

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
(Appellate Side)

W.P.A. 5600 OF 2024

**ARPITA RAY & ANOTHER
VS.
THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & OTHERS**

Mr. Tulshi Das Ray, Adv.
Mr. Tirthankar Roy, Adv.
...for the Petitioners

Mr. Bhaskar Prasad Vaisya, AGP
Mr. Ranjan Saha, Adv.
...for the State

Ms. Koyeli Bhattacharyya, Adv.
Mr. Bibek Dutta, Adv.
...for the W.B.B.S.E.

Mr. Mahadeb Sarkar, Adv.
...for the Respondent No.6

1. Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the petitioners is taken on record.
2. Petitioners are Assistant Teachers of Dum Dum Motijheel Girls' High School (H.S.), Kolkata (hereinafter referred to as '*said school*'), who have questioned the selection of respondent no.7 for the post of Assistant Headmistress in the said school.
3. Learned advocate representing the petitioners submits that one man panel was prepared which was given effect to thereby appointing respondent no.7. It is also submitted that petitioners were prevented from applying for the post of Assistant Headmistress based on recruitment notice dated 11th September, 2021.

4. State respondents, West Bengal Board of Secondary Education and respondent no.6 are represented by learned advocates.
5. Learned advocate representing the respondent no.6 has placed before this Court one memo dated 9th April, 2025 and same is taken on record.
6. On perusal of the said memo dated 9th April, 2025, it appears respondent no.7 was permitted to join the post of Assistant Headmistress subject to result of the present writ petition since panel which was submitted by the said school authority was approved *vide* memo dated 31st January, 2024.
7. Mr. Vaisya, learned Additional Government Pleader representing the State respondents submits that after joining the post of Assistant Headmistress appointment of respondent no.7 was approved *vide* memo dated 10th July, 2025 subject to the result of the present writ petition.
8. On hearing the learned advocate representing the petitioners, it appears that petitioners did not participate in the selection process. It was argued on behalf of the petitioners that they were prevented from participating in the selection process by offering their candidature but such submission is found to be not

correct as it appears from recruitment notice dated 11th September, 2021 issued by the said school authority that both the petitioners signed on the recruitment notice on 13th September, 2021 and their names are appearing against serial nos.4 and 5 in the said recruitment notice.

9. Question would have been different if petitioners participated in the selection process being eligible candidates but in the present case, petitioners did not apply for the post of Assistant Headmistress. Therefore, petitioners do not have *locus standi* to question the selection process.
10. Hence, writ petition stands dismissed.
11. However, there shall be no order as to costs.
12. Urgent photostat certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties, upon usual undertakings.

(Saugata Bhattacharyya, J.)