

63  
06.04.2026  
S.D.  
Ct. No. 24  
Bench Id  
266312

**WPA 1844 of 2026**

**Sayantika Saha  
Vs.  
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Bikram Banerjee  
Mr. Sandwip Sutradhar  
....For the Petitioner

Ms. Koyeli Bhattacharyya  
Ms. Saswati Chatterjee  
....For the WBBSE

Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya  
Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay  
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag  
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh  
...For the WBCSSC  
Mr. Swapan Kumar Dutta, Sr. Adv., G.P.  
Mr. Dipankar Dasgupta  
....For the State

1. The petitioner is aggrieved that she was not permitted to change her medium from English to Bengali. The petitioner had participated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> State Level Selection Test, 2025 (SLST) and had opted for Life Science in English medium under the Scheduled Caste female category. The petitioner's initial grievance was that there was only one seat earmarked for English medium and because of her meritorious stature she ought to have been given the said post.

However, the said post in the final list which was published in November 2025 seems to have disappeared.

2. Mr. Banerjee, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner ought to have been given an opportunity to exercise her option which has been retained specifically under the Rules as well as under Schedule 1 Rule 3 of the Notification No.: 764-SE/S/10M-03/2025 dated May 29, 2025.
3. Ms. Bhattacharya, learned counsel appearing for the Board submits that the post had not magically disappeared in the final list, but had been offered to the “in service” candidate under the Scheduled Caste category as the first preference, pursuant to the orders of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India. Thus, the only seat in English language for the Scheduled Caste category had been allotted to the first and deserving available candidate which was not the petitioner.
4. In this circumstance, the petitioner wanted to change her medium from English to Bengali as there were and still are several seats available in the Bengali medium for the same subject, i.e., Life Science.

5. Even though, Mr. Banerjee has labored on the issue that it is the petitioner's right to change the medium, no such imminent right is established from the Rule. The Rule merely refers to a willing candidate who seeks to be appointed as an Assistant Teacher.
6. Even if, Mr. Banerjee's submissions are taken to be true and correct, the petitioner ought to have challenged this issue, i.e. non-availability of the edit option in so far as the medium is concerned much prior to January 2026 when she approached this Hon'ble Court. The advertisement of May 30, 2025 which marked commencement of the 2<sup>nd</sup> SLST examination culminating in the results went through a long process including filing up of online form where the edit option was initially not available at all, but was subsequently included in so far as the Caste and Sub-Caste options were concerned. The edit option was never extended to "change of medium" for the candidates. The petitioner had participated in the SLST examination with ears and eyes open and was alive to the fact that there was no edit option in so far as medium is concerned. Even though, the results were declared in November 2025, other than making

a representation sometime in December 2025, the petitioner took no steps. The petitioner chose to approach this Court in the third week of January, 2026.

7. The petitioner is in an unfortunate circumstance whereby exercising a particular option has left her without any opportunity of being appointed as that option has already been exercised in favour of other candidate, being an “in service” candidate.
8. Mr. Bhattacharya, learned counsel appearing for the Commission submits that there can be no question of changing of medium at this stage, which is not only belated, but would also be in complete the in level playing field in so far as all the candidates are concerned. He has placed reliance on the decision of an Hon’ble Division bench of this Hon’ble Court in F.M.A. 115 of 2026 with I.A. No. CAN 1 of 2026 (**Mahmooda Khatun & Anr. Vs. The State of West Bengal & Ors.**) The Hon’ble Division Bench has held in no uncertain terms “that once a candidate has consciously chosen a medium at the time of submission of the application, he cannot be permitted to change the medium of instruction subsequently”.

9. Unfortunate as the situation and circumstance may be for the petitioner in line with the order passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench, the petitioner cannot be permitted to change her medium only to avail of a better opportunity in the Bengali language in the Life Science subject, as it has more vacancies. This ought to have been considered by the petitioner at the time of filling up the form and prior to exercising her option for medium. Once she has exercised her option and she has been found inadequate for appointment not because of any fault of others, but because there is a better or a better situated candidate than her, she cannot be permitted to alter her position by editing her medium.
10. This would completely derail the process and create an arbitrary, if not a whimsical exercise of discretion in her favour as similarly situated persons will be deprived of an equal opportunity to change their medium. I say discretion consciously as she was unable to establish any right to change her medium.
11. In view of the afore-stated discussions, I do not find any reason to permit the petitioner to change her medium at this stage or at all since

the same is not provided in the Rule and cannot be permitted by way of this writ petition.

12. The writ petition being **WPA 1844 of 2026** fails and is accordingly **dismissed**.

13. There will be no order as to costs.

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

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)