

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

WPA 4968 of 2026

Ritwika Mondal
-versus
State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Rabi Sankar Chatopadhyay
Mr. Sayan Chattopadhyay
Mr. Ayanava Acharya
... For the petitioner

Mr. Rajarshi Basu
Mr. Shehnaz Tareq Mina
... For the State

Mr. N.C. Bihani, Sr. Advocate
Ms. P.B. Bihani
... For Burdwan University

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.

2. The petitioner was a student of BA course in the University of Burdwan. She completed the said course in August, 2025 and her result was shown as 'PNC-Programme not cleared'.

3. The petitioner applied for review and the provisional review result was published by the University on 12th February, 2026.

4. The petitioner intended to pursue the three years LLB (Honours) course under the same University. As she could not clear her graduation course, she was

ineligible to apply for the LLB course. The admission process for the LLB course started on 17th September, 2025. The last date for filling the online application form was 30th November, 2025.

5. The petitioner is aggrieved as the University delayed in declaring the result of the review for which she could not participate in the admission process for LLB course.

6. From the brochure of the University relating to admission of the three-year LLB (Honours) course for the session 2024-2025, it appears that the mode of selection is based on the performance of the eligible candidates in the written admission test to be conducted by the University on 15th October, 2025. The petitioner could not participate in the selection process as she was ineligible to apply for the course. After the review result was published, she was declared qualified in the examination.

7. The petitioner prays for a direction upon the University to conduct a special entrance test for her. Submission is that the University ought to have published the review result prior to the conclusion of the selection for the three-year LLB course. For the delay on the part of the University to declare the result of the review, one valuable year of the petitioner ought not to be wasted.

8. Learned senior advocate representing the University has drawn attention of the Court to the civil suit filed by the petitioner against the University, being Title Suit No.584 of 2025, praying for a declaration that the notification published by the University for admission in the three-year LLB (Honours) course for the session 2025-2027 is illegal.

9. It has been submitted that the selection process is long over and the LLB classes have already commenced. At this stage, there is hardly any scope to conduct fresh selection test for the petitioner alone.

10. I have heard the submissions made on behalf of both the parties.

11. On perusal of the documents annexed to the writ petition, it appears that the petitioner failed to clear the BA three-year degree (Honours) examination 2025. She was declared qualified only upon publication of the result of the review on 12th February, 2026. Long prior thereto, the LLB (Honours) admission started and concluded.

12. The right of the petitioner to participate in the selection process for LLB (Honours) accrued only after she was declared qualified upon publication of the review result in February, 2026. Till a candidate clears the graduation course, the candidate is not eligible to take part in the selection process for the LLB course. By

the time the result of the review was published, LLB classes have also started. At this stage, directing the University to conduct fresh selection test, including a written entrance examination for the petitioner alone, cannot be allowed.

13. The admission test for the LLB course is based on the performance of eligible candidates in the written examination test. The eligibility of the candidates is considered relying on the relative merit of the participating candidates. A single candidate cannot be permitted to appear in a special entrance test to be conducted to assess her performance.

14. The prayer of the petitioner for special consideration also cannot be allowed.

15. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

16. It is made clear that the observations made herein are restricted to the submission made in the writ petition and the same will not have any bearing on the civil suit that is pending. It will be open for the petitioner to proceed with the civil suit in accordance with law, if so advised.

17. All parties are to act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

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

(Amrita Sinha, J.)