

27th Nov., 2025

Item no.D/L 06
Court No. 18

Pradip, A.R.(Ct.)

In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Case No. **WPA 27109 of 2025**

In the matter of :
Animesh Chattopadhyay & Ors. *Petitioners*
VS.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.*Respondents*

For the Petitioners:
Mr. Pritam Choudhury
Mr. Sakhawat Khandakar
Ms. Swati Jha*Advocates*

For the WBCSSC:
Mr. Kalyan Bandopadhyay, Sr. Adv
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya
Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh*Advocates*

For the WBBSE:
Ms. Koyeli Bhattacharyya
Mr. Bibek Dutta*Advocates*

For the State:
Mr. Sandip Das Gupta
Ms. Mahima Cholera
Mr. Niket Ojha*Advocates*

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.
2. Receipt showing submission of deficit Court fees filed in Court today is taken on record.
3. The petitioners participated in the 2nd SLST-2025 conducted by the West Bengal Central School Service Commission. The result of the written examination and the interview list has been published.

4. The petitioners secured one mark less than the cut off mark.
5. It has been submitted that objections were raised by the petitioners with regard to the answer in respect of five questions. At the time of publication of the final result, three of the objections raised by the petitioners were found to be proper but the rest two were not.
6. According to the petitioners, the other two objections are based on the study materials which they have annexed with the writ petition.
7. It has been submitted that the final answer key may not be proper as the study material suggest that the answer provided by the petitioners is also correct.
8. Instance has been shown when the Commission awarded marks to candidates who attempted the questions. Marks have also been awarded to all candidates in respect of certain questions.
9. It is submitted that had one more mark been awarded to the petitioners by properly considering the objections raised by the petitioners, then the petitioners will secure the cut off mark and may also get one more mark above the cut off mark.
10. Prayer has been made to appoint an expert to assess as to whether the objections raised by the petitioners are proper or not.
11. The aforesaid submission of the petitioners is opposed by the Commission.
12. It has been submitted that as per the Recruitment Rules, the answer key prepared by the expert committee is to be treated as final and binding. There is no scope for re-evaluation of the answers.
13. In support of such submission reliance has been placed on the judgment delivered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of

Vikesh Kumar Gupta & Anr. Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.

reported in (2021) 2 Supreme Court Cases 309 wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court deprecated the practice of the Court to interfere with the recommendations of the expert committee.

14. Learned advocate for the petitioners submits that the facts and circumstances of Vikesh Kumar Gupta (supra) do not match with the facts and circumstances of the instant case. The role of the Commission in the instant case has been frowned upon by the Courts from time to time.
15. After hearing the submissions made on behalf of both the parties, it appears that out of six petitioners, three of them did not raise their objection within the stipulated time period fixed by the Commission. However, the same questions have been objected to by the other petitioners.
16. The objections raised by the candidates were considered by the expert body and a final answer key has been published. All the appearing candidates have been marked and the result has been published.
17. There may be candidates who are not satisfied with the evaluation by the expert committee and they may have study materials in support of their objection.
18. The candidates at the time of participation in the recruitment process were aware that the declaration of result by the expert committee is to be treated as final and binding. If the prayer of the petitioners is allowed for re-evaluation, then the same will be contrary to the Recruitment Rules published by the Commission.

19. The unsuccessful candidates who may have objections in respect of many or even one question will rush to the Court seeking re-evaluation. Such practice has not been appreciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Court is not an expert body. The Court is also not inclined to appoint any other expert to re-evaluate the answers. This approach is being taken to arrive at a finality to the recruitment process or else such objections will continue to pour in.
20. In view of the above, the Court is not inclined to interfere in the instant writ petition.
21. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
22. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)