

S/L 17
13.02.2026
Court No.18
SD

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 28062 of 2024

Md. Nasiruddin Khan

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Biswarup Biswas

...for the Petitioner.

Mr. Sabyasachi Mondal

...for the State.

Dr. Sutanu Kumar Patra

Ms. Supriya Dubey

...for the WBCSSC.

1. Exception filed by the petitioner to the affidavit filed by the Commission in Court today be retained with the records.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by awarding of marks in the recruitment process of Headmaster conducted by the West Bengal Central School Service Commission.

3. Submission of the petitioner is that he possesses two graduation and two post-graduation certificates; one with marks below 60% and the other with marks above 60%. He alleges that the Commission considered the post-graduation certificate of the petitioner with lower marks ignoring the certificate with higher marks.

4. It has been contended that if certificate with more marks is taken into consideration, then the petitioner would be entitled to three more marks which will take him beyond the cut-off marks.

5. The Commission has filed an affidavit enclosing the online application form filed by the petitioner wherein he clearly mentions that the marks obtained by him in the post graduate level are between 50% to 60%.

6. The petitioner was called for verification of testimonials when the petitioner attended and put his signature in the attendance sheet. The marks secured by the petitioner in the post graduate level also mentions that he secured marks less than 60%. The University where the petitioner acquired the post graduate degree is also mentioned in the check list for verification of testimonials which has been annexed to the affidavit filed by the Commission.

7. Learned advocate for the Commission submits that had the petitioner produced the certificate with more marks at the time of credential verification and had mentioned about the said certificate at the time of filing of the application, then the same could have been considered by the Commission.

8. Specific submission of the Commission is that there is no scope to consider two certificates simultaneously. The petitioner ought to have relied on the certificate with more marks.

9. Upon hearing the submission made on behalf of both the parties, it appears that even though the petitioner claims to possess two post-graduation

certificates, for reasons best known, he mentioned about the certificate with lesser marks in the application form and also produced the same certificate at the time of credential verification. The petitioner did not disclose the certificate with higher marks throughout the entire selection process.

10. The application form of the petitioner mentions that he secured marks less than 60% in the post-graduation level. The Commission has awarded marks and assessed the merit of the petitioner taking into consideration the score declared by him. The Commission cannot predict that a candidate may have more than one certificates, that too, with more marks. It is for the candidate to disclose information of his qualification properly.

11. The submission by the petitioner that the certificate with higher marks ought to be taken into consideration, cannot be accepted, as the petitioner himself failed to disclose the said marks at the time of filing the application form.

12. In view of the above, no relief can be granted in the instant writ petition. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

13. Certified copy of this order, if applied for, shall be made available to the parties.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)