

20.02.2026
20
sdas

WPA 28019 of 2025

Mousumi Maiti

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Pallav Chatterjee

Mr. Monajit Chakraborti

..... for the petitioner

Mr. Vimal Kumar Shahi, learned AGP

Ms. Sangeeta Roy

..... for the State

Mr. Nilotpal Chatterjee

Mr. Satyaki Banerjee

..... for the Calcutta University

Mr. Suhrid Sur

..... for the respondent no. 6

1. The petitioner, a student pursuing her masters in Electronic Science from Dinabandhu Andrews College has approached this Court by way of this petition seeking For Self-Inspection (FSI) in the paper of digital signal processing, the examination whereof was held in December, 2019 and the petitioner had duly passed that examination.
2. The petitioner had been unable to clear two papers in December 2019, which she had taken in October, 2020 and cleared the same. The petitioner at no point of time till then, challenged the marks given in the digital signal processing paper. It was only January 13, 2021 that the petitioner made an application seeking FSI.

3. Mr. Pallav Chatterjee, learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner, submits that the University has not considered the application of the petitioner seeking FSI. In fact, he has also referred to a decision of this Hon'ble Court reported in **(2000) 1 CHN 375** (*The University of Calcutta & Ors. Vs. Sk. Monir & Ors.*).
4. Mr. Nilotpal Chatterjee, learned Advocate appearing for the respondent nos. 2 to 5, has submitted that in view of the Notification No. CSR/26/12 of the University of Calcutta, the timelines for making an application for the evaluated answer script for the purpose of FSI is 15 days from the date of publication of the result of the concerned examination. The result in so far as digital signal processing paper was concerned had been published sometime in December, 2019, which had not been challenged or questioned in any manner whatsoever till January, 2021.
5. Mr. Sur, learned Advocate appearing for the respondent no. 6/College, has also made submissions.
6. I have heard the learned Advocates appearing for the parties. Admittedly, the timelines provided by the University, being 15 days from the date of publication of the result has long expired, since the result in the digital signal processing paper

was published in December, 2019, and had never been challenged by the petitioner. The result in so far as the supplementary papers were concerned, made in October, 2020, which has been accepted by the petitioner. The petitioner is, thus, grossly out of time. In so far as the decision relied upon by Mr. Pallav Chatterjee is concerned, the facts of the case were completely different in as much as the matter related to a process where the application for review had already been made by the petitioner/appellant and had been duly concerned by the authorities, which was assailed before this Hon'ble Court. In the present case, there is no application for review and the application for FSI is clearly beyond the stipulated time of 15 days.

7. The petitioner has also slept over her rights as an application for FSI of 2021 has been pursued only in 2025 by way of this writ petition. Prayer of the petitioner cannot be granted at this belated stage on account whereof the writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed.
8. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.
9. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)