

02
13.12.2021.
d.p.

**In The High Court At Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

**W.P.A 1357 of 2019
IA No. CAN 2 of 2019
(Old No. CAN 11815 of 2019)
CAN 3 of 2020
(Old No. CAN 1791 of 2020
CAN 4 of 2020
(Old No. CAN 2356 of 2020)
(Via Video Conference)**

**Ranjit Sarkar & Ors.
-versus
State of West Bengal & Ors.**

**Mr. Dibyendu Chatterjee,
Ms. Piyali Paul,
Mr. Tirthankar Das.
...For the Petitioner.**

**Ms. Chaitali Bhattacharyya,
Mr. Mrinal Kanti Ghosh.
...For the State.**

**Dr. Sutanu Kumar Patra,
Mr. Kanak Kiran Bandyopadhyay.
...For WBCSSC.**

The petitioners participated in the State Level Selection Test, 2016 and claim to be eligible for selection for the post of Assistant Teacher in Primary School, Upper Primary level in the subject Work Education. The examination was held on 4th June, 2017.

According to the petitioners, the key answers provided by the experts were incorrect.

It is the further contention of the petitioners that the key answers were published by the experts after publication of the merit list.

The Court upon considering the submission made on behalf of the petitioners directed the Commission to engaged separate experts for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of the key answers. Report has been filed before this Court affirmed by the Assistant Secretary, West Bengal Central School Service Commission on 7th December, 2021 wherein at page 4 a chart has been prepared.

It appears therefrom that with regard to the disputed questions being question Nos. 38, 44 and 46 the final key answers, answers as per experts engaged in Susanta Singha Modak's case and the answers as per the experts engaged in the present writ petition are more or less the same.

The answers of the aforesaid questions are appearing in the options provided by all the three sets of examiners.

The petitioners submit that after the answers were published by the experts engaged in the present writ petition, the mark sheet or the panel is required to be changed because there must be addition of marks.

The aforesaid contention of the petitioner is inconceivable. The answers of all the three experts being the same, there can hardly be any scope of addition of marks. The marks which were earlier given will possibly remain the same as the answers to the questions remain the same.

In view of the above, the submission of the petitioners for recasting the panel by adding extra marks cannot be accepted.

The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

The report filed by the respondent Nos. 5 and 6 is taken on record.

All connected applications are disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order be supplied to the parties, if applied for, as early as possible.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)