



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

281

CWP-13026-2017

Date of decision: 03.03.2025

Amreek Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Subordinate Services Selection Board Pb and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Kuldip Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Anil Chawla, Sr. Panel Counsel
for respondent No.2-UOI .

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for directing the respondents to forthwith verify the genuineness of the certificates of the petitioners in respect of their selection as Surveyors.
2. Learned State counsel makes a reference to paras 7 to 10 of the reply dated 08.10.2018 filed by way of affidavit of Secretary, Subordinate Services Selection Board, Punjab, to which there is no rebuttal by filing any replication, which reads thus:-

“7. That it is further respectfully submitted that during the course of recruitment process, various candidates submitted Diploma certificates issued by some other Institutions, including the institution from where the petitioners have purportedly acquired their Diplomas. It came to fore that the Apex Body which recognizes such Diplomas is the Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, Government of India. Consequently, in order to ascertain the genuineness and recognition of such institution, a communication vide Memo No. 2/1/2016-CA 1 & 2/SSSS/22111, dated 22.9.2017 was sent to the Directorate General of Training of the Ministry of Skill Development Entrepreneurship, Government of India, New Delhi through responsible Members of the answering respondents' Board. In



response the said letter, the authorities of the said Body vide letter dated 27.10.2017 has informed that their Ministry is an apex organization for development and coordination of the vocational training across the country and offers a wide range of certificate courses(126) including trade of Surveyor duration of one year under the Craftmen Training Scheme approved by National Council for Vocational Training. Simultaneously, vide the said letter, it was also informed that as on date neither they deal in Diploma courses nor granted permission to any university to run such type of courses. A copy of said letter dated 27.10.2017 is being appended at Annexure R-5.

8. That it is further respectfully submitted that the Diplomas possessed by the petitioners on the basis of they are claiming selection and appointment, neither are issued by any authorised Institution nor the same were recognized by any statutory body conferring with powers to do so. Apart from above, the University Grants Commission i.e. Respondent No. 4 vide letter No. F.5-3/2018(CPPP-1/PU), dated 17.3.2018 has also, inter-alia, informed that the Indira Gandhi Industrial and Vocational Training Cenre, Sohana, Gurgaon (Haryana) is not included in the list of Universities maintained by UGC. A copy of said letter dated 17.3.2018 is being appended at Annexure R-6.

9. That as per the advertisement and departmental rules qualification prescribed was surveyor course whereas the petitioner have acquired diploma in Civil surveying. The qualification for the post of Surveyor is under challenge in CWP No. 5770 of 2017 titled as Surjit Singh and others Vs State of Punjab and others and other connected matters wherein the Hon'ble court has directed the government in department of Soil Conservation to constitute a committee to consider the matter of qualifications.

10. That it is respectfully submitted that from the above stated factual position it would explicitly emerge that the Diplomas of Surveyors possessed by the petitioners have not been granted by any recognized institution or university and could not be considered to be a valid ones. As the petitioners did not have any recognized Diplomas, which is one of the basic qualifications for the post of Surveyor, therefore, the claim of the petitioners for being selected and appointed on the basis of such Diplomas has no substance. Consequently, the same deserves to be declined.”

3. In view of the above, there being no merit, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

03.03.2025
Hemant

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No
Whether reportable : Yes / No