

**20.04.
2026**

Ct. No. 24

Ab

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

WPA 377 of 2026

**Md. Ittefaque Alam
Vs.**

The State of West Bengal and others.

**Mr. Ali Ahsan Alamgir,
Ms. Rabia Khatoon,
Ms. June Modak,
Mr. Debarpan Bose.**

... for the petitioner.

**Mr. Bhaskar Prasad Vaisya, Ld. AGP,
Mr. Bitash Goswami.**

... for the State.

**Ms. Koyeli Bhattacharyya,
Mr. Bibek Dutta.**

... for the WBBSE.

**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 petitioner is a candidate in the 2nd State Level Selection Test Examination. The petitioner's grievance is that presently being 42 years of age, he has not been granted the requisite age relaxation, which would enable him to be considered as a successful candidate in the State Level Selection Test.
3. Mr. Alamgir, learned Advocate appearing for the

petitioner, submits that the petitioner was an OBC-A category candidate and after the 100 point roster of 2025 became an OBC-B candidate. However, at the time of verification he had produced all credentials pertaining to both OBC-A and OBC-B category.

4. He further submits that the credentials were considered and he was duly called for the interview. However, on the date of interview, he was not permitted to participate as he was found to be over aged and did not have the requisite credentials to establish his classification as an OBC-B candidate. He was, thus, treated as a general category candidate and therefore, considered over aged.
5. Mr. Bhattacharya, learned Advocate appearing for the Commission, submits that though initially the petitioner may have been classified as an OBC-A candidate, at the time of editing, sometime in August 2025, the petitioner was well aware that he was classified as an OBC-B category candidate. Thus, he ought to have edited the form to apply as an OBC-B category candidate and not as a General category candidate, as he had done.
6. He further submits that in terms of Memo No. 1521/7016/CSSC/ESTT/2025 dated August 7, 2025, this particular situation had been clarified by the Commission and had given specific instructions

to such candidates as the petitioner, as to how the application form ought to be made and/or at least edited.

7. He also submits that in terms of the notification bearing Memo No. 1092/7016/CSSC/ESTT/2025 dated May 30, 2025, it has been clarified in Clause 13(d) that the eligibility of the candidate, who has qualified, shall be verified by the Commission at any time up to the final counseling stage, and then at any time by the appointing authority. He further drew attention of this Court to Memo No. 764-SE/S/10M-03/2025 dated May 29, 2025 under Clause 13(5)(c) that any misrepresentation by a candidate would render the candidate as ineligible by way of removal.
8. Thus, he submits that mere verification or calling for an interview does not cloth any candidate with any right or equity for being appointed or for being considered for the next stage.
9. I have heard the learned Advocates for the parties and considered the documents on record.
10. The petitioner has been considered as a candidate from the general category. The shift of the petitioner from OBC-A category to OBC-B category was known to him at least by June 2025 and the filling up of the online form, which had been done in July 2025, was subsequently permitted to be edited, in

August 2025. Having got this opportunity to edit the form, it was incumbent on the petitioner to exercise due diligence and care while filling up such form. The diligence and care is coupled with the fact that the Memo of August 7, 2025 as published by the Commission has clearly mentioned as to how such candidates, whose categories have been shifted or have been reclassified, would have to apply or edit online form. The petitioner has not applied himself to such memorandum nor has the petitioner made any classification or granted any clarification insofar as his changed classification is concerned.

11. The petitioner cannot also claim any equity merely by the fact that the petitioner had been called for interview upon verification of the documents. The Commission is well within its authority and its powers to re-verify and recheck all documents of any incumbent candidate and, if found to be inappropriate and/or inadequate, the candidate may be rejected as ineligible.
12. It is true that the petitioner had both OBC-A and OBC-B category certificate, but chose not to apply under the appropriate category. The petitioner had applied under the wrong category and had, thus, made an incorrect statement, which rendered his candidature in such category ineligible. Thus, the

petitioner was considered as a general category and dealt with accordingly.

13. I do not find any error or infraction by the Commission to entertain this writ petition.

14. Accordingly, WPA 377 of 2026 is dismissed.

15. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

16. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties on priority basis.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)