

W.P.S.T. 107 of 2026

Chandra Sekhar Sen
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Haradhan Mondal

...for the Petitioner

1. Heard the learned advocate for the applicant/writ petitioner.
2. It is his case that his name was forwarded by the Employment Exchange under the then procedure for recruitment of LDC in the NCC in the year 2007-2008. He participated in the written test and thereafter participated in the typing test. Thereafter, the recruitment process was cancelled, so as to enable those who are not recommended by the Employment Exchange, also to make an application.
3. The petitioner, in the circumstances, claims to have approached the High Court earlier by filing W.P.S.T. 212 of 2010 wherein the Court after considering the facts directed as follows :

“In the aforesaid circumstances, we dispose of this writ petition by directing the respondent authorities to allow the petitioner along with other employment exchange sponsored candidates to participate in the future process of recruitment for filling up the aforesaid 40

vacant posts of LDC in the NCC establishment of West Bengal, if necessary by condoning the age bar in respect of the petitioner herein.”

4. Twelve (12) years thereafter, he has filed an Original Application seeking a direction to appoint him.
5. It is admitted by the learned advocate for the writ petitioner that now the petitioner is about 56 (fifty six) years old.
6. In the circumstances, the West Bengal Administrative Tribunal directed as follows:

“After careful examination of the order of the Hon'ble High Court, it is clear that the Hon'ble Court had directed the authority to allow the applicant to participate in the future process of recruitment. The Hon'ble Court also left it to the discretion of the authority to condone the age of the applicant. If the 40 vacancies to the post of L.D.C. are being filled up against the panel cancelled in the year 2009, the applicant is at liberty to file a representation before the respondent No.4, the Joint Secretary, (N.C.C.), Higher Education Department, for condonation of his age. The respondent No.4 is directed to dispose of the prayer of the applicant for consideration of excess age as per Rules within a reasonable period of time.”

7. We do not find any reason to interfere with the direction/observation of the Tribunal passed in O.A. No. 530 of 2022 filed by the writ petitioner.
8. The Writ Petition is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)