

27/04
2026

AD/30/24
266312
NANDY

(DO)

**In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

WPA/3927/2026

PUSHPLATA PRAJAPATI
VS
THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.

Mr. Rajendra Banerjee, Advocate
Mr. Souvik Ganguly, Advocate

.....for the Petitioner

Mr. Rajendra Chaturvedi, Advocate
Mr. Sajal Kumar Pandit, Advocate

.....for the WBBSE

Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya, Advocate
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh, Advocate

.....for the WBCSSC

1. Affidavit of service as filed, be kept with the record.
2. The petitioner is a participant in the second State Level Selection Test (SLST). The petitioner's result has been withheld on the ground that the petitioner has failed to mention the booklet series number in the OMR sheet. Such OMR sheet has been disclosed at page 16 of the writ-petition.
3. The Commission submits that the booklet series is a unique identification and is handed out by the concerned invigilator at the time of examination to individual candidates, on account whereof, mentioning the series is of utmost importance. It is thus impossible at present to trace the booklet series that had been handed out to the petitioner.
4. Even though, the petitioner is a 100% visually impaired candidate and had taken the assistance of a Scribe to sit for the examinations, the mistake committed by the petitioner and/or the scribe is of a nature, which cannot be rectified at this stage.
5. The Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court in MAT/124/2026 (*Bandana Panja & Ors. vs. State of West Bengal & Ors.*) has categorically held that if a

candidate, despite specific instructions to perform a particular act, fails or omits to do so, such candidate cannot claim any right to compel the Commission to assess such OMR answer-sheets after the results have been published upon completion of the evaluation of the OMR answer-sheets of all candidates. Clearly, the Hon'ble Division Bench has reiterated the age-old principle that no person can claim negative equality.

6. The petitioner may not have been directly or indirectly concerned with the mistake committed by the Scribe. However; any mistake has consequences and the consequence of this particular mistake is of a nature, which cannot be rectified or redressed.
7. In line with the decision of this Hon'ble Court in *Bandana Panja (supra)*, I do not find any reason to entertain the instant petition at this stage.
8. The writ petition is **dismissed**. No order as to costs.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)