

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

W.P.(C) No.150 of 2026

Sri Mihir Das,
Son of Late Chandan Kumar Das,
Resident of Kathal Tali, PC Tilla, Gandhigram, Salbagan,
Post Office-Salbagan, P.S.-Airport PS
Sub-Division-Mohanpur, District-West Tripura,
PIN-799012, aged about 42 years.

----- Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. The State of Tripura, represented by the Chief Secretary, Government of Tripura, having his office at New Secretariat Complex, Gorkhabasti, Agartala, PO-Kunjaban, PS-New Capital Complex, Sub-Division-Agartala, District-West Tripura, PIN-799006.

2. The Chief Secretary, Government of Tripura, having his office at New Secretariat Complex, Gorkhabasti, Agartala, PO-Kunjaban, PS-New Capital Complex, Sub-Division-Agartala, District-West Tripura, PIN-799006.

3. The Tripura Public Service Commission, represented by its Secretary, having its office at Akhaura Road, Agartala, PO-Agartala, PS-West Agartala, Sub-Division-Agartala, District-West Tripura.

4. The Secretary, Tripura Public Service Commission, having his office at Akhaura Road, Agartala, PO-Agartala, PS-West Agartala, Sub-Division-Agartala, District-West Tripura.

-----Official Respondents

5. Sri Dipankar Das, son of Sri Narayan Das, holding the post of District Panchayat Officer, Secretary Zilla Parishad, Superintendent of Excise and Officer-In-Charge of General Section, Judicial Section, E-District and PRTI, having his office at Unakoti, District-Unakoti Tripura.

----- Private Respondent(s)

For Appellant(s)	:	Ms. Adwitiya Chakrabarti, Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Dipankar Sarma, Addl. G.A., Mr. Kundan Pandey, Adv.

Date of Hearing & Judgment and Order	:	10.03.2026
---	---	------------

Whether fit for Reporting	:	NO
------------------------------	---	----

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BISWAJIT PALIT

Judgment & Order(Oral)

Heard Learned Counsel, Ms. A. Chakrabarti appearing on behalf of the petitioner and also heard Learned Counsel, Mr. K. Pandey appearing on behalf of the TPSC.

02. At the time of hearing, Learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that against an advertisement bearing No.4/2016, the petitioner applied for the post of TCS, Grade-II (Annexure-1), wherein respondent No.5 also applied.

03. According to Learned Counsel, the petitioner could qualified in the written examination and after that by issuing provisional call letter dated 17.10.2025 (**Annexure-4**) he was asked to appear for interview and one of the main criteria of said call letter was to obtain "no objection certificate" from the employer. Learned Counsel submitted that the petitioner obtain no objection from the present department but the private-respondent No.5 could not obtain no objection certificate, but he appeared in the process in absence of NOC. In the meantime, the petitioner filed one writ petition bearing No.W.P.(C) No.81 of 2026 and this Court by order dated 11.02.2026 disposed of the same with a liberty to the petitioner to approach to the TPSC to collect the information as per notification dated 08.12.2025. Accordingly, the TPSC issued score summary, from which it appears that he has secured 474.58 marks out of 900 in the said exam. But the private-respondent in absence of no

objection certificate from his department got selected and as such in absence of the requisite document, there was no scope on the part of the respondent-TPSC to issue any order of appointment in favour of private-respondent No.5. Hence, the petitioner filed the writ petition.

04. Learned Counsel, Mr. K. Pandey appeared on behalf of TPSC and submitted that the said private-respondent No.5 has submitted "no objection certificate" from his employer which was issued on 14.06.2016 i.e. prior to the date of issuing of the call letter by the respondent-TPSC and furthermore, in the written examination, said private-respondent No.5 has obtained total 543.17 marks out of 900 and there were six numbers of posts reserved for SC category against the said advertisement bearing No.4/2016 and at present no post is lying vacant and furthermore, the last SC candidate Jayanta Kumar Das also secured 482.5 marks out of 900 which was more than the present petitioner who scored only 474.58 marks and as such the TPSC rightly rejected the candidature of the petitioner.

So, Learned Counsel for TPSC submitted that there is no merit in the writ petition and as such the same is liable to be dismissed henceforth. Being asked by the Court Learned Counsel for the petitioner fairly submitted that it is not the case of the petitioner that appointment has been given to some other SC candidates who have secured lower

marks than that of the petitioner rather it appears that all the six SC candidates who were selected by TPSC have secured more higher marks than the present petitioner and as such the petitioner was in no way eligible for appointment for the said post and furthermore, since the private-respondent No.5 already obtained NOC from the department for appearing in the Tripura Civil Services Examination and as such there was no embargo for the said respondent to lawfully appear in the interview.

05. Thus, it appears to this Court that the present petitioner could not make out any case for issuing any rule and as such the same stands dismissed being devoid of merit. But considering the facts and circumstances of the case no order is passed as to costs.

With this observation, this petition is disposed of.

JUDGE

PURNITA DEB

Purnita

Digitally signed by PURNITA
DEB
Date: 2026.03.11 17:43:56
+05'30'