



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No. 1845 of 2026

03 August, 2026

Vijeta Dhapola

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

With

Writ Petition Service Single No.1852 of 2026

Pankaj Kumar

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

Writ Petition Service Single No.1865 of 2026

Ashish

--Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

Writ Petition Service Single No.1940 of 2026

Aditya

--Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Dushyant Mainali, learned counsel for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Anil Dabral, learned Additional C.S.C. for the State of Uttarakhand.

Mr. Shailendra Nauriyal, learned counsel for the respondent-Selecting Body.

Mr. Saurav Adhikari, learned CGSC for the Union of India.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

Since common questions of fact and law are involved in these petitions, all these petitions are being decided by this common judgment. However, for the sake of brevity and convenience, the facts of WPMS No. 1845 of 2026 alone are being considered and discussed.

2. Petitioner responded to the advertisement



issued by the Selecting Body-UKSSC dated 16.02.2024 inviting applications for the post of Instructor (Employability Skills) in Government ITIs. Petitioner passed the written examination. However, subsequently, during document verification, it was found that petitioner was not holding the qualification of TOT (Training of Trainers) from an Industrial Training Institute run by the Directorate of Training by the State Government. Therefore, petitioner was not selected. Petitioner has challenged the non-selection by filing the present writ petition.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that, in view of the Office Memorandum dated 30.06.2023, annexure-9 to the writ petition, if the selected candidate is not in possession of the TOT Qualification, the same can be obtained within one year from the date of the appointment. To substantiate his argument, petitioner has relied upon para 6, Clause (ii), which is quoted herein below:-

“(ii) Any selected candidate who has not done CITS or any other form of pedagogy training shall undergo Pedagogy training within one year from the date of appointment.”

4. From bare perusal of the said Clause, it is reflected that it is meant for a selected candidate who has not undergone CITS or any other form of pedagogy training and shall undergo such pedagogy training within one year from the date of appointment. However, in the case at hand, petitioner has not even been selected, and therefore, there is no question of offering an appointment to her by the State Government. Further, it does not speak for qualification of T.O.T. which is an essential



qualification under the advertisement.

5. In such view of the matter, this Court cannot find fault with the Selecting Body for not selecting the petitioner, as the petitioner lacked the qualification required under Clause 5(v)(1) of the advertisement. Thus, no interference is warranted. All the writ petitions are hereby dismissed.

6. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
03.08.2026

AK