

WPA 461 of 2026

Soumyabrata Bhattacharya
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Ms. Sneha Dutta
Ms. Megha Sarkar
Mr. Partha Sarathi Boyal
.... for the petitioner

Mr. Supriyo Chattopadhyay
Mr. Ezaz Hossain
.... for the State

Mr. Kalyan Bandopadhyay, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya
Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh

.....for the WBCSCC

1. Let affidavits-of-service, as filed in Court, be kept on record.
2. Petitioner is a participant in the second SLST examination. He is aggrieved that some of the answers to the questions have been incorrectly assessed.
3. More than being incorrect, the petitioner submits that it is possible that there are multiple correct answers to the questions in support whereof he has relied upon certain papers and text books. According to the petitioner, the extracts which are appended to the instant writ petition, had been given to the Expert Committee for its consideration. The Expert Committee, according

to the petitioner, has not considered any of such extracts of the papers or text books. The acts of commission and/or omission of the authorities are, therefore, liable to be set aside as they are mechanical and without any application of mind.

4. Petitioner has not challenged the Rules by which the petitioner is guided in terms of the Notification No. 764-SE/S/10M-03/2025 dated May 29, 2025.
5. Mr. Singh, learned Advocate appearing for the Commission, submits that the Expert Committee has duly considered all such facts and has also applied itself on the basis of the extracts of the papers and text books submitted by the petitioner and has given to its opinion as reflected in the final answer key.
6. The petitioner's grievance that the answers given by him could also have been correct, in addition to the answers rendered correct by the Expert Committee, is required to be probed.
7. The decision relied upon by the petitioner in R.K. Dhanapriya vs. The Chairman, passed by the Hon'ble High Court at Madras, related to a case where there is a palpable error in the finding of the Expert Committee. The said decision does not apply to the facts of the instant case as the decision of the Expert Committee does not appear to be palpably incorrect.

8. However, to ascertain whether the answers given by the petitioner could also have been correct answers, I direct the Commission to consider the representation made by the petitioner on January 6, 2026, in accordance with law and dispose of the same by May 31, 2026.
9. Resultant order will be communicated to the petitioner by June 15, 2026. This order will not create any right or equity in favour of the petitioner.
10. I have not gone into the merits of the case. Expert Committee will be at liberty to decide with the matter in accordance with law.
11. With the aforestated directions, the writ petition is disposed of.
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.)