



2025:DHC:349-DB



\$~89

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

*Date of decision: 22.01.2025*

+ W.P.(C) 14508/2024 & CM APPL. 60785-88/2024  
STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr.Balendu Shekhar, CGSC  
with Mr.Krishna Chaitanya &  
Mr.Raj Kumar Maurya, Adv.

versus

MANISH KUMAR

.....Respondent

Through: Ms.Easha Mazumdar, Mr.Setu  
Niket, Ms.Unni Maya. S &  
Mr.Devansh Khatter, Advs.

**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 11.03.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, 'Tribunal'), in OA No. 1008/2024, titled *Manish Kumar v. Staff Selection Commission & Ors.*, directing the petitioners herein to conduct a re-medical medical examination of the respondent herein by constituting a fresh Medical Board.

2. The respondent had been declared 'unfit' for appointment to the



2025:DHC:349-DB



post of Constable (Executive) (Male) by the report dated 24.01.2024 of the Review Medical Examination (in short, 'RME') Board, which found the respondent to be suffering from '*vitiligo vulgaris*'. The abovesaid report itself states that RME Board got the respondent re-examined and evaluated by a Dermatologist.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent has drawn our attention to the report of the expert/Dermatologist, Lok Nayak Hospital, New Delhi, contending that this is the report of the expert to whom the respondent was referred to by the petitioner, and which, *inter alia*, had recorded as under:-

*"no c/I for joining duty"*

4. As there was some clarification required regarding the above comment, we had requested the petitioners to have a specialist doctor join the proceedings.

5. Dr.Laxmi, a Senior Dermatologist from the Lok Nayak Hospital is present in the Court today. She explains that the above remark means that there was no contra indication for allowing the respondent to join duty, that is, the candidate was found to be fit for joining the duty.

6. The learned counsel for the respondent has also drawn our attention to the reports of medical examinations from the V.M.C.C. & Safdarjung Hospital as also the Sanjay Gandhi Memorial Hospital, both of which have found that the respondent is not suffering from vitiligo and that the respondent is fit from dermatological side.

7. In view of the above, we find that no error has been committed



2025:DHC:349-DB



by the learned Tribunal in referring the respondent for a re-medical evaluation by a freshly constituted Medical Board by the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed. The pending applications stand disposed of.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J**

**JANUARY 22, 2025/rv/SJ**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*