

30.03.2026
24
sdas

WPA 808 of 2026

Satadal Mandal
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Md. Zeeshanuz Zaman
.... for the petitioner

Ms. Tapati Samanta
..... for the State

Mr. Kalyan Bandopadhyay, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharaya
Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh
..... for the WBCSSC

1. Let affidavit-of-service, as filed in Court, be kept on record.
2. Mr. Zaman, learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner, submits that an error made by him in filling up his form has resulted in his disqualification in as much as he could not include the M.Ed. degree in his application form.
3. That the petitioner was not careful enough while filling up the form is fairly admitted by Mr. Zaman. However, he adds that the petitioner had taken all necessary steps including intimating the respondents immediately, which was ignored by the respondents.

4. The first of such letters was written by the petitioner in November, 2025, after publication of the interview list. The petitioner approached this Court only in January, 2026.
5. Mr. Bandopadhyay, learned senior Advocate, appearing for the Commission, submits that there is no right of the petitioner which has been violated or any duty of the respondents which it has breached. In the absence of either of the above, the writ petition ought not be entertained.
6. I have heard the learned Advocates for the parties.
7. It is unfortunate that the petitioner, could have been a successful candidate, if his actual marks were considered. However, this unfortunate bit cannot be foisted on the respondents' breach of duty nor can it create a right in favour of the petitioner which he did not otherwise have.
8. The petitioner ought to have been more diligent and approached the Court at an appropriate time to seek any reliefs. Presently, any order directing the respondents to rectify the petitioner's form and proceed to consider the writ petitioner's candidature would cause a complete disruption of the entire process of the SLST, 2025. The petitioner having made a mistake, which can be attributed only to him, cannot be given further right to be considered in the SLST, 2025.

9. In view of the aforestated, the writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed.
10. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.
11. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)