



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No.1634 of 2026

Vijayanand Raturi and others --Petitioners

Versus

State of Uttarakhand & Ors. --Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Abhijay Negi, learned counsel for petitioners.

Mr. S.S. Chaudhary, learned Standing Counsel for the State/respondent no.1.

Mr. Pankaj Miglani, learned counsel for respondent no.2.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J. (Oral)

By means of present writ petition, petitioners have challenged the report/recommendation dated 17.02.2026 of the Equivalence Committee whereby one year Certificate Course in Health Sanitary Inspector/Sanitary Inspector issued by National Center of Vocational Training/ITI was treated equivalent to one year Diploma qualification prescribed under the advertisement for recruitment on the post of Sanitary Inspector.

2. It is the case of the petitioners that for the post of Sanitary Inspector, the qualification prescribed in the advertisement for the post of Sanitary Inspector was prescribed as “ B.S.C Degree from any university established by law in India and at least one year Diploma in Hygiene/Sanitation/Sanitary Inspector/Health Sanitary Inspector from any University or Institute recognized by the Center or any State Government.”

3. According to petitioners, they applied for the said post pursuant to the advertisement dated 08.08.2023 (Annexure No.2 to the writ petition). The petitioners further submit that they fulfill the qualification as they possess the B.Sc Degree and one year diploma in Sanitary Inspectors’



Diploma Course from different institution though recognized by the State Government/Central Government.

4. There appears some dispute with regard to the qualification held by the 44 private respondents who were declared ineligible by the respondent Commission calling upon them to submit their objection to the said notice (declaring them ineligible) dated 10.04.2024. On the representation made by these ineligible candidates, their candidature was accepted by the Commission and they were found eligible. The result was declared. Since the petitioners were lower in merit, therefore, after induction of these 44 private respondents, petitioners were ousted and they could not make it to the select list.

5. Feeling aggrieved, petitioners filed Writ Petition (S/S) No. 1930 of 2024 “*Anmol and others vs. State of Uttarakhand and another.*” In the said writ petition, a Coordinate bench of this Court directed the State Government to constitute an Equivalence Committee; and the Committee was directed to consider the qualification possessed by the private respondents and the writ petition was finally disposed of vide order dated 25.09.2025. The order was assailed by the petitioners in SPA No.340 of 2025, which too was disposed of. The direction issued by the learned Single Judge was set aside and a direction was issued to the respondent nos.1 and 2 to refer the issue to Permanent Equivalence Committee constituted by the State.

6. The matter was taken up by the petitioners to Special Leave Petition, but that too was dismissed, thus the matter came up for consideration before the Permanent Equivalence Committee constituted by the State Government which found the qualification held by private respondents equivalent to one year Diploma, qualification



prescribed under the advertisement for the post of Sanitary Inspector.

7. Now, the decision of the permanent Equivalence Committee is under challenge by the petitioners in the writ petition.

8. Learned counsel for respondent no.2, per contra, submits that after the decision taken by the permanent Equivalence Committee, the recommendation was made by the Commission and the appointments were issued to the private respondents for the post of Sanitary Inspector.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the Equivalence Committee has committed error in finding equivalence on the qualification held by the petitioners i.e. one year diploma required by the advertisement vis-a-vis to one year certificate which is obtained by the private respondents.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the certificate which was in possession of the private respondents was not a diploma while for the post of Sanitary Inspector the qualification is diploma and NSQF Level-5. This is reflected from letter dated 18.06.2024 issued by the Commission.

11. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having perused the record, as referred by the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court is of the view that the decision which is being referred by the learned counsel for the petitioners dated 18.06.2024 was much earlier to the decision taken by the permanent Equivalence Committee pursuant to the orders of this Court and, therefore, this documents will not come to the aid of petitioners to disturb



the qualification which has been decided equivalent by the Permanent Equivalence Committee.

12. In such view of the matter, no interference is warranted more particularly in view of the fact that the private respondents have been issued appointment letter, they joined their duties and after being satisfied on the qualification held by them by the permanent Equivalence Committee.

13. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
15.07.2026

Nahid/Ravi