

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

W.P.A 25034 of 2025

**Chandra Shekhar Mandal & Ors.
-versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

**Mr. Anindya Lahiri. Sr. Adv.
Ms. Pranati Das.
Mr. Subhomay Paul.
Mr. Anish Chakraborty.
...For the Petitioner.**

**Ms. Sipra Majumdar.
Ms. Prativa Ghatak.
...For the State.**

**Dr. Sutanu Kumar Patra.
Ms. Supriya Dubey.
... For the WBCSSC.**

1. Affidavit-of-service filed in Court today is kept with the records.

2. The petitioners intend to participate in the Teacher Eligibility Test 2025 in terms of the notification published by the West Bengal Central School Service Commission on 9th September, 2025.

3. The petitioners are pursuing the B.Ed. for Special Educators Course recognized by the RCI. They allege that the Commission erred in publishing notification for holding the Teacher Eligibility Test and the recruitment process for Special Education Teachers simultaneously.

4. The eligibility for participating in the recruitment process requires the minimum qualification of B.Ed in Special Education from a RCI approved

Institute possessing a valid RCI CRR number. For participating in the TET Examination, the candidate may be permitted even if he/she is pursuing the B.Ed course.

5. As the petitioners do not have the qualification to participate in the recruitment process, they only intended to participate in TET 2025.

6. On a perusal of the notification dated 9th September, 2025 it appears that the date for commencement of the online application and the last date for submission of the same are clearly mentioned therein. The last date for filing the application expired on 24th September, 2025. The instant writ petition has been filed on 4th November, 2025, that is long after expiry of the last date for participation.

7. The petitioners allege that they could not file their application within the stipulated time period.

8. Prayer has been made to permit the petitioners to participate in the TET Examination.

9. Prayer has also been made to modify the notification to permit the candidates pursuing the B.Ed course to participate in the recruitment process.

10. Learned advocate representing the Commission opposes the prayers of the petitioners.

11. It has been submitted that the TET was conducted only for those candidates eligible to participate in the recruitment process and who intended to take part of the recruitment process. As the petitioners are not qualified or eligible to participate in the recruitment process, accordingly, the question of holding TET for them does not arise at all.

12. It has further been submitted that had the petitioners approached the Court within the time period as prescribed in the notification prior to closing of the last date of receiving the application, then the prayers of the petitioners for appearing in TET could have been considered. At this stage, when the last date for filing the application is long over, there is hardly any chance to provide relief to the petitioners.

13. I have heard the submissions made on behalf of both the parties.

14. The notification which the petitioners intend to challenge is dated 9th September, 2025. On the date of the notification, the petitioners were aware that they were ineligible to participate in the recruitment process as they are still pursuing B.Ed course but have not concluded the same.

15. As TET does not require possession of B.Ed qualification, the petitioners ought to have approached the Court at the opportune moment to ventilate their grievances had they been genuinely interested to appear for TET.

16. At such belated point of time, long after the last date for filing the application, the prayer of the petitioners to permit them either to participate in TET or the recruitment process cannot be permitted. If the prayer of the petitioner is allowed, then the same will amount to extension of the time period for filing the application which ought not to be done by the Court.

17. Prayer for modification of the subject notification cannot also be allowed even though date for holding the examination has not been declared by the Commission. The same may have the effect of unsettling the steps taken by the Commission for conducting the examination.

18. The writ petition stands dismissed.

19. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order be supplied to the parties, if applied for, as early as possible.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)