



2024:CHC-AS:2271-DB

S/L 12 to 21
24.02.2026
Court No.04
B.K.N

C.P.A.N. 648 of 2025

Sanjib Das

Vs.

Arup Sengupta & Anr.

In

F.M.A. 407 of 2021

Sanjib Das

Vs.

State of West Bengal & Ors.

With

C.P.A.N. 675 of 2025

Madan Chandra Bag

Vs.

Arup Sengupta & Anr.

In

F.M.A. 268 of 2021

Madan Chandra Bag

Vs.

State of West Bengal

With

C.P.A.N. 681 of 2025

Astu Charan Ghanti

Vs.

Arup Sengupta & Anr.

In

F.M.A. 635 of 2020

Astu Charan Ghanti

Vs.

State of West Bengal & Ors.

With

C.P.A.N. 687 of 2025

Madhabi Das

Vs.

Arup Sengupta & Anr.

In

F.M.A. 406 of 2021

Madhabi Das

Vs.

State of West Bengal & Ors.



With

C.P.A.N. 689 of 2025

Ram Prasad Das

Vs.

Arup Sengupta & Anr.

In

F.M.A. 389 of 2021

Ram Prasad Das

Vs.

State of West Bengal & Ors.

With

C.P.A.N. 692 of 2025

Sanjay Kumar Malik

Vs.

Arup Sengupta & Anr.

In

F.M.A. 404 of 2021

Sanjay Kumar Malik

Vs.

State of West Bengal & Ors.

With

C.P.A.N. 697 of 2025

Goutam Pakira

Vs.

Arup Sengupta & Anr.

In

F.M.A. 646 of 2020

Goutam Pakira

Vs.

State of West Bengal & Ors.

With

C.P.A.N. 702 of 2025

Bimal Kumar Ruidas

Vs.

Arup Sengupta & Anr.

In

F.M.A. 259 of 2021

Bimal Kumar Ruidas

Vs.

State of West Bengal & Ors.



With
C.P.A.N. 705 of 2025
Sukumar Malick
Vs.
Arup Sengupta & Anr.
In
F.M.A. 269 of 2021
Sukumar Mallick
Vs.
State of West Bengal & Ors.

With
C.P.A.N. 723 of 2025
Radheshyam Das
Vs.
Arup Sengupta & Anr.
In
F.M.A. 390 of 2021
Radheshyam Das
Vs.
State of West Bengal & Ors.

*Mr. Subir Sanyal, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Biswarup Biswas,
Mr. Kamal Mishra,
Mr. Pratap Sanfui*

... for the applicants/writ petitioners.

*Mr. Biswabrata Basu Mallick,
Mr. Biman Halder
Mr. Amman Arif Ansari*

... for the Alleged Contemnor No. 2/D.P.S.C, Hooghly.

1. We have heard the learned senior advocate representing the applicant as well as the learned advocate representing the D.P.S.C, Hooghly.
2. The learned advocate for the D.P.S.C, Hooghly has filed a report in the form of affidavit wherein there is a specific averment that the petitioners have obtained less than the cut off marks (38.0772). The marks obtained by all the applicants are disclosed in a list of appellants containing the total score obtained by the applicants. The list contains the marks of all the applicants which



we have found to be below 38.0772. The petitioners were awarded the following marks:

1. Sanjib Das ---- 36.006
2. Madan Chandra Bag ---- 34.906
3. Astu Charan Ghanti ---- 33.272
4. Madhabi Das ---- 35.361
5. Ram Prasad Das ---- 33.122
6. Sanjay Kumar Malik ---- 33.967
7. Goutam Pakira ---- 33.389
8. Bimal Kumar Ruidas ---- 35.200
9. Sukumar Malick ---- 32.044
10. Radheshyam Das ---- 25.594

3. Having found such situation transparently emerging from the list filed alongwith the compliance report we were inclined to close the contempt proceedings.
4. The learned advocate, however, appearing for the applicants sought an opportunity to file an exception. Thereafter, an exception was filed.
5. Today when the matter is taken up, the learned senior advocate submits that the cut off marks which has been made the basis of excluding the petitioner is cut off marks for the General Category; and there is no publication of the panel.
6. We invited the learned senior advocate to substantiate such submission with reference to averments made in the exception filed. Having gone through the same, he is not in a position to show that any such averment is



made in the exception regarding cut off for General Category being made the basis to exclude the present applicants who is a member/s of Schedule Caste Category.

7. The directions contained in the order, contempt of which is alleged was to prepare a merit wise panel and include all candidates if they are found having obtained more marks than cut off marks. Exercise having completed and list enclosed with the affidavit of compliance, there is no scope for proceeding further in the contempt proceedings.
8. We, however, leave it open to the writ petitioners to agitate any grievance with reference to their disqualification, in appropriate proceeding in accordance with law, if so advised.
9. The contempt application/s is dismissed.
10. Urgent Photostat Certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all necessary formalities.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)