

1st April., 2026

Item no.D/L 11
Court No. 18

Pradip, A.R.(Ct.)

In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Case No. **WPA 18818 of 2024**

In the matter of :
Sabera Khatun *.... Petitioner*
VS.
The State of West Bengal & Ors. *....Respondents*

For the Petitioner:
Ms. Santi Das
Mr. N.K. Roy
Ms. Satabdi Das *....Advocates*

For the State:
Mr. Debraj Sahu *....Advocate*

For the Private Respondent:
Mr. Aliul Islam *....Advocate*

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.
2. Leave granted to the learned advocate on record of the private respondent to file vakalatnama in the department in course of the day.
3. The petitioner participated for selection as ASHA in the recruitment process of the year 2023. She is aggrieved by the manner in which cent percent marks have been awarded to the private respondents in the interview by two of the interviewers.
4. From the final tally sheet annexed at Page-30 of the writ petition, it appears that the grand total is out of hundred marks. Ninety percent weightage is given to academics and ten percent in the interview.

5. The petitioner was awarded 49.84 marks in academics and only 1.75 marks in the interview. The private respondent was awarded 44.35 marks in academics and 9.25 marks in the interview.
6. According to the petitioner, as there are four interviewers, the candidates could not be awarded ten marks by two of them. Awarding of full marks in the interview has been questioned.
7. Learned advocate representing the State respondents submits, upon instruction that, after calculating the grand total by adding the marks obtained by the candidates in academics and interview, the private respondent has been found to have scored more marks than the petitioner and, accordingly, appointment was given to the private respondent long back.
8. Upon hearing the parties and on perusal of the documents annexed to the writ petition, it appears that four interviewers interviewed the petitioner and the private respondent. The marks given by each of them are disclosed in the final tally sheet and the signatures of the interviewers are also inscribed therein. Though the petitioner scored more marks in academics but failed to compete with the private respondent as she scored more marks in the interview.
9. The Court is unable to accept the submission of the petitioner that there has been incorrect assessment of marks provided by the interviewers in the selection process.
10. In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the instant writ petition. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
11. Parties to act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

12. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)