



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 1251 OF 2026**

	<p>Yadav Vaibhav Ravindra Kumar,  Aged about 25 years, Occ.: Student,  Residing at A-206, Vrindavan Park,  M.D. Nagar, Gala Nagar, Achole Road,  Nallasopara (East), Palghar,  Maharashtra 401 209</p>	....Petitioner
<b><i>Versus</i></b>		
1.	<p>The Union of India,  Through its Secretary,  Ministry of Home Affairs,  (Department of Personnel and Training),  North Block, Central Secretariat,  New Delhi.</p>	
2.	<p>The Secretary,  Staff Selection Commission,  Commercial Karmik, Block No.12,  Central Government Complex, Lodhi  Road, New Delhi 110 003.</p>	
3.	<p>The Under Secretary,  Ministry of Home Affairs,  Government of India, North Block,  New Delhi.</p>	
4.	<p>The Director General,  CRPF (Recruitment Branch),  East Block 07, Level 4, Sector 1,  R.K. Puram, New Delhi 110 066.</p>	
5.	<p>Regional Director (Western Region),  Staff Selection Commission, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor,  South Wing, Pratishtha Bhawan, 101,  Maharshi Karve Road, Mumbai,  Maharashtra 400 020.</p>	

6.	The Detailed Medical Examination Board, Through its President Officer, CISF Unit, Nehru Nagar, ISP Nashik.	
7.	Review Medical Examination Board, Through its Presiding Officer, CISF Unit, Nehru Nagar, ISP Nashik.  (Copies of Respondent Nos.1 to 7 on behalf of the Assistant Solicitor General's Office of Hon'ble High Court, Bombay).	....Respondents

\*\*\*\*

Mr. Pawankumar R. Prasad, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Rui Rodrigues a/w Mr. Aalekh Wagh, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1, 3, 4, 6 & 7.

\*\*\*\*

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE  
&  
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

**DATE : 28<sup>th</sup> JANUARY, 2026**

**FINAL ORDER (PER : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)**

1. We have considered the strenuous submissions of the learned Advocate for the Petitioner and the learned Advocate, Mr. Rodrigues, on behalf of Respondent Nos.1, 3, 4, 6 and 7. With their assistance, we have gone through the Petition paper book.

2. The issue brought before the Court falls in a narrow compass. The Petitioner has been declared medically unfit for further tests in recruitment process for CISF on the ground that he has a 'Speech Abnormality'. The speech abnormality is diagnosed as 'SUBTLE LISP'. Otherwise, the Petitioner is an able bodied person and can take the further tests in the selection process to join the CISF. There is no dispute by the Petitioner as well as the Respondents, that the Petitioner has a slight speech abnormality diagnosed as subtle lisp and he is otherwise fit to undergo the further rounds of the selection process.

3. The learned Advocate, Mr. Rodrigues, has brought to our notice a communication dated 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2025, issued by Dr. Subrata Mondal from the CISF Unit, ISP Nashik, to the Incharge, RECTT Centre-2025, CISF Unit ISP Nashik, which pertains to the reasons assigned for disqualifying the Petitioner. He was declared unfit during the detailed medication examination due to (a) Speech Abnormality (b) Pectus Excavatum. In the review medical examination, the second abnormality is held to be inapplicable and the Petitioner has been disqualified only due to the speech abnormality - subtle lisp.

4. The learned Advocate, Mr. Rodrigues, has drawn our attention to Clauses (3) and (4) of the a communication dated 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2025, which is marked as '**X-1**' for identification. The said Clauses (3) and (4), read as under :-

*“(3) Individual reported for RME on 22.11.2025 and various investigation and specialist opinion taken from Dr. Vasantrao Pawar Medical College and Hospital, Nashik and KIMS Manavata Hospital. After careful examination of all reports, specialist opinion and physical examination of the above candidate at ISP Hospital Nashik by RME Board, it concludes that individual was fit for Pectus Excavatum & UNFIT due to Speech abnormality (Subtle Lisp). ”*

*“(4) A Lisp is a type of speech impediment where sound like S and Z are pronounced imperfectly creating a soft, slushy sound. Basic requirement of our force is candidate should communicate effectively, for command and safety of our troops. But due to subtle lisp above individual cannot command satisfactorily and effectively. Hence the said candidate was declared UNFIT in RME.”*

5. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner has drawn our attention to the 'Guidelines For Recruitment Medical Examination in Central Armed Police Forces and Assam Rifles', which are the revised guidelines as on May, 2015. He specifically draws our attention to Clause 5(d) on internal Page No.6, which mentions "*Speech should be without impediment i.e. no stammering*". He then points out Clause 6(4) and 6(9). Clause 6(4) mentions

*“Generally impaired constitution, so as to impede efficient discharge of training/duties.* Clause 6(9) mentions *“Stammering, as specified later”*. Clause 7(f) deals with the ‘Minor Acceptable Defects’, mentions *“Slight stammering- If stammering appears after 4-5 sentences”*.

6. There is no dispute that the Petitioner does not suffer from stammering. He suffers from a subtle lisp. Subtle lisp is a slight mispronunciation of ‘S’ and ‘Z’ sounds, often involving a minor tongue placement issue, where the tongue pokes forward or sideways, creating a soft “TH” or a faint slushy sound instead of a clear, crisp “S”. It is a minor articulation disorder often called as a frontal or interdental lisp and can be addressed with focused tongue exercises, minor practice and sometimes professional speech therapy for clearer speech. Google indicates that some families accept it as a unique way of talking.

7. In view of the above, since the Petitioner desires to join as a Constable and the stage of issuing commands to the Jawans in the Forces is yet to come and also keeping in view that the guidelines referred to herein above do not include Subtle lisp as a disqualification, we are giving the benefit of doubt to the Petitioner.

8. As such, this **Writ Petition is partly allowed**. The impugned disqualification on the ground of subtle lisp, is quashed and set aside. The Petitioner would be entitled to undertake further rounds of selection as may be prescribed. We make it clear that we have only overruled the objection of subtle lisp at this stage and the Petitioner would be eligible to participate in the further selection process strictly in accordance with the rules and the procedure applicable to the concerned Forces.

9. We clarify that the Petitioner would be at liberty to undertake focused tongue exercises or minor practice or assistance of a professional speech therapist for overcoming the issue. Even otherwise, as and when the stage for promotion would arrive in future, and when he has a chance of occupying a position which would require issuance of loud commands to the Jawans and the Forces under him, the concerned Authorities would be at liberty to subject him to a proper medical test to find out whether the subtle lisp problem still persists or is overcome. If it persists and if it is an impediment, the Forces would take an appropriate decision.

**(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)**

**(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)**