## ORDER SHEET

## WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

## Present-

The Hon'ble Justice Soumitra Pal (Chairman)
\& The Hon'ble Mr. P. Ramesh Kumar (Administrative Member)
Case No - OA 1187 OF 2017
SUKHEN GHOSH + 14 ORS. Vs The State of West Bengal \& Ors.


| Serial No. and Date of order. 1 | Order of the Tribunal with signature $2$ | Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | had adopted unfair means of pick and choose policy as per their whims which is nothing but an act of abuse of process of law. Further in paragraph 6 (h) it has been stated as under : <br> "......There are instances when candidates securing lesser marks and less meritorious is being selected for appointment depriving the present applicants $\qquad$ Since, the respondents does not adopt a fair policy and does not secure transparency in the process of selection all these illegality has been allowed to happen." <br> It is submitted by Mr. D. Pal, learned advocate for the applicant that as there are numerous instances of placing a lowly placed candidate above the successful candidates in the merit list, the Tribunal should pass appropriate order restraining the respondents from proceeding with the filling up of the post of Constable (Male) in the West Bengal Police. <br> Mr. G.P. Banerjee, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that in the application it has been incorrectly stated that the respondents have failed to publish the panel of selected |  |


| Serial No. and Date of order. 1 | Order of the Tribunal with signature $2$ | Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | candidates as results were published on $7^{\text {th }}$ July, 2017 and was posted in the website on $10^{\text {th }}$ July, 2017 as evident from the four advertisements published in four daily newspapers. Copies of the said advertisements are furnished in Court today which are kept on record. Let the same be furnished to the learned advocate for the applicant. <br> It is further submitted on instruction that fifteen applicants, who have filed this original application, have not been selected as all of them got below the total marks obtained by the last selected candidate in each of the categories. A list showing comparative statement of marks is furnished in Court today. Let it be kept on record. Let a copy of the same be furnished to the learned advocate for the applicant. <br> Heard Mr. Pal and Mr. Banerjee. It is clear that though it has been stated that the respondents have failed to publish the panel of selected candidates, it is evident that results were declared on $7^{\text {th }}$ July 2017 which were put up in the website on $10^{\text {th }}$ July, 2017 as evident from the newspaper advertisements. <br> It is also evident that the applicants were not selected in their respective categories as they secured lower marks than the last selected candidate. Further it is |  |

## ORDER SHEET

| Serial No. and <br> Date of order. <br> 1 | Order of the Tribunal with signature <br> SCN | effice action with date <br> and dated signature <br> of parties when necessary <br> 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| on "apprehension" which cannot be the basis of filing an |  |  |
| application. Though the applicants have referred to |  |  |
| instances "when candidates securing lesser marks and less |  |  |
| meritorious candidate is being selected for appointment |  |  |
| depriving the present applicants" in this regard not a |  |  |
| single example has been given. For the reasons as |  |  |
| aforesaid there is no merit in the application. Hence, the |  |  |
| application is dismissed. |  |  |

