

06.03.2025

Item no.ML57
Court No. 23

Asraf, A.R.(Ct.)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

Case No. **WPA 29381 of 2024**

MAMTAJ KHATUN & ORS.

....Writ Petitioners

VS.

THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.

....Respondents

For the Writ Petitioner :

Mr. Dilip Kumar Sinha

....Advocate

Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.

The petitioners are three in number. However, the court fees is paid in respect of one petitioner. The petitioners are directed to pay the deficit court fees by tomorrow.

The petitioners say that pursuant to an advertisement published for engagement of Anganwadi worker in Bharatpur-I ICSD Project in the District of Murshidabad on 13th October, 2009, the petitioners applied for their candidature for being considered. Although, in paragraph 4 of the writ petition, the petitioner has referred to the advertisement but no copy of the advertisement is annexed with the writ petition.

It is the case of the petitioners that after being successful in the written examination the petitioners were called for the viva voce test. Three documents respectably at pages 22, 23 and 24 are annexed as the call letters for the interview. In page 22 the date of interview is written as 24.01.2011, this is in respect of petitioner no.1. In page 23 the document is illegible, yet from the copy of the learned advocate it can be ascertained that the date of the interview was 24.01.2011. This is in respect of petitioner no.2. So far as the document at page 24 is concerned, it relates to petitioner no.3. The interview date in the said document is clearly stated to be 15th July, 2007. The advertisement is according to the petitioners dated 13th October, 2009 and, as such, there can be no call letter issued for appearing in the interview on 15th July, 2007.

It further appears from paragraphs 13, 14 and 15 of the writ petition that the final result after the interview has not been published, however, in prayer (b) the petitioners have asked for production of the panel alleging that the same is prepared hiddenly and appointment is given accordingly for which the selection list should be cancelled.

After hearing the petitioners and considering the materials on record, I find that the writ petition is

completely vague and inconsistent. The writ petition is, accordingly, **dismissed**.

The petitioners will be, however, at liberty to file afresh on the self-same cause if the law so permits.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

(Arindam Mukherjee, J.)