

12 **30.03.
2026**

Ct. No. 24

Ab

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE.**

WPA 5212 of 2026

**Nasiruddin Islam and others
Vs.
State of West Bengal and others.**

**Mr. Sudipta Dasgupta,
Mr. Saikat Sutradhar.**

... for the petitioners.

**Mr. Supriyo Chattopadhyay,
Mr. Manoj Kumar Mondal.**

... for the State.

**Mr. Kalyan Badopadhyay,
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya,
Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay,
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag,
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh.**

... for the WBCSSC.

1. The affidavit of service filed today is taken on record.
2. The petitioners' grievance is that having participated in the 2nd SLST Examination, the petitioners' answer to certain questions were correct in terms of the preliminary answer module. However, in terms of the Rules as enshrined in the Notification No. 764-SE/S/10M-03/2025 dated May 29, 2025, objections were raised and the Expert Committee had considered such objections and then found that some other answers, other than the one in the preliminary answer keys was

correct. This shift resulted prejudicially against the petitioners as the petitioners' answers were in tune with the preliminary answer keys.

3. The petitioners, therefore, seek a revisiting of the answer keys by the Expert Committee.
4. The issue, it seems, has already been decided by a Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court in MAT 30 of 2026 (Swaoni Bhattacharjee vs. The State of West Bengal and others) decided on March 23, 2026.
5. I have heard Mr. Dasgupta, learned Advocate appearing for the petitioners and Mr. Bandopadhyay, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the Commission.
6. Bereft of all other issues, like and similarly placed persons as the petitioners, at the time of participating in the examination were aware that once the final answer keys were published, they were not amenable to any challenge in terms of the afore-stated notification. Clearly, reevaluation is not permissible under the Rules in terms of the notification.
7. It is not for the Courts to sit in appeal over the expertise of a body, which has been constituted for such specific and specialized performance.
8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its judgment in the case of Vikesh Kumar Gupta and another vs. State of Rajasthan and others, reported in (2021) 2

SCC 309 has reiterated in no uncertain terms that reevaluation should be discouraged by the Courts, since they do not have the expertise in such academic matters. Reevaluation is permissible only if allowed under the relevant Rules.

9. In the instant case, as discussed above, the notification permits only one reevaluation, which is after the preliminary answer keys are published. There is no provision under the method of SLST for selection of candidates and preparation of panel in Rule 11 to challenge the final answer keys that are published. The opinion of the Expert Committee is final and binds all persons, who have participated in the examination.
10. The decision of the Hon'ble Division Bench in *Swaoni Bhattacharjee (Supra)* is also clear and unequivocal. As reiterated by the Hon'ble Division Bench, "the power to interfere is not when the order appealed against is not right but only when it is clearly wrong".
11. The petitioners are within the zone of consideration and are presently waitlisted. Rule 11(iv) and 11(vi) of the 2025 Rules provide for submission of suggestions/objections, which were considered by the Expert Committee and the final answer keys prepared and published.
12. In a competitive exam of this nature, where lacs of

examinees are involved, the Expert Committee has acted to the best of its ability and there is no insinuation of arbitrariness or any discriminatory action of such Expert Committee.

13. In the afore-stated facts and circumstances, it would not be proper to disrupt the finding of the Expert Committee at the behest of an examinee and disrupt the entire ongoing selection process undertaken pursuant to the SLST, 2025.

14. In view of the afore-stated observations and discussions, I do not find any reason to entertain the instant writ petition, the same is accordingly dismissed.

15. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

16. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties on priority basis.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)

