

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

13 02.09.2025
rkd Ct.18
DM

W.P.A. 16134 of 2025

Ritwija Jana

-vs-

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Syed Mansur Ali

....for the petitioner.

Ms. Parna Roy Choudhury,
Mr. Avishek Prasad

....for the State.

Mr. Sunit Kumar Roy

....WBCSSC.

1. Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.
2. On being selected in 1st State Level Selection Test, 2016 (Upper Primary) petitioner was recommended vide memo dated 11th November, 2024 to Keshabpur Bhabataran Bani Mandir (HS), Purba Medinipur.
3. Petitioner instead of joining the post made application for extension of validity of recommendation dated 11th November, 2024 on 18th January, 2025. Based on application for extension of validity of recommendation, concerned authority of West Bengal Central School Service Commission (for short "Commission") by issuing memo dated 27th February, 2025 extended validity

of recommendation for thirty days.

4. However, petitioner could not join within the extended period of recommendation and has filed the present writ petition seeking extension of validity of recommendation for longer period in order to facilitate her joining in the recommended school as per memo dated 11th November, 2024.
5. Learned advocate representing the Commission has submitted in spite of extending validity of recommendation vide memo dated 27th February, 2025 petitioner failed to join the recommended post. Therefore, there is no further scope left open to extend the validity of recommendation and same is not permissible under Rule 17(3) of the West Bengal School Service Commission (Selection for Appointment to the Posts of Teachers for Upper Primary Level of Schools), Rules, 2016.
6. On consideration of application seeking extension of validity of recommendation, it appears that petitioner was undergoing IVF treatment as a result whereof she could not join the recommended post as per memo dated 11th November, 2024 within the prescribed period.
7. However, petitioner applied for extension of validity of recommendation which was allowed by the concerned authority of the Commission vide memo

dated 27th February, 2025 thereby extending the validity period of the recommendation for thirty days. Even after extending the validity period of recommendation, petitioner could not join the recommended post.

8. In terms of Rule 17(3) of the said Rules of 2016 once recommendation is issued same shall remain valid for ninety days and concerned authority of Commission may, if it thinks expedient can extend the validity of recommendation beyond the period of ninety days for any reasonable cause, such reasons to be recorded in writing in order to extend the period of validity of recommendation letter for a further period not exceeding sixty days.
9. Therefore, in terms of Rule 17(3), it appears that for a maximum period of one hundred and fifty days recommendation issued by the Commission can remain alive provided validity of recommendation is extended for a period of sixty days beyond ninety days.
10. In the present case at my hand recommendation was issued on 11th November, 2024 and on 10th April, 2025 one hundred and fifty days expired.
11. During this period of one hundred and fifty days petitioner's application for extension of recommendation was accepted by the Commission

and recommendation was extended for a further period of thirty days in terms of Rule 17(3) but petitioner did not join the recommended post.

12. In aforesaid conspectus, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.
13. The writ petition stands dismissed.
14. However, there shall be no order as to costs.
15. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the learned Advocates for the parties on the usual undertakings.

(Saugata Bhattacharyya, J.)