



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.10367 of 2025

Date of Decision: 09.04.2025

Manjinder Kaur

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- Mr. Parth Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

The petitioner has been declared ineligible for the post of Craft Instructor (Women) Fashion Technology. Faced with such ineligibility, she challenges the provisions of the Industrial Training Department, Haryana, Field Officers (Group-C) Service Rules, 2013 and the Appendix-B-2 appended to the same which provides the qualifications for Craft Instructor (Women) Fashion Technology.

2. Learned counsel submits that for the post of Craft Instructor Fashion Technology, the NTC Certificate acquired in the subject of Embroidery and Needle Work, Cutting and Tailoring ought to have been included for the purpose of treating such candidates having NTC Certificate of Embroidery and Needle Work, Cutting and Tailoring eligible



for the post. Similarly, he further submits that even those who possess NTC Certificate in Cutting and Tailoring also should be included for the purpose of eligibility for the post of Craft Instructor, Fashion Technology.

3. Learned counsel also submits that once the respondents themselves have introduced a Teachers Training Course in Fashion Technology for the duration of two years where they allow the candidates to participate, holding NTC/STC in Cutting & Sewing or Embroidery and Needle Work or Dress Making or Fashion Technology as eligible, there is no reason for not including the afore-said NTC Certificate in Cutting & Sewing or Embroidery or Needle Work or Dress Making as sufficient qualifications for the post of Craft Instructor, Fashion Technology.

4. Learned counsel further submits that the requirement under the Appendix-B-2 to possess only NTC/NAC Certificate in Fashion Technology and CITC/TTC Certificate in Fashion Technology cannot have any nexus and the petitioner ought to be treated as eligible.

5. We have noticed the afore-said submissions and reject the same. At the threshold, this Court would not be treated as an expert Body to assign the necessary qualifications for recruitment of a particular post. The same is an exclusive domain of the Administrative Authorities. Further, granting equivalence of different subjects is also not our domain of judicial review. On the said reason that equivalence has not been granted, the rule or provisions of Appendix as in the present case, cannot be declared *ultra vires* to the rule. It is not the case where the power is not



available with the Authorities to lay down the qualifications. Whatever qualifications the employer wants for a particular post, has to be accepted. It is also noticed that the petitioner had himself applied for both the posts of Craft Instructor, Dress Making as well as Fashion Technology but failed to obtain necessary minimum marks for selection for the post of Craft Instructor, Dress Making. For the post of Fashion Technology, admittedly, the petitioner does not possess the qualification of NTC in Fashion Technology and the 02 years TTC Certificate in Fashion Technology is different from NTC in Fashion Technology Course necessary for Craft Teacher.

6. In these circumstances, she is not eligible for consideration for the post of Instructor in Fashion Technology. The order dated 23.02.2024 passed by the respondents does not warrant any interference. The writ petition challenging the said order is found to be mis-conceived and is, accordingly, dismissed.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

April 09, 2025
Yag Dutt

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No