

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

19. 11. 2024

BP
Sl. 24
Court No. 14

WPA 16989 of 2024

Chaiti Datta
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Ms. Rita Patra
Ms. Pusmita Das
..for the petitioner

Mr. Sougata Mitra
..for the State

Mr. Raja Saha
Ms. B. Roy
..for the respondent
nos. 2 and 4

Ms. Piyali Sengupta
Mr. Victor Chatterjee
..for PSC

1. Affidavit of service filed by the petitioner is taken on record.
2. In compliance of the order passed by this Court on 11th March, 2024 in WPA 28104 of 2023 (Chaiti Datta vs. The State of West Bengal and others) the Public Service Commission has supplied to the petitioner the information sought for.
3. The petitioner submits that in the tabulation sheet supplied to the petitioner there is a double tick mark against her name. Signatures of all the members of the

selection committee are not there.

4. Learned advocate representing the Public Service Commission submits that the information as sought for by the petitioner has been provided.

5. The examination in question took place in the year 2010 and the signature of the member is appearing at the bottom of page 77.

6. Learned advocate for the Commission denies that there is any mala fide reason for putting double tick against the name of the petitioner.

7. Upon hearing the parties and on perusal of the documents on record, the Court is not convinced with the submission made on behalf of the petitioner that there is any mala fide intention in putting a double tick against her name in the tabulation sheet.

8. It may be for the purpose of identifying the petitioner for supplying the required information that tick mark has been inserted.

9. The allegations made by the petitioner qua the information that has been supplied involves disputed questions of facts. The same cannot be adjudicated by the writ court. The subject recruitment examination is of the year 2008 and the personality test was conducted in July, 2010. It is too late in the day, in the end of the year 2024, to reopen the issue of selection all over again.

10. In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the instant case.

11. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

12. Urgent certified photocopy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties expeditiously on compliance of usual legal formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)

