

W.P.S.T. 112 of 2026

**Debashis Purkait
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Pratyush Patwari

...for the Petitioner

Ms. Chandreyi Alam, Id. A.G.P.,
Ms. Kakali Dutta

...for the State

1. Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.
2. Heard the learned advocate for the applicant/writ petitioner and the learned State advocate.
3. The petitioner is still pursuing appointment based on an advertisement published in the year, 2007.
4. Despite raising the issue earlier in the Original Application bearing O.A. No. 34 of 2018, relying upon certain orders passed in other earlier Original Applications and Writ Petitions, the petitioner failed to secure any order for his appointment. The order passed in O.A. 34 of 2018 takes note of a fact that the petitioner was placed at Serial No. 420, whereas the last appointment was given up to Serial No. 391. Considering this fact, the petitioner's prayer for issuance of a direction to appoint him from the panel in respect of the recruitment process of 2007, was rejected.
5. By making application under Right to Information Act, in the year 2023, and relying upon the reply submitted by the authorities under the Right to

Information Act, the petitioner tried to re-agitate his claim for an appointment in respect of a recruitment process arising out of an advertisement of the year 2007, which has been rejected by the West Bengal Administrative Tribunal ('Tribunal' for short).

6. The learned advocate for the applicant/writ petitioner has vehemently submitted that under the reply to Right to Information Act, the authorities responded by saying that in between the last selected candidate at Serial No. 391 and the petitioner, who was at Serial No. 420, only five (05) persons could submit the required documents. He, therefore, submits that it is more than obvious that several vacancies were still available.
7. We are unimpressed by such submission.
8. Firstly, the petitioner's claim for an appointment in respect of the recruitment process of the year 2007, was concluded by order passed in O.A. No. 34 of 2018. The order of the Tribunal rejecting his claim was dated 27.07.2022.
9. Secondly, there was no occasion for the petitioner to approach the Tribunal successively for the same relief, by relying upon replies under RTI, in the years 2024, as if the merit list published in respect of that recruitment process of the year 2007, was a perennial source from which

recruitment could be directed, as and when the candidates come.

10. We find no infirmity in the order dated 24.02.2025 passed by the Tribunal in O.A. 102 of 2024.
11. The Writ Petition is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)