

8th Dec., 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 27217 of 2025**

In the matter of :
Arpita Pal *.... Petitioner*
VS.
The State of West Bengal & Ors. *....Respondents*

For the Petitioner:
Mr. Subir Sanyal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sutirtha Das
Ms. Sumouli Sarkar
Mr. Sourojit Mukherjee *....Advocates*

For the WBCSSC:
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharjee
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag
Mr. Rahul Kr. Singh *....Advocates*

For the State:
Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay
Ms. Deboleena Ghosh
Mr. Sandip Dasgupta
Mr. Saqib Siddhiqui
Ms. Mahima Cholera
Mr. Niket Ojha *....Advocates*

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.
2. The petitioner participated in 2nd SLST (AT) 2025 (Class- ‘XI’ & ‘XII’). At the time of filling in the application form, instead of disclosing the percentage of marks she obtained in the post-graduate and B.Ed examinations, she erroneously disclosed her percentile.
3. After declaration of the result she noticed that the application form was not properly filled up for which she did not get the marks she

ought to have been awarded in accordance with the Recruitment Rules.

4. Prayer has been made to consider the actual score which the petitioner secured in the post-graduation and B.Ed examinations.
5. Submission of the petitioner is opposed by the Commission.
6. It has been submitted that the petitioner did not approach the Commission for rectification of the error prior to the declaration of the result of the written examination or the interview list.
7. After the interview list is published by the Commission, at this stage, the prayer of the petitioner seeking correction of her percentage disclosed in the application form cannot be allowed. If such relief is provided to the petitioner, similar cases may reach the Court.
8. Upon hearing the parties and on perusal of the documents, it appears that the petitioner has disclosed her academic qualifications for Madhyamik, Higher Secondary, Graduation, Post-Graduation and B.Ed examinations.
9. In case of each and every examination, the candidate was required to mention the percentage of marks obtained. In respect of three examinations, the petitioner disclosed her percentage but, for reasons best known, she disclosed her percentile in the other two.
10. The candidate ought to have been careful and alert at the time of filling in the application form. Any incorrect statement may be treated as an erroneous submission.
11. The Commission considered the marks disclosed by the candidate as the percentage of marks. The Commission does not have the opportunity to verify the documents prior to publication of the

interview list. Because of the difference of marks, the petitioner has not been able to qualify for the interview.

12. The Court is of the opinion that it was for the petitioner's fault that such a problem has cropped up. At this stage, there is hardly any scope to permit the petitioner to rectify her application form. The credential verification process is going on. Passing any direction upon the Commission to permit the petitioner to make the necessary correction will unsettle the list that has been published. The same will lead to uncertainty in conclusion of the selection process which is not desirable.
13. In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the instant writ petition. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
14. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)