

S/L 12
23.03.2026
Court No.18
SD

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 10929 of 2025

Sikha Sarkar

Vs.

The Chairman, Staff Selection Commission & Ors.

Mr. Debasish Kundu
Mr. Sayan Mukherjee
Mr. Bidan Modak

...for the Petitioner.

Ms. Sunita Sarkar

...for the Union of India.

1. The petitioners participated for appointment as Constable (GD) in CAPF. Though she cleared all stages of the recruitment examination-2024, her name has been published in the list of withheld candidates by the Staff Selection Commission due to pendency of Court case.
2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the same.
3. It has been submitted that the appeal was preferred long back and no steps have been taken by the authority to get the appeal heard. Because of the pendency of the appeal, the petitioner is not being provided appointment. She is losing her monthly salary as well as her seniority in service.
4. Prayer has been made to direct the authority to appoint the petitioner in the job.
5. Learned advocate for the respondents relies on the report prepared by the Commandant at the office of the Inspector General of Police, Salt Lake. In paragraph 3 of the said report it has been averred that the Court orders have already been examined by the

respondents and the competent authority has directed to comply with the Court orders dated December 4, 2024 and December 5, 2024 respectively subject to the outcome of the legal remedy already communicated to the petitioner vide letter dated December 10, 2024 through the learned advocate. The appeal preferred by the respondents being MAT 1692 of 2025 is pending consideration before the Hon'ble Division Bench.

6. After hearing the submission made on behalf of both the parties, the Court is of the opinion that the appointment of the petitioner ought not to be stalled merely because of pendency of an appeal preferred by the authority.

7. It appears that the appeal was preferred more than a year back but till date no steps have been taken to get the matter heard. The petitioner is actually losing her salary as well as her seniority in service for not being provided appointment despite being successful in the PST, PET, DME and RME.

8. The concerned authority is, accordingly, directed to take necessary steps to provide appointment to the petitioner, subject however to the result of the appeal.

9. Steps shall be taken in the matter at the earliest but positively within a period of eight weeks from the date of communication of this order.

10. The writ petition stands disposed of.

11. Parties to act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)