

20 **30.06.**
2026
Ct. No. 18

Ab

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE.**

WPA 13829 of 2026

**Debendra Singha
Vs.
Union of India and others.**

**Mr. Partha Sarathi Bhattacharya,
Mr. Moniruzzaman,
Mr. Raju Bhattacharya,
Mr. Jahangir Badsha.**

... For the petitioner.

**Mr. Siddhartha Bhattacharyya,
Mr. Sourav Sengupta.**

... For the Union of India.

1. The affidavit of service filed today is taken on record.
2. The petitioner aggrieved that he was not selected for the Armed Forces after having sat for the examination conducted for such appointment.
3. Mr. Bhattacharya, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the petitioner, has raised two principal issues challenging the rejection of the petitioner's application.
4. The first of these issues is that the petitioner was given 10 out of 100 in the two written examinations that he had taken. The petitioner being a meritorious student ought to have been given higher marks.
5. Second that the answer scripts for such examinations were never disclosed to the petitioner.
6. The petitioner, through his father, had approached

the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Kolkata, sometime in 2015 to challenge the examination results, which had been published sometime in 2012. The matter was pursued from 2015 to 2024, when ultimately, it was found that the application made by the father could not be entertained since the matter pertains to his son's grievance and not that of the father. The said application was withdrawn after nine years with liberty to take appropriate steps.

7. On the basis of this liberty, the petitioner herein preferred an application before the Armed Forces Tribunal sometime in 2026 seeking redressal of his grievance. However, this application was also dismissed as withdrawn on May 18, 2026 since the petitioner was not a member of the Armed Forces and could not have approached the Armed Forces Tribunal with his grievance.
8. It is only thereafter that the petitioner has approached this Court.
9. The timelines are completely haywire since the first application made by the father was in 2015 leaving a gap of three years from the date of publication of the result in 2012. There is no explanation for this delay of three years.
10. There is also no explanation as to why the application was kept pending for almost nine years by the father before the Armed Forces Tribunal and

ultimately withdrawn in 2024.

11. There is also no explanation to the fact as to why the petitioner waited for two years from 2024 till 2026 to initiate an action to buttress his grievance, that too before the Armed Forces Tribunal, which again was unceremoniously withdrawn in 2026.

12. Beyond these timelines, the petitioner has been unable to show any Rule or Regulation that he has a right to obtain the answer scripts for the examinations conducted by the Armed Forces for Appointment of Soldiers.

13. There is no Rule or Regulation or any other Notification disclosed to buttress his case that there is a right of review given to examinees, who have participated in the examination process. On the contrary, empty and bald allegations were made by the petitioner seeking review, which were rejected. Those rejections were made sometime in the year 2013, have not been challenged by the petitioner either prior to or even at this stage.

14. The petitioner's grievance that he is a meritorious candidate and ought to have been blessed with better marks than getting 10 out of 100 is completely unsubstantiated, without any basis and calls for no interference of the process, which has already attained finality in 2012.

15. This attempt by the petitioner to reopen an issue,

which is more than fourteen years old, cannot be entertained at this stage.

16. The writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed.
17. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.
18. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties on priority basis.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)