

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

WPA 25929 of 2025

Milan De
v.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Arunava Pati
... For the petitioner

Mr. Amit Gupta
Ms. Debabrata Mondal
... For the State

Mr. Sandip Das Gupta
Ms. Mahima Chobera
Mr. Niket Ojha
... For the respondent no.2

Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya
Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh
... For the WBCSSC

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.
2. The petitioner participated in the recruitment process for appointment of Assistant Teacher in 2nd SLST, 2025 published by the West Bengal Central School Service Commission. He is an in-service teacher serving in a Government aided school in Jharkhand. He seeks marks on account of his prior teaching experience.
3. Reliance has been placed on the order passed by the Court on 6th November, 2025 in WPA 24192 of

2025 (Pintu Mallik & Ors. v. The State of West Bengal & Ors.).

4. Learned advocate representing the Commission opposes the prayer of the petitioner. It has been submitted that the petitioner did not disclose his prior teaching experience either in the application form or in the edit option form which was provided by the Commission.
5. Reliance has been drawn to the order dated 17th November, 2025 passed in WPA 25701 of 2025 (Prasanta Kumar Mondal & Ors. v. The State of West Bengal & Ors.).
6. I have heard the submissions made on behalf of both the parties.
7. It appears from the documents annexed to the writ petition that the petitioner did not fill up the column for his prior teaching experience. A window was provided by the Commission for editing the application form for updating the prior teaching experience column.
8. According to the petitioner, the said option was not available to in-service candidate of other States.
9. Fact remains that the result of the written examination and the interview list has been published. Credential verification of the successful candidates is going on.
10. The order in the matter of Pintu Mallik (supra) was passed prior to publication of the result of the written test and the interview list. In Prasanta

Kumar Mondal (supra), the Court refused to interfere as the result was declared.

11. In the instant case, the Court is not inclined to exercise jurisdiction. The petitioner has approached this Court at a belated point of time. Allowing the prayer of the petitioner at this stage may unsettle the regular process of recruitment which is being conducted in terms of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.
12. As a result, the writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
13. All parties shall act on the basis of a server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.
14. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties, upon compliance of necessary formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)