

Dated : 12.11.2025
Sl. No. : 37.
Ct. No. : 18.
Officer : AGM.

**In The High Court At Calcutta
Constitution Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

WPA 25059 of 2025

Sk. Abdul Majid
Vs
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Sujit Bhunia.
Mr. Siddhartha Bhattacharya.
.....for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanuja Basak.
... For the State.

Mr. Bipin Ghosh.
... For the respondent no. 7.

Mr. Naren Ghosh Dastidar.
... For the respondent no. 5.

1. Affidavit-of-service filed in Court today be kept with the records.
2. The petitioner contested in the selection process for appointment in the Group C category in a school.
3. From the documents annexed to the writ petition, it appears that in respect of the same selection process a writ petition was filed by one Subhendu Bikash Das being **WP 19053 (W) of 2015** wherein the Court passed order on 14th September, 2015 directing the school to hold fresh selection in respect of the post of Clerk on the basis of the prior permission granted by the Additional District Inspector of Schools (S.E.),

Contai, Purba Medinipur with the same set of candidates within a period of six weeks.

4. Submission of the petitioner is that the School Authority conducted the selection permitting candidates who were not sponsored by the Additional District Inspector of Schools as was directed by the Court on 14th September, 2015.
5. It has been submitted that the private respondent who has been found to be securing the first position in the panel was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange.
6. Prayer has been made to set aside the selection process and cancel the candidature of the private respondent as the same is contrary to the direction passed by the Court on 14th September, 2015.
7. Learned advocate representing the School relies upon documents in support of the submission that the private respondent was permitted to appear in the selection process in compliance of the order passed by the Court on 14th December, 2015 in **WP 28952 (W) of 2015 (Debdulal Mandal -Vs- State of West Bengal & Ors)** wherein the Court directed that the school will allow the petitioner Debdulal Mandal to participate in the interview if he is found otherwise eligible.
8. As the private respondent was found to be eligible, the school permitted him to participate in the selection process.
9. The school has placed before this Court the consolidated score sheet in support of the submission that 39 candidates were directed to appear for interview and out of them the private respondent secured the first position.

10. The consolidated score sheet was forwarded to the Additional District Inspector of Schools (S.E.) for approval and the same stood approved.
11. Appointment letter was issued in favour of the private respondent on 20th August, 2025 and he joined the school on 25th August, 2025. The appointment of the private respondent stood approved on 24th September, 2025. The private respondent is currently serving in the school.
12. Upon hearing the submission made on behalf of the parties and on perusal of the documents placed before this Court, it appears that though initially the Court directed the school to conduct the selection process from amongst the candidates in respect of whom prior permission was issued by the authority but thereafter vide order dated 14th December, 2015 the Court directed the school to permit the private respondent also to participate in the selection process, if he was otherwise eligible.
13. The direction of restricting the selection process between the candidates vide order dated 14th September, 2015 stood literally modified by order dated 14th December, 2015 allowing the private respondent to participate in the selection process. The private respondent was found otherwise eligible by the school and was permitted to participate in the selection process.
14. The school has conducted the selection process and found the private respondent to be the best suitable candidate. Appointment letter has been issued in his favour and the appointment of the private respondent stood approved by the authority way back in September 2025.

15. The instant writ petition has been filed on 4th November, 2025, that is, long after the appointment of the private respondent stood approved. It does not appear that the school acted in an arbitrary manner or contrary to the order assed by the Court. At this stage, there is hardly any reason to interfere in the matter.
16. The writ petition accordingly fails and is hereby dismissed.
17. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order be supplied to the parties, if applied for, as early as possible.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)