



2025:DHC:8934-DB



\$~74

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 14688/2025 & CM APPL. 60234/2025
UMA MAHESHWARA SASTRY DURBAKAPetitioner
Through:

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Premtosh K Mishra, CGSC
with Mr. Prarabdh Tiwari, Adv. Major
Anish Muralidhar and Capt Anirudh Singh
for Army
Mr. Ravinder Agarwal, Mr. Manish Kumar
Singh, Mr. Vasu Agarwal and Mr. Lekhraj
Singh, Advs. for UPSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

% **22.09.2025**

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. This writ petition challenges the impugned letter dated 24 June 2025, declaring the petitioner to be unfit for recruitment to the Army, issued by the Air Commodore, Commandant Hospital, Bengaluru.

2. The Union Public Service Commission issued Examination Notice No. 10/2024-NDA-II dated 15 May 2024, inviting applications towards admission in the 154th Course for Army, Navy and Air Force wings of the National Defence Academy (NDA) and the 116th Indian Naval Academy Course.



2025:DHC:8934-DB



3. The Examination Notice also prescribes the physical standards that are to be met by the candidates in order to be eligible for admission to the NDA and Naval Academy Course, which were enumerated in Appendix-IV to the Examination Notice.

4. The petitioner applied for admission to the NDA and Naval Academy Examination (II), 2024, giving his preferential choice of service as the Army, Air Force, Naval Academy and Navy respectively.

5. The petitioner cleared the written examination and interview, forming part of the selection process. Thereafter, the petitioner was recommended for medical examination on 7 January 2025.

6. On 16 January 2025, he was informed that he did not clear the medical examination due to 'accessory nipple (Lb)'. The petitioner thereafter filed an appeal.

7. Appeal Medical Board was conducted on 18 February 2025. It is stated by the petitioner that he was orally informed that he was 'fit for Army', but 'unfit for Navy' for having substandard vision in his right eye.

8. On 14 May 2025, the petitioner received another letter requesting him to report MH Jalandhar Cantt for 'amendment to his SMB'. On 21 May 2025, petitioner reported at the Hospital. It was stated that the petitioner was not medically examined on that day but,



upon insistence of the members of the Armed Forces, he appealed against the finding ‘unfit for Navy’.

9. The petitioner thereafter reported at Command Hospital (AF), Bangalore apropos his appeal against the finding ‘unfit for Navy’. The Command Hospital (AF) found that the petitioner was unfit for both the Navy and Army. It was found that the petitioner suffered from the following disabilities:

“1.1. NDA NAVY DUE TO SUBSTANDARD CORRECTED VISION IN RIGHT EYE AND SUBSTANDARD VISION IN BE.

1.2. NDA ARMY DUE TO CENTRAL NEBULAR CORNEAL OPACITY IN RIGHT EYE SUBSTANDARD CORRECTED VISION IN RIGHT EYE.”

10. The petitioner, in the circumstances, assails the finding that he was unfit for the Army owing to corneal opacity in his right eye. He submits that he has had himself examined by two Civil Hospitals, who have confirmed that he has 6/6 vision in both eyes.

11. The petitioner thereafter sought for a Review Medical Board, whereupon he was orally informed that his review had been rejected. Aggrieved by these actions, the petitioner has preferred this writ petition.

12. Mr. Mishra, learned CGSC, has produced before us the decision of the Review Medical Board conduct at the Army Research & Referral Hospital, which, too, has confirmed that the petitioner suffers from corneal opacity in his right eye.



2025:DHC:8934-DB



13. In view of the fact that there are concurrent medical findings of Central Nebular Corneal Opacity in Right Eye by the Appeal Medical Board and the Review Medical Board conducted at the Army Research & Referral Hospital, we are not inclined to interfere in this matter.

14. Though Mr. Mukunda has very earnestly tried to convince us that, as per the extant instructions, the defect from which his client suffers is not a disqualification for entry into the Army, the said submissions does not appeal to us. In fact, the instructions specifically state that any defect in vision would operate as a disqualification.

15. Even otherwise, when we are dealing with induction into the Army, especially where it involves compromised vision, the Court has to be extremely circumspect. Induction of an officer who suffers from any kind of vision deformity may be seriously prejudicial to national security.

16. Accordingly, we regret that we are not in a position to come to the aid of the petitioner.

17. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2025/AR