

S/L 10
18.06.2026
Court No.04
B.K.N

F.M.A. 1211 of 2024
Surojit Kanrar & Ors.
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

*Mr. Sabyasachi Chatterjee,
Mr. Akashdeep Mukherjee,
Mr. Badrul Karim,
Mr. Sayed Hossain,
Ms. Monalisha Sinha*

...for the Appellants.

*Ms. Chandreyi Alam, Ld. AGP,
Ms. Runu Mukherjee*

...for the State of West Bengal.

1. Heard the learned advocate for the appellants/writ petitioners.
2. The writ petitioners participated in a recruitment process undertaken to appoint Data Entry Operators on contract basis by the respondent no. 2. The recruitment process concluded and result was published of the selected candidates wherein the writ petitioners/appellants emerged unsuccessful.
3. Thereafter it is submitted by the learned advocate for the appellants that there was some reports viral on social media that while publishing the result, the authorities in the State Government omitted to include the unique application ID number (AID for short), granted to the candidates by the recruiting agency while conducting the recruitment process. The same was done to shower undue benefits on persons who had not participated in the recruitment process. The result, therefore, excluded the AID granted by the recruiting

authority to maintain transparency and published the result with reference to Aadhar number of the candidates. Such exclusion by the appointing authority gives rise to a reasonable apprehension to the writ petitioners that the transparency aspect introduced by the recruiting body based on the AID was omitted while publishing the result for extraneous considerations and, therefore, there was an occasion for the Writ Court to direct for an independent enquiry into the entire recruitment process.

4. The Hon'ble Single Judge after according consideration to the writ petitioners' assertion was not inclined to interfere in the matter. The writ petition was dismissed. The Intra Court Appeal is filed putting to challenge the order of the Hon'ble Single Judge.
5. Earlier directions were issued in the present proceeding for filing reports on affidavit; and opportunity granted to the writ petitioners/appellants to make an exception to the report/s which opportunity has already been availed by the appellants and the respondents.
6. We have considered the rival submissions and the reports/exceptions filed.
7. The details of the candidates entered at the time of application have been stated in the report. It appears from the report/s that the respondent no. 2 while conducting the recruitment process had given an AID number to the candidates in the process of recruitment. At the time of application, the Aadhar card number of

all the candidates was also entered by the recruitment agency. It is the stand of the recruitment agency that the AID was in addition to the Aadhar number, to facilitate identification in the recruitment process by the recruiting authority.

8. According to the petitioners, the AID allotted to the candidates was required to be published at the time of publication of result. Otherwise it is not possible to ascertain whether those who were declared successful, participated in the recruitment process or not.
9. Based on the report/s filed by the respondent on affidavit and the exceptions filed by the petitioners, we find no scope for any such tangible apprehension. Copy of a slip issued in acknowledgement of submission of the application is annexed to one of the reports filed by the respondent no. 2. A bare perusal of the acknowledgement slip shows that right from the date of application, a candidate's Aadhar number was also entered in the system. The AID was an additional number. The Aadhar number entered at the time of application, therefore, continues to be an identifying factor of the candidates throughout the recruitment process, from submission of applications, till the publication of result.
10. It is, therefore, misconceived for the writ petitioners to apprehend that based on the Aadhar number published in the result it is not possible to ascertain whether a

candidate, declared successful, actually participated in the recruitment process or not.

11. In view of our consideration above, we find that no real/tangible apprehension is raised based on which the Writ Court could have interfered in the selection process. The apprehension raised is devoid of substance and based on non est reasons.
12. We, therefore, find no occasion for issuing any direction to conduct an independent enquiry into the recruitment process as prayed for. The judgment of the Hon'ble Single Judge, in our opinion, requires no interference.
13. The appeal is dismissed.
14. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)