



2025:DHC:507-DB



\$~80

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI*****Date of decision: 28.01.2025***+ W.P.(C) 121/2025
SONU SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Himanshu Gautam, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr.Rohan Jaitley, CGSC with
Mr.Hussain Taqvi, GP, Mr.Dev
Pratap Shahi, Mr.Varun Pratap
Singh, Mr.Yogya Bhatia, Advs.
AC/CISF Sanjay Mehta and
Sub INS Atul Sen, CISF**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR****NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)****W.P.(C) 121/2025 & CM APPL. 454/2025**

1. Pursuant to our Order dated 08.01.2025, the petitioner was examined by the Army Hospital (R&R). A report dated 15.01.2025 of the opinion of the Medical Examination Board has been placed before us in a sealed cover.

2. Paragraph 3 of the said report records as under:

“3. Medical Opinion

Based on the comprehensive medical evaluation carried out at our centre – It is certified that the individual has congenital brachymetatarsia of IVth metatarsal (Right) with no apparent syndromic association. However, the individual’s fitness for duty in the CISF is an organizational subject.



Fitness to be assessed by guidelines provided by CISF vide Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, (Pers.II Desk) dt 20th May 2015.”

3. The petitioner has to be assessed on the basis of the following Clause in the Medical Guidelines dated May 2015:

“B. Foot and ankle.

xxx

(b) Presence of deformities of the toes (acquired or congenital, including, but not limited to conditions such as hallux valgus, hallux varus, hallux rigidus, claw toe(s), overriding toe(s), (that prevents the proper wearing of combatised footwear or impairs walking, marching, running, or jumping, are disqualifying.”

(Emphasis supplied)

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as guided by the Army Hospital (R&R), the CISF may consider the eligibility of the petitioner by applying the above Clause of the Medical Guidelines. He submits that he shall not be challenging the findings of the Medical Board to be appointed by the CISF on the ground of any prejudice or bias.

5. Keeping in view the above, we direct the respondent no.2 to have a Medical Board constituted for re-determination of the fitness of the petitioner for the post of Assistant Sub Inspector (Executive) through the LDCE for the year 2022, keeping the above Medical Guidelines in mind.

6. We direct that in case the petitioner is found fit for appointment, the case of the petitioner shall be further processed for the same. In

