

11-03-2026
Item No.18
Subrata
Bhattacharyya
AR(C)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction

Appellate Side

WPA No.2865 of 2026

Jaya Chakraborty

-vs-

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Tapas Kumar Dey

Mr. Nirupam Sarkar

...for the petitioner

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order of rejection for regularization of engagement dated August 28, 2024 passed by the Child Development Project Officer, Ranaghat-II ICDS Project.
2. The impugned order records that there is no document to show that the petitioner was formally engaged as an Anganwadi helper. No formal letter of engagement was ever issued in her favour by the appropriate authority. There is no documentary evidence that the petitioner was engaged as Anganwadi helper subsequent to the participation of a formal process of recruitment.
3. The authority opined that her service was a consequence of a personal arrangement without issuance of a formal letter of engagement.
4. The petitioner earlier approached this Court with a prayer for regularization of her service by filing a writ petition being WPA No.28746 of 2022 which stood disposed of by the Court on May 17, 2023 by observing that no record could be found that a recruitment process or process for engagement of Anganwadi helpers had been

initiated. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner participated in any selection process. She solely relies on recommendation of one of the members of the Legislative Assembly. The Court was of the opinion that if the engagement of the petitioner was a personal arrangement, the State exchequer cannot be burdened.

5. It appears that the finding of the Court is similar to the finding arrived at by the Child Development Project Officer.
6. The petitioner in the instant writ petition has also not been able to show any document in support of her engagement but for letters of recommendation issued by one of the members of the Legislative Assembly in the year 2019 and again in August 2025.
7. There is also no explanation in the writ petition as to why the petitioner approached this Court only in February 2026, even though her prayer for regularization stood rejected by the authority in August 2024.
8. The Court is of the opinion that no order can be passed for regularizing a candidate who has not been appointed in accordance with law.
9. The Court does not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order.
10. The writ petition fails and is hereby 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]

