

Item No.- 21
23.03.2026
Court No. 24
Rohan

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

WPA 26301 of 2025

**Rathindra Nath Chatterjee & Ors.
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Dibyendu Chatterjee
Mr. Sasthi Charan Dhara
... for the Petitioners

Mr. Biplab Guha
Mr. Kartik Chandra Kapas
... for the State

Mr. Kalyan Bandopadhyay, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya
Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh
... for the WBCSSC

Mr. Suman Dey
... for the Respondent Nos. 9 & 10

1. The petitioners have approached this Court, aggrieved by the fact that their prior teaching experience has not been taken into consideration for allotment of marks.
2. The petitioners have relied upon the notification No. 764-SE/S/10M-03/2025 dated May 29, 2025. Clause A Sub-clause (2)(b) of Schedule-II of the notification specifies that prior teaching experience would be allotted 10 marks and also defines where and how such prior teaching experience ought to have been obtained to enable the authorities to apply the

requisite marking system. The petitioners submit that there are certificates issued in favour of some of the petitioners by headmasters of schools which specify that the posts in which these petitioners had been discharging their service, was substantive posts in vocational courses. Interestingly, these documents are mostly of a date beyond the cut-off date which was July 21, 2025.

3. Mr. Bhattacharya, learned advocate appearing for the Commission, submits that there was no valid certificate given by any of the petitioners in view of the following issues:
 - a. The certificates did not qualify the parameters set forth in Schedule-II of the notification;
 - b. The certificates which specify that the respective petitioners were discharging duties in substantive posts, were of a date, which was beyond the cut-off date;
 - c. In terms of the testimonials to be submitted as specified by the Commission, the prior teaching experience letters and/or certificates ought to have been issued by the competent authority, which had been specified to be office of the District Inspector of Schools along with adequate proof that they were working in substantive posts;

4. Thus, even if these documents were considered to be correct, they were clearly unacceptable as they were issued beyond the cut-off date.
5. Mr. Dey, learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos. 9 and 10, submits that the documents at pages 77, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87 and 92 are all suspicious.
6. Mr. Guha, learned advocate appearing for the State authorities, has filed a report which is taken on record. He submits that there are no such substantive posts in Khadaghosh High School (H.S.) and their document at page 92 is extremely suspicious.
7. I have heard the learned advocates for the parties.
8. The document at page 92 is certainly a suspicious document for various reasons on which, need not deliberated at the moment, however, even if the document is taken to be genuine, the same would not be acceptable as it was issued on October 29, 2025, much beyond the cut-off date.
9. Insofar as the other documents are concerned, as submitted by the various petitioners, the said documents are all beyond the cut-off date and cannot be construed as valid documents, which ought to have been considered by the authorities while deciding the eligibility of the petitioners herein.

10. There is just one document which is within the stipulated date, issued sometime in June, 2023. However, this document is clearly not within the parameters set forth by the Commission and fails to meet the benchmark of a valid document, which as specified, has to be issued by the District Inspector of Schools. This document, which is within the cut-off date, has been issued by the headmaster, who is not the designated authority.
11. None of the petitioners can be construed to have shown adequate proof of their past/prior service which would constitute a benchmark for experience for being allotted a further 10 marks as stipulated in the aforestated notification of May, 2025.
12. The petitioners are wholly ineligible insofar as the experience is concerned and no further marks can be allotted to them or even be considered for being allotted to them at this belated stage.
13. In view of the aforestated, the writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed.
14. There shall be no order as to costs.
15. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)