

W.P.S.T. 66 of 2025

**Priyabrata Dhar
VS.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Arindam Das,
Mr. Snehasish Ghosh

...for the Petitioner

Mr. Tapan Kumar Mukherjee, Id. A.G.P.,
Ms. Sangeeta Roy

...for the State

Ms. Shraboni Sarkar,
Ms. Umme Habiba Khatun,
Ms. Swarnali Halder

...for the P.S.C.

1. The writ petitioner was the applicant before the West Bengal Administrative Tribunal (In short 'Tribunal') in O.A. No.8 of 2022. The O.A. was filed since the petitioner was found unsuitable for consideration for want of essential qualification (experience). The Tribunal did not entertain the petitioner's plea and rejected his claim as being without any merit by its order dated 16.01.2025. The same is put to challenge in the present writ petition.
2. Heard the learned counsel for the writ petitioner and the learned counsel for the Commission as well as the learned State counsel.
3. The petitioner did not emerge successful in the process of recruitment for the post of District Mass Education Extension Officer/ Assistant

Director, Mass Education Extension/ Chief Superintendent, State Welfare Home Banipur under the Department of Mass Education and Library Services.

4. The authorities have found the petitioner to be deficient in experience. Intimation regarding such deficiency was given to the petitioner by a notice dated 14.02.2020, allowing an opportunity to give the documents in support of the shortcoming, if available. In response to such notice, the petitioner sent an e-mail to the authorities stating therein that he has requisite experience. The e-mail written by the petitioner is dated 23.02.2020. Based on such self-serving e-mail, the petitioner submits his experience, stated in the e-mail, ought to have been taken into consideration for assessing his eligibility.
5. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the advertisement required qualification of three years in the field of social education and welfare work, but there was no requirement of submitting any certificate in support of such claim. The e-mail, therefore, was sufficient to substantiate the petitioner's claim.
6. The learned counsel/s for the respondent/s have drawn attention of the Court towards Clause 5

and 6 of the information, forming part of the advertisement which reads :

“5. In cases where no Division/Class is awarded and only grading is done, exact percentage of marks and conversion formula adopted are to be mentioned with documentary evidence, if required.

6. Where experience of a number of years is prescribed as an item of qualification this would mean only experience gained in full time employment in the relevant field within the closing date of receipt of applications.

[Certificate(s) from the Head(s) of the Organisation(s)/Department(s) or Competent Authority for the entire experience claimed, clearly mentioning the duration of employment (date, month and year) and field of experience indicating basic pay and consolidated pay must be obtained. The certificate(s) should also mention the nature of duties performed/experience obtained in the post(s) with duration(s)].”

7. It is submitted that there was requirement to furnish the certificate in support of the claim for experience which the petitioner did not submit.
8. Under the circumstances, treating his application as suffering with a shortcoming of inadequate experience vide order dated 14.02.2020, cannot be

faulted with. The petitioner never submitted any certificate in support of such experience.

9. We find that it is not in dispute that the petitioner did not submit any certificate. The e-mail dated 23.02.2020, being relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner is a self-serving e-mail issued by the petitioner claiming the experience. Such e-mail cannot be accepted in view of the specific requirement under the advertisement of submitting a certificate from the head of the organisation/department or competent authority for the claimed experience.
10. We find no infirmity in the decision of the authorities and the decision of the Tribunal dated 16.01.2025 passed in O.A. No.8 of 2022 rejecting the petitioner's claim based on such e-mail.
11. The Writ Petition being **W.P.S.T. No. 66 of 2025** is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)