

51 **20.04.
2026**

Ct. No. 24

Ab

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE.**

WPA 428 of 2026

**Archana Mondal and others
Vs.
The State of West Bengal and others.**

Ms. Priyanka Yadav.
... for the petitioners.

**Mr. Kalyan Bandopadhyay,
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya,
Ms. Promiti Bandopadhyay,
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag,
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh.**
... for the WBCSSC.

1. The affidavit of service filed today is taken on record.
2. The petitioners are the unsuccessful candidates in the 2nd SLST Examination held sometime in September, 2025. The petitioners' grievance is that they were unable to fill up the particulars under the reserved category and filled the same under the General category.
3. Learned Advocate appearing for the petitioners submits that the categorization was not there at the initial stage and though the window for such categorization was subsequently made and opened to be edited between July and August, 2025, the petitioners failed to edit and classify their categorization from General to Reserve

category.

4. The petitioners have presently filed this writ petition sometime in November, 2025, seeking inter alia, the portal be opened to enable the petitioner to edit her categorization and be considered under the reserved category.
5. Mr. Bhattacharya, learned Advocate appearing for the Commission, submits that sufficient time was given to the petitioners and the persons, similarly situated as the petitioners, to edit their application forms in the online portal. In spite of such time being given, the petitioners were unable to edit the form and have applied under the category that they now seek i.e. reserved category.
6. I have heard the learned Advocates appearing for the parties. The decision reported in MAT 2115 of 2025 (The West Bengal Central School Service Commission & Ors. Vs. Somnath Pramanik & Ors.) made in the facts and circumstances of that case and the portal had been opened for a period of 24 hours only, in view of the request made by the Bench. In fact, that order pertained to only those candidates who had filed writ petitions by 2:30P.M. on the date of the order i.e. December 16, 2025. The said order cannot be and was indeed not made to be treated as a precedent as specifically entailed in the order itself.

7. I am also informed that the order in MAT 17 of 2026 passed by the second Division Bench opening the portal for a further period was carried in appeal to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and has been stayed by the order dated March 16, 2026, a copy whereof has been handed up in Court and is kept on record.
8. The petitioners, meritorious as they may be, is an unsuccessful candidate and cannot be permitted to alter her position for her benefit, in the manner that she now seeks. This would open the flood gates for all such candidates.
9. The petitioners cannot be permitted to seek a modification of their application form on the alleged ground that they were unable to edit the form, even when sufficient time had been given to the candidates to edit their respective forms. This would create an administrative mayhem.
10. In view of the afore-stated findings and observations, I do not find any reason to entertain the instant writ petition.
11. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.
12. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.
13. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)

