

13-02-2026
Item No.16
Subrata
Bhattacharyya
AR(C)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

WPA No.28025 of 2024

Dipankar Deb & Ors.

-vs-

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Ashis Kumar Chowdhury
Mr. Rohan Paul
Mr. Babhru Bahan Bera
Mr. Siddhartha Roy ...for the petitioners

Dr. Sutanu Kumar Patra
Ms. Supriya Dubey ...for the Commission

Mr. Sayan Ganguly ...for the State

1. The petitioners participated in the recruitment process of upper primary teachers conducted by the West Bengal Central School Service Commission in the year 2016. They challenged the said recruitment process. Direction was passed upon the Commission to provide opportunity of hearing to the aggrieved candidates. The petitioners were duly heard; and it was found that the petitioners secured less marks than the cut-off. For the same, the petitioners have been found to be unsuccessful in the said process. The petitioners are aggrieved by the same.
2. Submission is that the candidates possessing D.El.Ed. qualification ought to have been given preference over the candidates possessing B.Ed qualification.
3. The West Bengal Central School Service Commission (Selection for Appointment to the Posts of Teachers for Upper Primary Level of

Schools) Rules, 2016 has been relied on.

4. Learned counsel for the Commission submits that the petitioners being unsuccessful in the recruitment process have approached this Court to unsettle the settled position.
5. Upon hearing the respective parties and on perusal of the materials placed before this Court, it appears that the petitioners participated in the recruitment process relying on the 2016 rules. The grievance raised by the petitioners was duly heard by the Commission and it was detected that the petitioners failed to secure the cut-off marks.
6. The petitioners fail to refer to any rule which mentions that candidates possessing D.El.Ed qualification is to be given preference over B.Ed qualification. The score sheets of the petitioners are annexed to the writ petition. It appears that the petitioners have been given full marks on account of professional score.
7. The cause of action for filing the instant writ petition appears to have arisen in the year 2021 when the petitioners case stood rejected while the writ petition has been filed in 2024.
8. The Court is not satisfied with the ground(s) made out by the writ petitioners seeking interference.
9. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
10. Receipt showing payment of deficit court fees and affidavit of service filed by the petitioners be taken on record.
11. Certified copy of this order, if applied for, shall be made available to the parties.

[Amrita Sinha, J]

