

05
30.01.2026
d.p.

**In The High Court At Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

W.P.A 1832 of 2026

**Shailendra Kr. Vishwakarma
-versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

**Mr. Raghunath Chakraborty,
Mr. Md. Apzal Ansari.
...For the Petitioner.**

**Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay, Sr. SC,
Ms. Tapati Samanta.
... For the State.**

**Mr. Kalyan Kumar Bandyopadhyay, Sr. Adv,
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya,
Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay,
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag,
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh.
...For WBCSSC.**

1. The petitioner participated in the 2nd State Level Selection Test (SLST), 2025 in the subject Commerce (PG). Though his name featured in the preliminary interview list at serial no.1, but his name was not included in the provisional panel. His candidature stood rejected on the ground that he did not study the subject in the post graduate course.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the same.

3. The petitioner has annexed the certificate issued by the West Bengal University of Technology certifying that he obtained the degree of Master in Management Administration in support of the submission that he has the eligibility to be appointed for teaching classes XI and XII.

4. According to the Commission, the subject Master in Management Administration is not equivalent to the degree Master in Commerce.

5. As per the acceptance of different subjects in respect of Classes XI and XII at the post graduation level published by the Commission in respect of Commerce, the equivalent subject is MBA (Finance) preceded by B.Com. (Hons.).

6. Learned advocate representing the petitioner submits that the degree Management Administration has been recognized by the University of Calcutta and the petitioner has been permitted to teach the students of Classes XI and XII and has also been appointed as examiner and scrutinizer by the West Bengal Council of Higher Secondary Education.

7. Prayer has been made by the petitioner to accept the master degree qualification of the petitioner.

8. Upon hearing the parties, as it appears that the subject for which the petitioner applied for in the recruitment process is not equivalent as per the equivalence notification published by the Commission, accordingly, the Court cannot accept the submission of the petitioner for accepting his master degree qualification.

9. If the prayer of the petitioner is allowed, then the same will amount to directing the authority to change the rules of the game after the game has started. The petitioner must have been well aware of the qualifications accepted by the Commission as the same was published by the Commission and is in the public domain.

10. Had the petitioner been aggrieved by the subjects and equivalence thereof accepted by the

Commission, then he ought to have approached the Court at the very initial stage. The petitioner has approached the Court just prior to the publication of the final merit list.

11. In view of the above no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the instant case.

12. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

13. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)