mentioned hereinabove is for internal haemorrhoids, while the respondent, as per the report of the



2025:DHC:347-DB



RME, has been found to be suffering from external haemorrhoids. He submits that the respondent would need to be re-examined in order to determine his exact medical condition.

6. In view of the above, no infirmity can be found in the Impugned Order.

7. The petition and the pending application are accordingly dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J

JANUARY 22, 2025/rv/SJ

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