

S/L 12
20.02.2025
Court No.19
SK

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 3252 of 2025

Sabita Rani De

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

*Mr. Shaunak Ghosh,
Ms. Paramita Mondal,
Ms. Suva Gayen*

...for the Petitioner.

*Mr. Shamim Ul Bari,
Ms. Indrani Nandi*

...for the State.

Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the petitioner be kept with the record.

The petitioner claiming to be a teacher of Nimbark Math Prati-bandhi Siksha Niketan, at Baikunthapur, District – Paschim Medinipur had filed a writ petition being W.P.A. 14839 of 2021 for approval of her said appointment.

A co-ordinate Bench of this Court by the order dated February 29, 2024 had disposed of the said writ petition directing the trustees of the said Siksha Niketan to send an appropriate communication to the District Mass Education Extension Officer, Paschim Medinipur, the respondent no. 4 herein for consideration of the said prayer of the petitioner.

In compliance with the said direction the said respondent has considered the prayer of the petitioner and by the impugned Memo bearing No. 159/DMEE0 – 24 dated September 10, 2024 has refused to accord the approval as prayed for, holding inter alia that the Samity applied for sponsorship on December 21, 2004 and following the norms for sponsoring the institutions for handicapped as envisaged under Memo No. 833 – Edn. (MEE) dated September 13, 1996, the sponsorship was accorded on February 10, 2006 with effect from December 01, 2005.

The Secretary of the said Siksha Niketan vide letter dated June 24, 2008 though had communicated the names of the organizing staff of the said Shiksha Niketan, but the name of the petitioner was not there and the said Secretary subsequently by two successive letters dated May 15, 2024 and September 05, 2024 had informed the

concerned authority that no record was found in the school showing the petitioner's existence as a staff of the school.

Mr. Ghosh, learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the appointment letter of the petitioner was issued by the Trust on March 03, 2005, the copy of which is annexed with the writ petition being Annexure – 'P1', therefore according to him in the order impugned is not sustainable.

Mr. Bari, learned advocate for the State submits that in the entire record of the school the name of the petitioner was not found, besides in the order impugned it has been specifically recorded that the petitioner could not produce the alleged appointment letter at the time of hearing.

Having heard the learned advocate for the parties and on perusal of the materials on record, it appears to me that the order impugned does not suffer from any illegality and/or infirmity warranting interference particularly when the school itself on the basis of its record is denying the existence of the petitioner as a staff of the said Shiksha Niketan.

W.P.A. 3252 of 2025 therefore is dismissed without any order as to costs.

Parties to act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties subject to compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Biswajit Basu, J.)