

5th January, 2026
(M/L No.15)
Ct. No.4
(SKB)

M.A.T.767 of 2025
With
CAN 1 of 2025

Ishita Das
Versus
The State of West Bengal and others

Mr. Sharanya Chatterjee,
Mr. Subhajit Barman
... for the appellant/petitioner.

Mr. Baidurya Ghosal,
Mr. Sourav Mukherjee,
Mr. Saikat Mukherjee
... for the respondent-Bank.

1. Heard the learned counsel for the appellant and the learned counsel for the respondent/Bank.
2. The appellant was working in the Junior Management Grade seeking a promotion to the post of Officer Middle Management Scale-II. The promotion is by two modes. One is through a Fast Track Mode which contemplates appraisal of the candidate wherein she is required to get minimum qualifying marks of 60% in the aggregate of three components, namely, Written Test, Interview and Performance of Appraisal Report ('PAR').
3. The appellant/writ petitioner was considered for grant of promotion under the normal channel.

4. The petitioner subsequently filed the writ petition raising a grievance that her case for promotion to scale 2 be reconsidered under the Fast Track Channel and granted with effect from the date on which she completed 6 years service in scale 1 i.e. on 01.12.2022. The petitioner, however, has been granted promotion under the normal channel on completion of 8 years.
5. The petitioner was seeking year wise break up of marks under the parameter Performance Appraisal Report (PAR). The response to her query under the RTI was made available on 15.03.2023 furnishing year wise break up of marks awarded for PAR. The information supplied reads as follows:

YEAR WISE P.A.R. NUMBER

<i>Sl.</i>	<i>PAR Year</i>	<i>PAR Number</i>
1.	2021-2022	78
2.	2020-2021	60.75
3.	2019-2020	60
4.	2018-2019	50
5.	2017-2018	50

6. The writ petitioner averred in the writ petition that while visiting the official website of the Bank, she came across the breakup of marks for the PAR, which was at variance with PAR Number, supplied to her under the RTI. In support of such submission, the learned

advocate has drawn attention to this court towards pages 144, 145, 146, 147 and 187 of the application. He submits that there is a clear discrepancy which is apparent from a bare perusal also of page 187, wherein, the appellant/petitioner has been granted PAR Number 87 by reviewer for the year 2022, whereas in the information supplied under the RTI Act, she has been shown to have obtained PAR Number 78.

7. The learned counsel for the Bank seriously disputes this fact. It is submitted that there is no discrepancy and the Bank has undertaken the petitioner's assessment in a transparent way. There is no allegation of any *mala fide* or any extraneous consideration against any person in the process of assessment. There is no procedural infirmity also pointed out.
8. In these circumstances, there is no occasion for the writ court to enter into a reappraisal of the PAR number awarded to the appellant/writ petitioner.
9. We have considered the rival submissions and gone through the order of the learned Single Judge, who has dismissed the writ petitioner's claim by an order dated 27.01.2025 passed in

W.P.A.27283 of 2023, order of which is under challenge in the present intra court appeal.

10. We have gone through the relevant rules which specified the modus of appraisal. The learned counsel for the appellant has pointed out the relevant provision in this regard in the Regional Rural Banks' (Appointment of Officers and Employees) Rules, 2017.

11. The third schedule contained therein specifies the manner of calculation or assessment to ascertain whether a person will qualify for promotion through the Fast Track Mode. The relevant provision reads as follows:

“(iv) In the case of normal channel;

- (a) the minimum qualifying marks shall be 50% in aggregate of written test, interview and performance appraisal reports;*
- (b) selection of candidates for promotion shall be made from amongst the successful candidates in the feeder grade, in order of their seniority in the feeder grade.*

(v) In the case of fact track channel;

- (a) the minimum qualifying marks shall be 60% in aggregate of written test, interview and performance appraisal report*
- (b) selection of candidates for promotion shall be made from amongst the successful candidates in the feeder grade in order of their merit, based on the aggregate of their marks in written test, interview and performance appraisal reports.*

(vi) There shall be common written examination and interview for both the channels.”

12. A bare perusal of the provision shows that minimum qualifying marks required for promotion in fast track channel is 60% in aggregate to be assessed by taking into consideration three components, namely, Written Test, Interview and Performance of Appraisal Report.
13. The appellant is pointing out certain information/marks which he claims to have downloaded from the website of the Bank at pages 144, 145, 146, 147 and 187 of the application and submits that there is a discrepancy with the PAR Number provided by the Bank in response to RTI query.
14. We find no force in such submission. A bare perusal of the RTI query and the 4-5 pages being referred to by the appellant, shows that the PAR Number was disclosed in the RTI query. However, on the Bank's website marks have been disclosed for certain parameters forming a part of PAR. There is no disclosure of PAR Number on the Bank's website, print out of which was enclosed at the above noted 4-5 pages. The petitioner is trying to make out a case that the higher marks displayed on the

Bank's website which are at variance with the information supplied under RTI should be the basis of assessment of her claim for promotion under the fast track channel.

15. We find no force in such claim. As noticed above, the marks disclosed on the Bank's website are in respect of some of the parameters based on which PAR Number is awarded to a candidate for a particular year. The marks disclosed on the Bank's website are in respect of other parameters. Thus, there is no question of the same being at variance with the PAR Number awarded to the petitioner, as disclosed in the information supplied under RTI. The very premise of the petitioner's claim in the writ petition that she has been assessed based on lower PAR Number as communicated under RTI, and not granted the benefit of higher assessment of PAR, available on the Bank's website is, therefore, untenable. The question of variance does not arise since the marks on the website being relied upon by the petitioner are marks awarded under different parameters and is not the PAR Number.

16. From bare perusal of the records, we find that no case of discrepancy is made out.

Otherwise also the scope for judicial review in respect of marks awarded lies in a very thin and narrow compass. There being no allegation of any *mala fide* or extraneous consideration and there being no palpable procedural infirmity pointed out there is no scope for interference, or to reassess petitioner's appraisal/assessment. Merely because a writ petitioner/appellant is not satisfied with the marks awarded, normally a writ Court will not enter into a reassessment of marks in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

17. In the above circumstances where there is no violation of the rule governing the process of promotion and there is no allegation of any ill-motive against any person, there being no allegation of extraneous consideration, we are of the view that the court should not enter into a reassessment and evaluation of the petitioner's performance and marks awarded. We consider it apposite to quote from paragraph 103 of recent judgment of the Apex Court in the case of ***Abhimeet Sinha v. High Court of Patna*** reported in **2024 (7) SCC 262** wherein the Apex Court held:

“The Court in any case should not step into the shoes of the Selection

Committee. The assessment and evaluation of the candidates appearing before the Selection Committee/Interview Board should best be left to the members of the Committee unless it is violative of the statutory rules or tainted with ill motive.”

18. We, therefore, find no infirmity with the decision of the learned Single Judge in rejecting the writ petition.

19. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

20. The connected application is also dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)