

13.02.2026
Item No.23
Court No.11
KCP

**MAT 2158 of 2025
with
IA No. CAN 1 of 2025**

**Firdousi Khatun
- Versus -
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Uday Sankar Chattopadhyay
Mr. Pronay Basak
Ms. Bidisha Chakraborty
Ms. Sadia Parveen
... for the Appellant

Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay, Ld. Sr. Stng. Consl.
Mr. Vivekananda Bose, Jr. S.C.
Mr. Sandip Dasgupta
Ms. Mahima Cholera
Mr. Niket Ojha
... for the State

Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharyya
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh
... for the WBCSSC

Ms. Koyeli Bhattacharyya
Mr. Bibek Dutta
Mr. Manas Bhattacharyya
..... For the W.B.B.S.E.

The present appeal has been preferred challenging an order dated 2nd December, 2025 passed by the learned single Judge in a writ petition being WPA 27265 of 2025.

Mr. Chattopadhyay, learned advocate appearing for the appellant submits that the appellant participated in the 1st SLST, 2016 and emerged to be successful and was accordingly appointed to the post of an assistant teacher in Home Science (PG). On the basis

of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court the appellant's appointment was cancelled, however, liberty was granted to the appellant to participate in the fresh selection process. The Commission, thereafter, conducted the 2nd SLST, 2025 and the appellant was allowed to participate in the said examination for the post of an assistant teacher in Home Science (PG). In the 1st SLST, 2016 there were three notified vacancies, two reserved for OBC-A and one reserved for OBC-B. The appellant being an OBC-A candidate, having emerged to be successful was accordingly given appointment. Surprisingly, in the 2nd SLST, 2025 though the appellant has emerged to be successful she is being denied appointment on a purported plea that there is only one vacancy in the said subject under SC category and as such, the appellant being an OBC-A category candidate cannot be accommodated. For such alleged lack of vacancies, the appellant cannot suffer.

We find substance in such argument of Mr. Chattopadhyay, however, Mr. Bhattacharyya, learned advocate appearing for the Commission submits that as regards information regarding vacancy status, Board and the State Government are answerable.

Ms. Bhattacharyya, learned advocate and Mr. Ojha, learned advocate enter appearance on behalf of the Board and the State respondents respectively.

Answering our query, Mr. Chattopadhyay submits that by the dint of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the appellant would continue in service till 31st August, 2026.

Upon hearing the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties and considering the materials on record, we are of the opinion that the application for appropriate orders needs to be decided upon exchange of affidavits but prior to 31st August, 2026.

Accordingly, the respondents are directed to file their affidavit-in-opposition dealing with the averments made in the application for appropriate orders and the supplementary affidavit positively by 27th February, 2026. Reply thereto, if any, be filed within 10th March, 2026.

List the matter for further consideration under the same heading in the daily supplementary list of this Court on 16th March, 2026.

(Partha Sarathi Chatterjee, J.) (Tapabrata Chakraborty, J.)