

22.04.2026

**DL-27
Ct. No. 18
Srimanta
Dismissed**

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

WPA/23995/2025

**Rokeya Siddika
-Vs.-
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Probal Sarkar

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Saikat Chatterjee,

Mr. Sankar Halder

...for the State.

1. The petitioner participated in a recruitment process for engagement of 'cook' in terms of the notice published by the Block Development Officer on 25th June, 2025.
2. The petitioner was called for interview on 24th September, 2025 and a provisional contractual engagement letter was put up in the office board of the Block Development Office on the selfsame day disclosing the name of the private respondent as 'cook'.
3. Submission of the petitioner is that the Block Development Officer ought to have published a panel disclosing the names of the candidates who were successful in the selection process.

4. Allegation is that the private respondent has been selected surreptitiously. A legal representation was filed on behalf of the petitioner and the same is alleged to be kept pending.
5. Prayer has been made to direct the authority to consider the legal representation filed on behalf of the petitioner.
6. Learned Advocate representing the State respondents refers to the provisional contractual engagement letter dated 24th September, 2025 annexed to the writ petition as Annexure P-5 at pages 32 and 33 of the writ petition.
7. It has been submitted that the said engagement letter was published in the office board of the Block Development Office on the day of the interview. There is no suppression of fact and no preference has been shown to any of the candidates. As the petitioner was unsuccessful in the selection process, she could not be engaged.
8. Upon hearing the submissions made on behalf of both the parties and on perusal of the documents annexed to the writ petition, it appears that the petitioner was directed to

appear in the interview on 24th September, 2025. The Block Development Officer published the provisional contractual engagement letter on the selfsame day clearly mentioning that as per the result of the personal interview and work experience for engagement to the post of 'cook', the selected candidates have been engaged. The name of the successful candidate was mentioned in the said letter. The engagement is purely contractual and temporary.

9. As the name of the petitioner has not been published in the provisional contractual engagement letter, it has to be taken that the petitioner was unsuccessful and the private respondent, who has since been issued the engagement letter, has been found to be successful.

10. It is not necessary to intimate the unsuccessful candidate in a public recruitment process the fate of his/her candidature unless specifically prescribed in the recruitment rules or the recruitment notice. The fact that the result of the interview was made public on the date of the interview by publication of the list of selected candidates in the official notice board implies that the rest of the candidates who

participated in the recruitment process were unsuccessful in the same.

11. The Court does not find any error on the part of the authority in not publishing a separate panel of unsuccessful candidates. The Court is not inclined to interfere in the instant writ petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

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

13. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)