

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
Appellate Side

24.07.2026
S/L. 01
Court No. 4
(Naba)

W.P.S.T. 127 of 2026

Sunny Kumar Singh

Vs.

The State of West Bengal &Ors.

Mr. Subhankar Banerjee

...the Petitioner

Mr. Pulakesh Bajpayee,
Ms. Tanuka Basu

...the State

Ms. Shraboni Sarkar,
Ms. Umme Habiba Khatun

...the P.S.C., W.B.

1. Heard the learned advocate for the writ petitioner/applicant as well as the learned advocate representing the Commission. The State is also represented.
2. The petitioner participated in a recruitment process conducted for the purposes of recruitment of Panchayat Accounts and Audit Officer (Special). The examination is for the year, 2016, under an advertisement No.23/2016. The petitioner emerged unsuccessful therein. Since 2017, he has been filing applications under the Right to Information Act seeking various information on various facets of the recruitment process. An

Original Application was filed by him in 2025. The Original Application remained pending till such time, the West Bengal Administrative Tribunal ('SAT' for short) became non-functional with effect from September, 2025. Raising a plea that the petitioner is left remediless for want of a forum, he has filed the present writ petition.

3. It is submitted by the learned advocate for the writ petitioner that he was disqualified or excluded from the process based on an interview, even though no such interview was contemplated after the personality test.
4. We asked the learned advocate for the writ petitioner to show from pleading in the writ petition that any interview was conducted after the personality test.
5. The learned advocate for the writ petitioner is not in a position to point out any such interview being held after the personality test.
6. The advertisement reveals the recruitment process based on a written examination (conventional type) and personality test. The petitioner's marks were made available to him under the Right to Information Act, which is evident from the tabulation sheet. From perusal of the same the petitioner's marks are evident. Based on his performance he was excluded from the process of

recruitment. It is not his case that anyone inferior to him was selected.

7. The learned advocate for the respondent/Commission also raised an issue regarding the Original Application being filed at least seven (07) years after the recruitment process. It is, therefore, submitted that under the provisions of the Administrative Tribunals Act, the Original Application itself was not maintainable.
8. We also find force in such submission.
9. In view of our above consideration, we find no merit in the Writ Petition.
10. The Writ Petition and the Original Application bearing O.A. No. 469 of 2025 pending before the S.A.T. are, therefore, dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)