

**F.M.A. 197 of 2026
With
CAN 1 of 2026**

**Smt. Pampa Mukherjee Adhikari
VS.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Benazir Shaikh

...for the Appellant

Ms. Chandreyi Alam, Id. A.G.P.,
Ms. Runu Mukherjee

...for the State

1. Heard the learned advocate for the appellant and the learned advocate for the respondents.
2. The appellant participated in a process for selection and appointment of Anganwari Workers under the ICDS Scheme. The panel for the selection process was published on 10.01.2008. The writ petition was filed in 2025, about 17 years after publication of the panel, seeking the relief in the form of a direction for issuing an appointment letter as Anganwari Worker to the writ petitioner. The same was rejected by the writ court by an order dated 23.12.2025 which is the subject matter of the present intra-court appeal.
3. The learned advocate for the appellant submits that the writ court in a writ proceeding arising out of W.P.A. 22415 of 2009 filed by another candidate has recorded that the present appellant was appointed to the post of Anganwari Worker

despite securing lesser marks than the writ petitioner therein. He submits that though such facts have been recorded in the order passed in W.P.A. 22415 of 2009, appointment letter was never issued to the writ petitioner/appellant and therefore, prompted by the order of the writ court dated 03.10.2023 passed in W.P.A. 22415 of 2009, the writ petition was filed.

4. We have perused the order dated 03.10.2023. Paragraph 3 of the order merely records that the State was given an opportunity to explain by filing a report how a candidate at serial no.32, (writ petitioner) was appointed though she had lesser marks. The order does not record any conclusive finding regarding appointment of the present writ petitioner, so as to vest any enforceable right to the writ petitioner to claim issuance of an appointment letter, 17 (seventeen) years after the publication of the panel. It is apparent from the reading of the entire order dated 03.10.2023 passed in W.P.A. 22415 of 2009 that other candidates at serial nos. 31 and 34 were appointed and not the writ petitioner/appellant.
5. Considering the facts, as noted, the writ court found that the appellant had no right which could be enforced by the writ court, directing for issuing

an appointment letter based on a panel of 2008,
in a writ petition filed in the year 2025.

6. We find no reason to interfere with the order dated 23.12.2025 passed by the Writ Court in W.P.A. 4825 of 2025.
7. The appeal is dismissed.
8. Pending application also stands disposed of.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)