

F.M.A. 1069 of 2024

**Debiprosad Chakrabortty
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Bidhan Biswas

...for the Appellant

Mr. Avishek Prasad

...for the DPSC, Malda/Respondent No.6

1. It is pointed out by the learned advocate for the writ petitioner/appellant that respondent no.3 in the writ petition, namely, “the District Inspector of Schools (P.E.)” was wrongly described as “the District Inspector of Schools (S.E.)”. The same is an inadvertent typographical error in the appeal, reflecting in the order dated 18.03.2026 in paragraph no.5.
2. While disposing of the appeal this Court recorded the description of respondent no.3 as “the District Inspector of Schools (S.E.)”, on account of such inadvertent typographical error in the appeal record.
3. The error is apparent and not in dispute by the learned advocate representing the respondents.
4. In the above circumstances, we direct that the description of respondent no.3 be corrected in the appeal to be read as “the District Inspector of School (P.E.)”.

5. We direct the **Office** to make such correction in the appeal.
6. In view of the correction having effected in the appeal record, we further consider it appropriate that “the District Inspector of Schools (S.E.)” in paragraph no.5 in the order dated 18.03.2026 be read as “the District Inspector of Schools (P.E.)”.
7. The order dated 18.03.2026 stands modified accordingly.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)