

6-7 **29.05.**
2026

Ct. No. 08

Ab/Pk

MAT 932 of 2026
IA CAN 1 of 2026

Chittaranjan Mahato
Vs.
Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education
University and others.

With

MAT 933 of 2026
IA CAN 1 of 2026

Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education
University and others.
Vs.
Deben Mahato Teachers' Training Institute
(B.Ed.) College and others

Mr. Sarosij Dasgupta,
Mr. Lutful Haque,
Mr. Pourush Bandyopadhyay,
Ms. Taharima Khatun,
Mr. M. Rasool.
... for the appellant in MAT 932 of 2026 &
for the respondent no. 4 in MAT 933 of 2026.

Mr. Parashar Baidya.
... for the respondent no. 1 to 3 in MAT 932 of
2026 and for the appellants in MAT 933 of
2026.

Mr. Soumya Majumder,
Mr. Srijib Chakraborty,
Mr. Aditya Mondal,
Ms. Rupsa Sreemani.
... for the respondent nos. 5 & 6 in MAT 932 of
2026 and for the respondent nos. 1 & 2 in
WPA 933 of 2026.

Ms. Asha G. Gutgutia.
... for the NCTE.

1. By consent of the parties, the appeals and connected applications are taken up for hearing.
2. These appeals are from the order of the learned

Single Judge dated May 22, 2026. MAT 932 of 2026 has been preferred by a person alleging to be in control of the college, the respondent no. 1 herein. MAT 933 of 2026 is an appeal by the University from the same order of May 22, 2026.

3. The pith and substance of the impugned order is that 36 students, who are otherwise meritorious, have not been considered for admission in the respondent no. 1/writ petitioner (in short 'college').
4. The genesis of the dispute arises from a fight between the two sets of Administrators in the college. The appellant in MAT 932 of 2026 is one of such set while the respondent nos. 1 and 2 represent the other set of Administrators.
5. The writ petition had been filed for a direction on the University Authorities to permit admission of 36 students in B.Ed. programs for the session 2025-2027, whose names featured in the merit list of the University.
6. The appellants contend that the entire admission process had been completed, prior to institution of the writ petition before this Hon'ble Court.
7. The second limb of contention of the appellants is that these 36 students had applied through the online portal, which is the designated mode of application for the University but had not appeared

physically to present their credentials to the college. Hence, the question of verification of the credentials of these 36 students by the University for the 100 seats, which are available for the said college, did not arise.

8. The appellants' third limb of submission is that the entire process having been completed, there are no vacant seats at present and the writ petition on the date of filing was indeed infructuous. Any order permitting the consideration of these 36 students would negate and denude the right of the 23 students, who were also in the contention for the vacant seats and have thereafter been admitted.
9. The writ petitioner/respondent submits that the process of admission could not have been completed prior to filing of the writ petition as this process was to end on May 22, 2026 at 11.30 p.m.
10. It is the further contention that these 36 students may have a higher rank than the 23 students, who have been given admission. Thus, the balance of convenience is overwhelmingly in favour of 36 students to be considered by the University, for those 23 seats, which have been filled up subsequently.
11. We have heard the learned Advocates appearing for the parties.
12. The issue is not so much about the credibility of the

students on the merit list, but the dispute between these two sets of Administrators, who seem to be bent upon ruining the college. These sets of Administrators have their own students, ostensibly the students who approached these Administrators and in turn, the Administrators forward the credentials of the students to the University.

13. As it now appears, the University has given the requisite leverage to the appellant in MAT 932 of 2026, who is presently administering the college and has access to the e-mail, User ID and Password, and thus, access to the University. According to the appellant, all students, who have been given admission had visited the college physically and deposited the credentials, which were duly forwarded by the college to the University and had been considered. The admission process completed.

14. These 36 students, according to the present Administrators of the college, never visited the college physically nor submitted their credentials on account whereof, the present Administrators of the college were unable to sent the credentials to the University within the timeline specified, for consideration by the University.

15. A further issue has been raised in the impugned order, since the same seems to have been passed on

the concession of Mr. Baidya, learned Advocate, appearing for the University that “the University is willing to verify the documents of the 36 students, who have been admitted by the writ petitioner as well as the students admitted by the respondent no. 5 and proceed for an admission as per the merit list”. Mr. Baidya further submits that this concession had never been made by him and this is an erroneous recording by the Court in the said order. In fact, he places reliance on paragraph 6 of the same order to submit that paragraph 6 and 9 are contrary and self-defeating on account whereof the concessions recorded as having been made by him in paragraph 9 are not tenable.

16. Though the interest of these 36 students are of paramount concern, if the students have not followed the procedure and process and not deposited their credentials to the college authorities physically, as they are meant to do, these students could not have been considered by the University.
17. Without concession of the University, as recorded in paragraph 9 of the impugned order, the said order could not have been passed as both sets of appellants have unequivocally submitted that the entire process has already been completed and there are no vacant seats available for considering the credentials of these

36 students. In fact, any such consideration would be an empty and idle formality.

18. The other issue, which we have considered, is that if any of these 36 students are to be considered afresh, as their names already appeared in the merit list, the rights of the 23 students, who have already been admitted, would be completely denuded. This reinstatement of right of 36 students cannot be permitted in the absence of the 23 students.
19. The basic tenet of principles of natural justice demands that these students (23 in number) be added as party respondents in the writ petition and be heard before any order is passed, which may have the effect of curtailing their rights.
20. Insofar as the concession of the University is concerned, the same will have to be dealt appropriately by the University, taking steps before the learned Judge, who had passed the impugned order dated May 22, 2026.
21. In the circumstances afore-stated, we keep the order dated May 22, 2026 in abeyance. The rights of the 36 students and the admission of 23 students shall abide by the result of the writ petition.
22. The writ petitioner/respondent is directed to add the 23 students as party respondents in the writ petition within a week from reopening of the Court.

Let the matter appear before the appropriate Bench on June 23, 2026.

23. With the afore-stated directions, the appeals and the connected applications are disposed of.
24. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

(Krishna Rao, J.)

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)