

12.09.2025
Item No.02
Court No.11
KCP

MAT 1473 of 2025
with
IA No. CAN 1 of 2025
with
IA No. CAN 2 of 2025

Susmita Rath
- Versus -
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Partha Pratim Roy,
Mr. Sumit Sanyal.
...for the appellant

Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay, Sr. Stng. Cnsl,
Mr. Bhaskar Prasad Vaisya, Ld. A.G.P.,
Mr. Sandip Dasgupta,
Ms. Mahima Cholera,
Mr. Ranjan Saha.
...for the State

Mr. Kalyan Kr. Bandopadhyay, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya,
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag,
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh.
...for the W.B.C.S.S.C.

Affidavit-of-service, as filed, be kept on record.

Re : CAN 1 of 2025

This is an application seeking condonation of delay in filing the present appeal by the appellant.

There is a delay of 25 days, which, we find, has been sufficiently explained.

Accordingly, the delay in filing the appeal is condoned. Thus, CAN 1 of 2025 is disposed off.

Re : CAN 2 of 2025

The appeal is by a candidate who had participated in the 1st SLST examination held in 2016. However, she fell short by six marks and did not qualify as a candidate. A writ petition had earlier been filed challenging the adequacy of the marks given to her, which we have been informed has been dismissed.

The present writ petition being WPA 14661 of 2025 had been filed by the appellant seeking *inter alia* a direction on the authorities to allow her to participate in the 2nd SLST examination to be held on September 14, 2025 upon granting age relaxation.

In view of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on April 3rd, 2025, such age relaxation extends to disabled candidates and to candidates who are not specifically tainted. The learned single Judge has also taken note of such relaxation granted in the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated April 3rd, 2025.

The appellant not being a candidate in the 1st SLST examination held in 2016 does not come within the purview of the two groups (disabled and not specifically tainted) to seek age relaxation.

In view of the aforesaid, we find that the writ petition has been rightly dismissed.

Hence, we find no reason to interfere with the order of the learned single Judge dated 10th July, 2025.

Thus, the appeal and the connected application are dismissed.

There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the learned advocates for the parties.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.) (Tapabrata Chakraborty, J.)