

13-05-2026
Item No.19
Subrata
Bhattacharyya
AR(C)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction

Appellate Side

WPA No.1506 of 2025

Anil Kumar

-vs-

The Coal India Limited & Ors.

with

CAN No.1 of 2025

(CAN not in file)

Mr. Shamik Chatterjee
Mr. Aditya Bikram Mahata
Mr. Sahil Kabir ...for the petitioner

Ms. Amrita Pandey
Ms. Ayushi Mishra ...for the respondents

1. Learned counsel for the respondents produces a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Empowered Committee of Functional Directors held on September 13, 2023 in support of the submission that the appeals of the appellants were considered in a uniform manner.
2. The report indicates that there were as many as 54 appeals and the authority noticed the observations of the reporting authority, the reviewing authority and the accepting authority and did not find any reason to interfere with the ratings mentioned. No specific reason has been mentioned in respect of any of the appeals for not interfering with the markings given by the other authorities.
3. It appears that the aforesaid system is being followed in respect of all the candidates. The appellate authority did not find any reason to review and, accordingly, disposed of all the

appeals without interfering with the original score of PRIDE for the financial year 2022-23.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner harps on the point that the appellate authority ought to have given reasons for rejecting the appeals. In the absence of reasons, the order of the appellate authority is liable to be set aside.
5. The matter was taken up for consideration on repeated occasions; and upon hearing both the parties, it appears that the appellate authority does not pass any separate order on disposal of the appeal. The figures of the three tiers of the authority are checked up and the appellate authority either accepts the score given by the accepting authority or rejects the same. As many as 54 appeals were disposed of by the appellate authority without any interference.
6. It does not appear that the authority acted in any mala fide manner. The assessments are all done online and there is hardly any scope for specifying any reason either to accept or to reject the appeal.
7. In fact, the reviewing authority as well as the accepting authority also did not mention any reason either accepting or rejecting the score given by the reporting authority.
8. In view of the above, the Court does not find it necessary to interfere in the instant writ petition.
9. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
10. CAN No.1 is also dismissed.
11. All parties are to act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.
12. Certified copy of this order, if applied for, shall be made available to the parties.

[Amrita Sinha, J]

