

WPA 10950 of 2011

3.12.2024

ct.25, sl. 268

sk

Latika Roy(Sarkar)

vs

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Dipankar Chatterjee
Mr. Mrinmoy Bhattacharyya
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapas Kr. Dey
Mr. Nirupam Sarkar
...for the respondent no. 6.

Mr. Shamim Ul Bari
...for the State respondent.

The petitioner is aggrieved due to the alleged inaction by the respondent no. 3/District Project Officer in approving the panel of recruitment process i.e. dated April 23, 2008.

The petitioner had appeared in the recruitment process initiated in the year 2004. The successful candidates were empanelled though not subject wise. Hence, the respondent no. 3 initially declined to approve the said panel and directed for recast thereof subject wise.

According to the said respondent after recast of the panel in accordance with the directions i.e. vide panel dated August 21, 2007, the same was submitted before the respondent no. 3 and duly approved by it. Pursuant to the approval as above of the respondent no. 3 to the panel submitted before it, appointments were made.

However, the petitioner is aggrieved that in spite of there being direction of the Hon'ble Court in W.P.No. 13521(W) of 2007 vide order dated January 30, 2008 and

in spite of a further panel being prepared, incorporating the name of the petitioner as the first empanelled candidate, i.e. the panel dated April 23, 2008, no steps have ever been taken by the respondent no. 3 on the basis of the said panel.

Heard submissions and perused the records available before me. It appears that after approval of panel dated August 21, 2007 by the respondent no. 3, and appointments being given as per the same, the said fact has never been ventilated before the Hon'ble Court, when it passed its order dated January 30, 2008 in W.P.No. 13521(W) of 2007.

On the basis of the fact that after approval of the panel, appointments have already been given in the year 2007 itself, the subsequent panel i.e. dated April 23, 2008 appears to be a redundant exercise, having no force in the eye of law.

In such view of the fact the Court finds no merit in the present writ petition.

The writ petition is dismissed.

(Rai Chattopadhyay, J.)