

Item No.- 33
23.03.2026
Court No. 24
Rohan

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

WPA 29011 of 2025

**Soumita Chakraborty
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Tilak Mitra
Mr. Soumon Nanda
Mr. Darpan Dutta

... for the Petitioner

Ms. Tapati Samanta

... 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

1. The petitioner submits that an error made by her in filling up her form has resulted in her disqualification in as much as she could have got 10 marks in place of 8 and thereby qualified.
2. That the petitioner was not careful enough while filling up the form is fairly admitted by Mr. Mitra, learned advocate appearing for the petitioner. However, he adds that the petitioner had taken all necessary steps including intimating the respondents immediately, which was ignored by the respondents.

3. The first of such letters was written by the petitioner in September, 2025. The petitioner approached this Court only in December, 2025.
4. Mr. Bhattacharya, learned advocate appearing for the Commission, submits that there is no right of the petitioner which has been violated or any duty of the respondents which it has breached. In the absence of either of the above, the writ petition ought not be entertained.
5. I have heard the learned advocates for the parties.
6. It is unfortunate that the petitioner, could have been a successful candidate, if her actual marks were considered. However, this unfortunate bit cannot be foisted on the respondent's breach of duty nor can it create a right in favour of the petitioner which she did not otherwise have.
7. The petitioner ought to have been more diligent and approached the Court at an appropriate time to seek any reliefs. Presently, any order directing the respondents to rectify the petitioner's form and proceed to consider the writ petitioner's candidature would cause a complete disruption of the entire process of the SLST, 2025. The petitioner having made a mistake, which can be attributed only to her, cannot be given further right to be considered in the SLST, 2025.

8. In view of the aforestated, the writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed.
9. No order as to costs.
10. 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.)