

AD -608
Ct No.24
28.04.2026
(SSS)

WPA 8230 of 2026

Parameswar Aich
Vs.
The West Bengal Central School
Service Commission and Ors.

Mr. Anindya Lahiri, Snr. Adv.,
Mr. Samrat Dey Paul
....For the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh
.....For the WBCSSC.

1. The petitioner's grievance is that in spite of editing the online application form and applying under the category PH-OH, the petitioner has not been considered as such category but rather as a candidate under the OBC-B category. The petitioner's name does not feature in the interview list which has been published, which necessarily means that there has been a rejection of the petitioner's application in the second SLST, 2025.

2. Mr. Lahiri, learned Senior Adv., appearing for the petitioner submits that the form filled by the petitioner on July 7, 2025 with a payment of Rs.200/- as fees did not contain specifics of any category as there were no such columns in his application form.

3. The form was subsequently edited, when it was inadvertently written as OBC-B by the petitioner and a similar sum of Rs.200/- paid. He contends that his certificate at Page 25 of the petition is clear and unequivocal that the petitioner is a PH-LD category person and the fees paid by him is in respect of PH category only. Had the petitioner intended to file the application form as an OBC-B category candidate, the application fee would have been Rs.500/-. Hence, this is nothing more than an error. He draws further support from the fact that pursuant to the order of this Hon'ble Court, when the edit option was opened for one more day sometime in December, 2025, the petitioner had exercised his option and had duly categorized himself as an PH-OH category candidate from the existing OBC-B which he had edited initially. Hence, he ought to have been considered as a PH-OH candidate by the Commission and his candidature ought not to have been rejected and the name ought to have featured in the interview list.

4. Mr. Singh, learned Advocate appearing for the Commission submits that there are two limbs to the case of the petitioner. First, that the petitioner had inadvertently categorized himself as an OBC-B and upon editing and had further edited in December, 2025 to be classified as a PH-OH.

5. The second limb of the petitioner's case is that even though he has classified himself as a PH-OH category candidate, he is a PH-LD candidate.

6. PH-OH refers to Physically Handicapped Other Handicapped. PH-LD is a special categorization for physically handicapped – Locomotor Handicapped. The petitioner having a certificate for Locomotor Disability (LD) would not have categorized himself as PH-OH. This has been done according to Mr. Singh specifically since there is no vacancy in the category of PH-LD. The only vacancy in this category is reserved for the scheduled caste candidates. Thus, it was not an inadvertent error, but intended as such.

7. He further submits that the petitioner could not have classified himself as a PH-OH in December, 2025 as this would tantamount to a second edit of the online application form which is not permissible. The sequence as mentioned by Mr. Singh is somewhat in this fashion: First, online application form was filled on 7th July, 2025. Second, the application form was edited either in August or in September, 2025 by the petitioner classifying himself as an OBC-B candidate. Having edited the online form, the petitioner could not have edited it on a second occasion in December, 2025.

8. I have heard the learned advocate for the parties. Clearly, this dispute cannot be resolved without calling for affidavits. Let affidavit-in-opposition be filed by May 20, 2026. Reply thereto, shall be filed by June 10, 2026.

9. List this matter in the Monthly Combined List of June, 2026 under the heading “hearing”.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)