



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

Sr. No.130

CWP No.1385 of 2026
Date of Decision: 04.02.2026

Meena Rani

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Manoj Makkar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to consider the petitioner eligible for the post of Group Instructor In-charge (Women)/Group Instructor (Women) for Teachers Training Course (TTC) in Fashion Technology, Cutting and Sewing, Embroidery and Needle Work, Dress Making, against category 70 of advertisement 12/2019.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner applied for the post on the basis of one year Diploma in Fashion Design from National Institute of Fashion Design (NIFD), SCO 32 to 35, Sector 8-C, Madhya Marg, Chandigarh, for which she has been issued mark sheets of first and second semesters, dated 12.06.2004 and 14.05.2005, Annexure P-2. She cleared the written test and was shortlisted for scrutiny of documents, as apparent from the announcement dated 07.02.2022, Annexure P-5; however, could not be selected. As per detailed result of candidates for the post notified by the Commission vide Annexure P-6, the petitioner was



letter dated 03.11.2022, Annexure P-7, informing that she was found not eligible due to not possessing essential qualifications for the post.

2.1. Learned counsel further contends that the respondents have wrongly considered the petitioner ineligible as her one year Diploma in Fashion Design from NIFD is a valid qualification for the post in question. In this regard, the Commission has sought a clarification from the second respondent vide memo dated 09.11.2023, Annexure P-10. In response, the Department informed the Commission vide memo dated 06.03.2024, Annexure P-11, that '*the institution which has issued the certificate is not a recognized autonomous institution as per departmental service rules*'. A reference has further been made to a letter from Annamalai University, Centre for Distance and Online Education, dated 07.10.2025, Annexure P-13, informing the petitioner that '*the University had tie-ups only with NIFD (National Institute of Fashion Design), Chandigarh, in this field*'. Accordingly, there is no reason to consider the petitioner ineligible for the post in question.

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that the final result of selection was declared on 05.12.2022 and, pursuant thereto, the selected candidates were recommended for appointment to the Department on 22.12.2022; and they have already been appointed. She further contends that the petitioner has rightly not been considered eligible for the post as her Diploma in Fashion Design is not a recognised qualification in terms of the rules which mention essential qualifications for the post, as incorporated in the advertisement also. Therefore, her candidature was rightly rejected.

4. Heard.

5. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition for the reason it is



qualifications for the post. The advertisement requires the candidates to possess following essential qualifications:

Full time, Regular mode Diploma in Apparel/Dress Design/Fashion Designing/Garment Manufacturing/Fashion Technology from any institute recognized by National Institute of Fashion Technology/State Board of Technical Education of any State Government/All India Council of Technical Education with three year Supervisory or practical or teaching experience in the concerned trade from a reputed Industry/recognized institution.

6. It has not been established on record that the NIFD, Sector 8, Chandigarh, from where the petitioner has obtained Diploma in Fashion Design is a recognised institute by National Institute of Fashion Technology, State Board of Technical Education of any State Government or All India Council of Technical Education. Accordingly, there is no basis to consider her diploma a valid qualification in terms of stipulations in the advertisement. Further, the communication dated 07.10.2025 from Annamalai University, relied upon by the petitioner, cannot be a basis to conclude that the Institute is recognised in terms of the requirements. It states ‘*the University had tie-ups only with NIFD ...in this field*’, which is not even sufficient to establish that the Institute is an authorised centre for diploma courses under the University.

7. In view thereof, finding no merit in the petition, it stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

04.02.2026
Maninder

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