

30-03-2026
Item No.20
Subrata
Bhattacharyya
AR(C)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

WPA No.30035 of 2025
Riya Mallick
-vs-
Union of India & Ors.
With
CAN No.1 of 2026

Mr. Gunjan Kumar Singh
Mr. Vijay Varma
Ms. Anita Das
Ms. Rushali Buiragi ...for the petitioner

Mr. S.N. Dutta
Mr. Anindya Sundar Das ...for the respondents

1. The petitioner participated for recruitment as Constable (General Duty) in CAPF, SSF, rifleman GD in AR and Sepoy in NCB. She has been declared unfit by the Detailed Medical Examination Board on three counts; 1) multiple scar mark in left forearm/wrist (self-cut), 2) B/L hand index/middle/ring finger straightening deformity and 3) white vaginal discharge. The Review Medical Examination Board declared the petitioner unfit on account of self-inflicted cut marks over the left wrist (13 in number.)
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner denies that he cut marks are self-inflicted. It has been submitted that without a positive finding, the authority ought not to conclude that the petitioner is mentally unstable.
3. Prayer has been made to conduct psychiatric test of the petitioner.

4. Learned advocate for the respondents oppose the prayer of the petitioner. The report filed by the DIG(PSO) for the Inspector General, FTR HQ BSF South Bengal signed on February 24, 2026 has been relied upon.
5. The report mentions that the cut marks comes under unsuccessful suicide attempt and potentially lethal action. A risk factor for future attempts to suicide always remain. Self injury has long been linked to other disorders as well, including post traumatic stress disorder, depressive disorders, obsessive compulsive disorder, anxiety disorder, borderline personality disorder. There is every likelihood of repetition of self harm due to various stresses which are part and parcel of combatised duties.
6. The petitioner was declared unfit as per the revised unit guidelines for medical examination which mentions that mental or nervous instability is a ground for rejection of candidature.
7. I have heard the submission made on behalf of both the parties and have perused the materials on record.
8. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was mentally stable and the cut marks are not self-inflicted, but the petitioner, for reasons best known, has not disclosed the reason for such cut marks in the exception filed by the petitioner to the report filed by the respondent.
9. The petitioner was participating for recruitment in the combatised force. Any candidate who, according to the authority, is not mentally fit and stable, cannot be engaged in a combatised Force.

10. The fact that the petitioner has not disclosed as to how 13 number of parallel cut marks have been found in her left arm above the wrist implies that the petitioner is trying to conceal facts. A person cannot have 13 cut marks in the arm automatically. There must have been some reason to why such cuts were inflicted in the body of the petitioner.
11. Till the authority is satisfied that a candidate is cent percent fit both physically and mentally, such person cannot be permitted to be engaged in the combatised force.
12. The Court does not find any error in the stand taken by the authority rejecting the candidature of the petitioner.
13. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
14. All parties are to act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.
15. Certified copy of this order, if applied for, shall be made available to the parties.

[Amrita Sinha, J]

