



\$~8

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

Date of decision: 22.11.2025

+ W.P.(C) 14159/2024 & CM APPL. 59272/2024
STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION & ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr.Vinay Yadav, CGSC with
Ms.Kamna Behrani, Mr.Ansh
Karla and Mr.Neeraj Paulose
Raj, Advs.

versus

ANNURespondent
Through: Ms.Saahila Lamba, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 14.05.2024 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as, 'Tribunal') in O.A. No.1032/2024, titled *Annu v. Staff Selection Commission & Ors.*, whereby the said O.A. filed by the respondent herein was allowed with the direction to the petitioners to conduct a re-medical examination of the respondent, in terms of the learned Tribunal's earlier Order dated 10.05.2024, passed in O.A. 519/2024, titled *Teekaram Singh Meena v. SSC & Ors.*

2. To give a brief background of the facts in which the present petition arises, the respondent had applied for the post of Constable



(Executive) (Female) in the Delhi Police pursuant to the Notice for recruitment issued by the petitioners on 01.09.2023.

3. Having cleared the Computer Based Examination, the respondent was subjected to a Detailed Medical Examination ('DME'). The DME Board declared her 'unfit' for appointment with the remark '*left upper thigh keloid 5 x 0.5 cm*'.

4. Aggrieved by the same, she applied for a Review Medical Examination ('RME'). The RME Board also, by its Report dated 29.01.2024, declared the respondent unfit for appointment with the following remarks:

*"5 x 5 cm - Healed old surgical scar with keloid Present
X-ray of left thigh - shows orthopaedic implant in situ"*

5. Aggrieved thereby, the respondent filed the above O.A. before the learned Tribunal, *inter alia*, contending that she had got herself examined at the Safdarjung Hospital and Santom Hospital, had also undergone treatment and subsequently, had the implants removed by a minor surgery. The respondent further claimed that she had thereafter been declared fit for any kind of physical activity by the two hospitals.

6. As noted hereinabove, taking these facts into consideration, the learned Tribunal directed that the respondent be subjected to another medical examination, against which the petitioners have filed the present petition.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both, the DME Board and the RME Board, gave consistent findings of medical unfitness of the respondent, and such consistent findings of the



medical boards should not have been interfered with by the learned Tribunal.

8. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent, placing reliance on Clause 13 of the Notice for Recruitment, which provides for the Medical Standard to be followed, submits that apart from finding of defect/deformity/disease with the candidate, the Medical Board was also to opine if the same would interfere with the efficient performance of candidate's duties. She submits that, however, the medical boards did not, either at the stage of DME or at the stage of RME, opine on whether the unfitness of the respondent would interfere with the discharge of her duties.

9. She submits that in the present case, the respondent was suffering from minor and temporary issues, which could be duly cured by minor surgeries, as has also been later got done by the respondent.

10. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

11. Though we do appreciate that the jurisdiction of the Court while considering a challenge to medical reports is highly restricted, and they should not be interfered with unless very cogent grounds are made out by the candidate, however, in the peculiar facts of the present case, we do not deem it appropriate to interfere with the direction of the learned Tribunal.

12. In the present case, the respondent has asserted that with minor procedures, not only the keloid, but also the implant, has now been removed, and she has been certified to be fit for duty and appointment.

13. The DME Board and the RME Board, from their reports, do not



2025:DHC:10407-DB



appear to have considered whether the unfitness of the respondent was temporary, or whether it would otherwise interfere with the performance of her duties, if appointed. This was a mandatory requirement to be considered during Medical Examination as per Clause 13 of the Advertisement.

14. Given the above peculiar facts, we do not find any merit in the present petition, however, we extend the time granted to the petitioners by the learned Tribunal to comply with the directions issued, by a further period of four weeks.

15. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

NOVEMBER 22, 2025/sg/Yg