

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA  
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction  
(APPELLATE SIDE)**

**Present:  
The Hon'ble Justice Smita Das De**

**WPA 27956 of 2025**

**Ayan Paul  
Vs.  
Union of India & Ors.**

**For the petitioner** : Ms. Tanuka Basu,  
: Mr. Tanmoy Chakraborty,  
: Ms. S. Fasih,  
Mr. Partho Proteem Das.

**For the Respondent No.1-4** : Mr. Imran Siddhiqui,  
: Mr. Aritra Shankar Roy.

**Heard on** : **09/12/2025**

**Judgment on** : **09/12/2025**

**Smita Das De, J.:-**

1. The instant writ petition challenges inter alia, the order dated 18.11.2025 wherein the candidature of the petitioner was rejected solely on the ground that the Domicile District was found to be mismatched with the online application form submitted by the petitioner.
2. Apropos the facts of the instant case is that, the petitioner applied for the post of Constable (GD) in CAPFs pursuant to a Notification dated 05.09.2024.

3. The application was submitted correctly by mentioning the permanent and correspondence addresses as 'North 24 Parganas'. The petitioner had successfully cleared all the stages including PET and PST and was thereafter shortlisted on merit accordingly.
4. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that at the stage of verification of the documents, the candidature of the petitioner was rejected by an order 18.11.2025 on the sole ground of mismatch of 'District of Domicile' with the online application form submitted by the petitioner which is reproduced below:-

*“You have failed to established the name of the district of domicile as mentioned in online application and found variation.”*
5. The learned Counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner never had any mala fide intention to mislead and take any advantage of the situation since the identity of domicile of the eligibility remains undisputed. The error was committed solely based on a clerical and technical issue and the same was uploaded inadvertently as 'Kolkata' instead of 'North 24 Parganas'.
6. It is also submitted that the recruitment process shall be held on 09.12.2025 and shall have no further occasion to agitate the same before the authority concerned for redressal.
7. The learned Counsel for the petitioner relies upon the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Vashist Narayan Kumar Vs. State of**

**Bihar & Ors.** reported in **(2024) 11 SCC 785** specially paragraphs Nos. 15 and 19 which is reproduced below:-

*“15. Recently this Bench in Divya vs. Union of India & Ors., while declining relief to candidates who acquired eligibility after the date mentioned in the notification carved out a narrow exception. There, the judgment in Ajay Kumar Mishra vs. Union of India & Ors., a case very similar to the facts of the present case, was noted. In Ajai Kumar Mishra (supra), Indira Banerjee, J. (as Her Ladyship then was) speaking for the Division Bench of the Delhi High Court in para 9 stated as under:-*

*9. It is true that whenever any material discrepancy is noticed in the application form and/or when any suppression and/ or misrepresentation is detected, the candidature might be cancelled even after the application has been processed and the candidate has been allowed to participate in the selection process. However, after a candidate has participated in the selection process and cleared all the stages successfully, his candidature can only be cancelled, after careful scrutiny of the gravity of the lapse, and not for trivial omissions or errors.” (emphasis supplied)*

*The exception for trivial errors or omissions is for the reason that law does not concern itself with trifles. This principle is recognized in the legal maxim - De minimis non curat lex.*

*19. In this case, the appellant has participated in the selection process and cleared all the stages successfully. The error in the application is trivial which did not play any part in the selection process. The State was not justified in making a mountain out of this molehill. Perhaps the rarefied atmosphere of the cybercafe, got the better of the appellant. He omitted to notice the error and even failed to avail the corrective mechanism offered. In the instant case, we cannot turn a Nelson's eye to the ground realities that existed. In the order dated 22.11.2021 [Prince Jaibir Singh vs. Union of India & Ors.], this Court rightly observed that though technology is a great enabler, there is at the same time, a digital divide.”*

8. It is also held in the case **Manjana vs. State of H.P. & Ors. (2025:HHC:14299)** that “Gravity of lapse to be taken into consideration, candidate cannot be cancelled for trivial error in application form”.
9. The learned counsel for the Union of India is unable to make any submission to contradict the same.
10. After careful consideration of the submissions made by the parties, I am of the considered view that the petitioner has successfully cleared all the stages including PET and PST and has been shortlisted on merit. Therefore, solely on the ground of committing an error in mentioning the District of Domicile the petitioner cannot be penalized.

11. It is well-settled proposition of law that for an insignificant error committed inadvertently, does not constitute any misrepresentation or suppression and therefore cannot be a ground to penalize someone which does not make any difference to the ultimate result. Candidates application cannot be rejected for trivial or inadvertent mistaken in an online form. If a candidate inadvertently mentions wrong district but can prove their correct domicile states and meets all other requirements, the rejection of the candidature may be challenged based on the principle that trivial error should not be a ground for disqualification. The Maxim *De minimis no curat lex* a legal principle meaning thereby that “the law does not concern itself with trifles,” suggesting that insignificant matters should not interfere with the administration of justice.
12. Mere rejecting a qualified candidate for minor error may violate Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The principles of fairness, equity, and minimal interference, the Court ensures that deserving candidates should not be unjustly penalized for minor, non-impactful mistakes.
13. In view of the above, the order of rejection dated 18.11.2025 is hereby set aside directing, inter alia, the authorities to furnish the medical report to the petitioner by 12.12.2025, which was held on 17.11.2025. In the event, if he is found to be eligible, in compliance of

all the formalities, he should be allowed to get the appointment for the post in question.

14. With the above observation and directions, this writ petition WPA 27956 of 2025 is disposed of.
15. Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be furnished expeditiously.

**(Smita Das De, J.)**