

17.03.2026
Sl. No.22
tkm

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI**

W. P. A. 363 of 2026

[Pradip Kumar Roy -Vs- State of West Bengal & Ors.]

Ms. Esha Acharya
... .. for the petitioner

Ms. Bedashruti Bose
Mr. Kumar Santanu
... for the State

Mr. Sourav Ganguly
Ms. Rishita Chakraborty
... for respondent nos. 5-7

Mr. Bikramaditya Ghosh
... for the primary board

1. The affidavit of service is taken on record.
2. The petitioner has preferred the present writ petition, alleging inaction on the part of the respondent authorities in not considering petitioner's applications dated 25.9.2025 and 7.11.2025 seeking transfer from Jamadar Para SC primary School.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was initially appointed as assistant teacher in Bairagipara Additional Primary School and was subsequently promoted to the post of head teacher and transferred to his current place of posting.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been

diagnosed with lumbar disc prolapse L4-L5 and has been advised to avoid prolonged sitting, standing and traveling. It is further submitted that the present school of the petitioner is located approximately 27 kms away from his permanent residence and in the absence of direct transportation, he is compelled to travel the said distance daily by motorcycle, which has led to a deterioration in his medical condition. In such circumstances, the petitioner has sought transfer from Jamadar Para SC Primary School to any nearby school by way of representations dated 25.9.2025 and 7.11.2025. However, no decision has yet been taken on the petitioner's said representations.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the competent authority has no objection to the representation of the petitioner being considered and decided in accordance with law.
6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner shall be satisfied if the same is done within a time-bound manner.
7. Having considered the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and without going

into the merits of the claim of the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed of by directing the respondent no. 7 to consider and decide petitioner's representations dated 25.9.2025 and 7.11.2025 in accordance with law and in terms of the relevant rules by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a period of four weeks from the date of communication of this order. However, it is made clear that this court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the claim of the petitioner and all issues are left open to be decided by the competent authority in accordance with law.

8. With the above directions, the present writ petition stands disposed of.
9. Since no affidavit-in-opposition has been called for, the allegations made in the writ petition shall be deemed to have been denied.

(Gaurang Kanth, J.)