

ORDER SHEET

WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake, Kolkata – 700 091.

Present-

THE HON'BLE SAYEED AHMED BABA, OFFICIATING CHAIRPERSON AND ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER,

Case No. - OA 80 OF 2024

RANAJIT HALDER & OTHERS - Vs - THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & OTHERS.

Serial No. and
Date of order

02
29.08.2024

For the Applicants : Mr. Arka Maiti
Advocate

For the Respondent No. 4 : Mr. Sankha Ghosh
(P & AR Department) Advocate

For the Public Service : Mr. Sourav Bhattacharjee
Commission, West Bengal Advocate

The matter is taken up by the Single Bench pursuant to the order contained in the Notification No. 638-WBAT/2J-15/2016 (Pt.-II) dated 23rd November, 2022 issued in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 5 (6) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

On consent of the learned counsels for the contesting parties, the case is taken up for consideration sitting singly.

Mr.Maiti, learned counsel submitted the prayers of the application which was partially responded to by Mr.Ghosh and Mr.Bhattacharjee, learned counsels appearing on behalf of the P & AR Department and the Public Service Commission. Stress has been laid on the primary prayer of the applicants which is as under:

“a. Pass an order directing the respondent Public Service Commission, West Bengal to recast the panel published through notices dated June 15, 2022; July 6, 2022; June 7th 2023; July 20, 2023; September 29, 2023; October 12, 2023 and December 12, 2023 by which reserved category candidates having more marks than the last empanelled unreserved category candidates have been recommended against reserved vacancies.”

While submitting, Mr.Maity also emphasis a point as an example

ORDER SHEET

Form No.

RANAJIT HALDER & OTHERS

Vs.

Case No : **OA 80 OF 2024**

THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & OTHERS.

that one successful candidate, Amit Raha, belonging to OBC-B Category, should have been recommended against the UR Category due to his higher scoring.

After perusal of the documents in this application, the Tribunal finds that the list of candidates called for computer test includes the names of the applicants also, but such list does not show any marks obtained by them. Further, this list is the list of the candidates who were called for computer type test. What is essential and required is a list of the candidates who had been successful in such computer type test. The list of the candidates called to appear for computer type test does not serve the purpose.

In view of the above observation, the Tribunal advises the Public Service Commission to file a reply against this application including the aggregate marks scored by the last successful candidate against each group.

Let the matter appear under the heading 'Hearing' on 5th February, 2025.

(SAYEED AHMED BABA)
OFFICIATING CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBER (A)

BLR