

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

WPA 3357 of 2026

Bibek Mondal
v.
Union of India & Ors.

Mr. Debasish Kundu
Mr. Bidan Modak
... For the petitioner

Ms. Chandreyi Alam
Ms. Runu Mukherjee
... For the UOI

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.

2. The petitioner participated for recruitment as Constable (GD) in CAPF. He was declared unfit on account of low distance vision - 6/9 B/L. The Review Medical Examination Board found the petitioner to be unfit because of defective distant vision - 6/12 in both the eyes. Bilateral vision, as was detected by the Detailed Medical Examination Board, could not be detected by the Review Medical Examination Board.

3. Being aggrieved by the test reports of the authority, the petitioner got himself checked before the Regional Institute of Ophthalmology of the Department of Health & Family Welfare, Government of West Bengal and the petitioner's vision was found to be 6/6 in both the eyes.

4. According to the petitioner, the report of the recruiting authority is incorrect. Prayer has been made

to permit the petitioner to be re-checked/re-evaluated by an expert body.

5. The prayer of the petitioner is opposed by the learned advocate representing the respondents.

6. Report filed by the Commandant (Estt.) for IG BSF, South Bengal Ftr. dated 23rd February, 2026 is taken on record.

7. It appears therefrom that the petitioner was found unfit on account of defective vision. It has been submitted that in case of recruitment in the disciplined forces, the standard of fitness and the rigour of examination is higher than those applied to normal civilians.

8. It has been argued that as there is no provision for appeal after a candidate is declared unfit in the Review Medical Examination Board, the prayer of the petitioner cannot be entertained.

9. I have heard the submissions made on behalf of both the parties.

10. The petitioner appears to have been checked by the specialist doctors of the recruiting authority twice. Surprisingly, two different figures of the petitioner's vision have been detected. If similar principle is applied for measuring the vision of the eyes, then a proper figure ought to be arrived by the recruiting authority.

11. The petitioner has got himself checked before the Regional Institute of Ophthalmology, being a

specialist centre for treating eyes under the State Government and no defect could be detected.

12. To put the issue at rest once and for all, the Court is of the opinion that the petitioner should be checked by a specialist ophthalmologist of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Kalyani.

13. The expert ophthalmologist of AIIMS, Kalyani shall check the health of the petitioner's eyes and forward a report to this Court through the learned advocate for the petitioner. Eye power of the petitioner's eyes shall be recorded.

14. Hearing of the writ petition stands adjourned till 20th April, 2026.

15. Learned advocate for the petitioner is directed to communicate this order to the Deputy Superintendent of AIIMS, Kalyani for necessary compliance.

16. All parties shall act on the basis of a server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

17. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)