

WPA 194 of 2026

Anyatrika Roy
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Debasish Banerjee
Mr. Devranjan Das
Mr. Apurba Kolya
.... for the petitioner

Mr. Arjun Roy Mukherjee
Ms. Sucheta Banerjee
.... for the State

Mr. Kalyan Bandopadhyay, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharaya
Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh
..... for the WBCSSC

Mr. Kunal Ganguly
..... for the WBBSE

1. Let affidavit-of-service, as filed in Court, be kept on record.
2. The petitioner is an unsuccessful candidate in the second SLST examination held sometime in September, 2025. The petitioner's grievance is that she was unable to fill up the particulars under the OBC-B category and filled the same under the General category.
3. Mr. Banerjee, learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner, submits that the categorization was not there at the initial stage and though the window

for such categorization was subsequently made and opened to be edited between July and August, 2025, the petitioner was unable to edit and classify her categorization from General to OBC-B category.

4. The petitioner has presently filed this writ petition sometime in November, 2025, seeking inter alia, the portal be opened to enable the petitioner to edit her categorization and be considered under the OBC-B category.
5. Mr. Bandopadhyay, learned senior Advocate appearing for the Commission, submits that sufficient time was given to the petitioner and the persons, similarly situated as the petitioner, to edit their application forms in the online portal. In spite of such time being given, the petitioner was unable to edit the form and has applied under the category that she now seeks i.e. OBC-B category.
6. I have heard the learned Advocates appearing for the parties. The decision reported in MAT 2115 of 2025 (The West Bengal Central School Service Commission & Ors. Vs. Somnath Pramanik & Ors.) made in the facts and circumstances of that case and the portal had been opened for a period of 24 hours only, in view of the request made by the Bench. In fact, that order pertained to only

those candidates who had filed writ petitions by 2:30P.M. on the date of the order i.e. December 16, 2025. The said order cannot be and was indeed not made to be treated as a precedent as specifically entailed in the order itself.

7. I am also informed that the order in MAT 17 of 2026 passed by the second Division Bench opening the portal for a further period was carried in appeal to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and has been stayed by the order dated March 16, 2026, a copy whereof has been handed up in Court and is kept on record.
8. The petitioner, meritorious as she may be, is an unsuccessful candidate and cannot be permitted to alter her position for her benefit, in the manner that she now seeks. This would open the flood gates for all such candidates.
9. The petitioner cannot be permitted to seek a modification of her application form on the alleged ground that she was unable to edit the form, even when sufficient time had been given to the candidates to edit their respective forms. This would create an administrative mayhem.
10. In view of the aforestated findings and observations, I do not find any reason to entertain the instant writ petition.
11. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

12. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

13. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)