

S/L 18
08.04.2026
Court No.18
SD

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 18623 of 2025

Pranata Guchhait

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Bharat Chandra Simai

...for the Petitioner.

Ms. Munmun Ganguly

...for the State.

1. The petitioner participated in a recruitment process seeking appointment in the post of Anganwadi worker-cum-helper. As she secured marks less than the last empanelled candidate, she was not appointed.

2. The petitioner challenged the recruitment of the candidates who were selected for appointment in a writ petition being WPA 3728 of 2025. After hearing all the parties, the Court dismissed the same on April 2, 2025 clearly holding that the last candidate selected in the panel obtained more number in aggregate than the petitioner. The objection of the petitioner against the selected candidates was not accepted by the Court.

3. The Court categorically held that whether the selected candidate is the relation of any of the panchayat official is a disputed question of fact which cannot be gone into in a writ petition without conducting a proper trial.

4. The Court took note of the submission of the private respondents that all the selected candidates have been working and a right stood vested in their favour.

5. In the instant writ petition, the petitioner alleges that certain other candidates were engaged even though they did not participate in the regular selection process.

6. The aforesaid contention of the petitioner is denied by the learned advocate representing the State respondents.

7. It has been submitted that the source of information from where the petitioner learnt that the selected candidates did not appear in the recruitment process is not disclosed. The same is mere allegation of the petitioner.

8. On a perusal of the writ petition, it appears that there is no clear proof that the private respondents did not participate in the regular recruitment process which concluded prior to the disposal of the earlier writ petition filed by the petitioner.

9. It is clear that the petitioner, time and again, is approaching the Court despite being unsuccessful in a recruitment process with unfound allegations against the selected candidates. The same is gross abuse of the process of the law.

10. The writ petition, accordingly, stands dismissed with costs of Rs.5,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner positively by April 17, 2026 in favour of the Juvenile Justice fund, State Legal Services Authority, West Bengal.

11. Re-list the matter under the heading 'To Be Mentioned' on April 21, 2026 to ascertain whether costs have been deposited or not.

12. Parties to act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)