

11.12.2025
Item no.D/L 28
Court No. 18
Sc

In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Case No. **WPA 26008 of 2025**

In the matter of :

Bandana Panja & Ors.

.... Petitioners

VS.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

....Respondents

For the Petitioners:

Mr. Anindya Bose
Mr. Sakhawat Khandakar
Mr. Mridul Biswas
Ms. Raima Das.

....Advocates

For the State:

Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay, Sr. S.C.
Mr. Sekhar Mustaphi
Ms. Richa Pramanik
Mr. Sandip Das Gupta
Ms. Mahima Cholera
Mr. Niket Ojha.

....Advocates

For the WBCSSC:

Ms. Kalyan Kr. Bandopadhyay, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharjee
Mr. Arka Kr. Nag
Mr. Rahul Kr. Singh.

....Advocates

For the WBBSE:

Ms. Koyeli Bhattacharyya
Mr. Bibek Dutta.

....Advocates

1. The petitioners participated in the recruitment process for appointment as Assistant Teachers conducted by the West Bengal Central School Service Commission in SLST-II, 2025.
2. They are aggrieved as their OMR answer sheets have not been assessed as they inadvertently failed to shade their booklet series.

3. A supplementary affidavit has been filed by the petitioners in support of the submission that answer scripts of some other candidates who did not shade the subject codes and erroneously shaded their roll numbers have been assessed. Prayer has been made to direct the Commission to assess their OMR answer sheets alphabetically marked by them.
4. Learned Senior Counsel representing the Commission submits that as the roll numbers of the candidates who erroneously bubbled the space and their subject code could be reconciled, accordingly, the OMR answer sheets of the said candidates have been assessed.
5. Booklet series is different in respect of each candidate and the candidate was mandatorily required to shade the booklet series. By merely mentioning the booklet series alphabetically will not be enough for assessment of the OMR answer sheet.
6. I have heard the submissions made on behalf of both the parties. The OMR answer sheets of the petitioners are annexed to the writ petition. The instruction mentioned in bold letters at the top of the OMR sheet clearly lay down that items in serial numbers 1 to 5 should be properly filled and shaded in appropriate boxes and circles, otherwise the OMR sheet cannot be evaluated or shall be treated as cancelled. The said instruction is mentioned in English language and vernacular.
7. The candidates, for reasons best known to them, though mentioned the booklet series in alphabet, but failed to shade the proper circle. As the booklet series differs from candidate to candidate, accordingly, the Commission cannot be directed to reconsider assessment of the answer sheets. The petitioners appear to have

been negligent at the time of filling up the OMR answer sheets. OMR sheets are scanned and checked relying upon the technology of optical mark recognition. If the marking is not clear or not made, the OMR sheet cannot be assessed.

8. The Court does not find any error on the part of the Commission in not assessing the answer sheets of the petitioners.
9. In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioners in the instant case.
10. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
11. Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be furnished to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)