

25/06
2026

AD/37/24
266312
NANDY

(DO)

**In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

**WPA/19845/2025
with
CAN/1/2025**

ANSHU PANDEY (KUMARI)
VS
THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.

Ms. Ajeya Mitra, Advocate
Mr. Supriya Ranjan Ghosh, Advocate
Mr. Jayabrata Mukherji, Advocate
.....for the Petitioner
Mr. Loknath Chatterjee, Advocate
Ms. Sneha Chatterjee, Advocate
.....for the State
Ms. Koyeli Bhattacharyya, Advocate
Mr. Bibek Dutta, Advocate
.....for the WBBSE
Mr. Tapas Kumar Majumdar, Advocate
Mr. Partha Pratim Bhattacharya, Advocate
.....for the Applicant (CAN/1/2025)

1. The petitioner is aggrieved that she has been removed from the post of Teacher-in-Charge of the respondent school.
2. The petitioner is an assistant teacher and had been officiating in the post of Teacher-in-Charge for a while. There have been several complaints against her while she was discharging the duties of Teacher-in-Charge.
3. Pursuant to the complaints made, proceedings were drawn up and initiated against her by the Board. These proceedings commencing from the enquiry reports, charges, show-cause, and ultimately the charge-sheet on 31.07.2025 has now culminated into a full-fledged disciplinary proceeding against the petitioner.
4. The petitioner, in the meantime, has for obvious reasons, been relieved of her responsibility to officiate as the Teacher-in-Charge. This, to ensure that she does not have any access to documents and thereby tamper with the same.

5. The charges framed against her on 31.07.2025, have also been replied and responded to.
6. Ms. Mitra, learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner should immediately be reinstated, as the charge-sheet was framed after she had been relieved from the post of Teacher-in-Charge.
7. Ms. Bhattacharya, learned Advocate appearing for the Board submits that it was imperative that she be relieved from the duties of the Teacher-in-Charge of the school, as her continuation in the said post would result in a flagrant violation of the principles of natural justice and could entail a complete bar to a proper and efficacious disciplinary proceeding.
8. As a period of almost 11 months has lapsed since the charge-sheet was framed and no steps have been taken, it would only be apt that the proceedings are completed as expeditiously as possible.
9. The question of reinstating the petitioner to the post of Teacher-in-Charge in the interregnum period does not arise as the petitioner is still facing the disciplinary proceeding where further documents and necessary and requisite papers may be called for. Thus, to put the petitioner in a position where she would have access to such documents, if not exclusive access, would completely derail the entire proceedings.
10. In the afore-stated facts and circumstances, I direct the Board to complete the disciplinary proceeding by 30.09.2026.
11. The petitioner will be permitted to continue in her service as an assistant teacher, without in any manner being permitted to be reinstated as the Teacher-in-Charge in the interregnum period.
12. However, depending on the outcome of the

disciplinary proceeding, the authorities shall be at liberty to take further decision as to whether the petitioner is entitled to any further post or not.

13. With the aforesaid directions, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

CAN/1/2025

14. The connected application for addition of party being **CAN/1/2025** also stands **disposed of**.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)