

30.03.2026
Sl. No.27
Ct. No.14
gd

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE**

WPA/28624/2024

**Sanjit Kumar Sanfui & Ors.
versus
State of West Bengal & Ors**

Mr. Sankar Prasad Dalapati
Mr. Asumdipta Santra

...for the Petitioners.

Mr. Bhaskar Prasad Vaisya, AGP
Mr. Suman Dey

...for the State.

Mr. Raja Saha
Mr. Sanjay Mukherjee

...for the Respondent No.4.

1. By the present writ petition the petitioners seek for giving appointment to the petitioners for the post of Primary Teachers in light of the order passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No.15253 of 2006 and connected applications filed therewith on 3rd May, 2018 and for submission of Joint Inspection Report made by the West Bengal State Legal Services Authority pursuant to direction of Hon'ble Supreme Court on 21st January, 2020.
2. The petitioners contend that they are Organizer teachers of different primary schools which are being run for imparting primary education at the village level. The petitioners applied for regularisation of their appointment. Since the authority concerned did not

pay any heed to their application, the petitioners preferred a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and ultimately the issue went upto the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave Petition being SLP (C) No.15253 of 2006 filed by the registered association of primary organiser teachers. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 21st January, 2020 directed for joint inspection of the documents, credentials and eligibility of the petitioners by the West Bengal State Legal Services Authority and submit report before the Hon'ble Court. However, such inspection report was not submitted by the West Bengal State Legal Services Authority before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The petitioners made an application under Section 6(1) of the Right to Information Act (*in short RTI Act*), 2005 seeking information in respect of such joint inspection. However, such report was not made available to the petitioners and no order was also passed in such regard by the authority concerned. Being aggrieved by such action of the authority concerned, the petitioners preferred a second appeal before the appropriate authority under Section 19 of the RTI Act, 2005 and ultimately the State Information Commission passed order on 18th July, 2024 holding that the report can be obtained only under the mechanism of Supreme Court rules and the case was closed. Since the petitioners have not been given appointment, they have preferred the present writ petition.

3. Mr. Sankar Prasad Dalapati, learned advocate appearing for the petitioners at the outset submits that the petitioners are not seeking for their appointment as prayed for in prayer no.(a) of the writ petition. The petitioners in the present writ petition precisely challenges the order passed by the State Information Commission in second appeal under the RTI Act, 2005 on 18th July, 2024 and also seek direction for making the Joint Inspection Report available to the petitioners.
4. Mr. Bhaskar Prasad Vaisya, learned advocate for the State respeondent as well as Mr Raja Saha, learned advocate appearing for the State Information Commission-respondent no. 4 indicate that there is no such prayer challenging the order passed by the State Information Commission in the second appeal. Therefore, the writ petition is not at all maintainable.
5. Upon hearing the learned advocate for the petitioners, it appears that principally the petitioner is aggrieved by the order passed by the State Information Commission in the second appeal on 18th July, 2024. It is pertinent to note that there is no such specific prayer in the writ petition challenging such order. Therefore, in light of the aforesaid, the writ petition falls short of merit.
6. Accordingly, the writ petition being **WPA 28624 of 2024** stands dismissed.
7. Petitioners are directed to deposit *advalorem* court fees in terms of order dated 17th December, 2024, if not already paid.

8. Since no affidavits have been called for, the allegation made in the writ petition is deemed to be not admitted.
9. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.
10. All connected applications, if any, stand disposed of.
11. There shall be no order as to costs.
12. All concerned parties shall act in terms of the copy of the order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.
13. Urgent Photostat certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties on compliance of all necessary legal formalities.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)