उत्तर क्षेत्रीय समिति
राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद्
(भारत सरकार का एक विधिक संस्थान)

गुरूर्गुरूतमो धाम
NCTE

Northern Regional Committee
National Council for Teacher Education
(A Statutory Body of the Government of India)

TO BE PUBLISHED IN GAZETTE OF INDIA
(EXTRAORDINARY)
PART – III, SECTION 4

F. No. NRC/NCTE/NRCAPP-7142/B.Ed. /446th Meeting/ Sl. No. 05/2025/ (233666-233672)
Computer No.79393 **Date:** 01/09/25

RESTORATION ORDER

In Compliance of order dated 22.08.2025 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) 11742/2025 & CM APPL. 48041/2025, the recognition of institution **Maa Sharda Vidhyapeeth, Plot/Khasra Number-115, 130, Street Number-NA, Village-Sehra, Post Office-Sehra, Tehsil/Taluka- Siyana, Town/City-Siyana, District-Bulandshahr (UP)-245411, State- Uttar Pradesh** for **B.Ed.** course of granted vide order F. No. NRC/NCTE/Recognition/ B.Ed./2016/150079-88 dated **08.06.2016** is hereby restored and recognition will remain valid till any further order of withdrawal in accordance with law is passed by the Northern Regional committee.

A Show cause notice is also being issued to the institution on the grounds mentioned therein.

By Order
(Punam Tiwari Sharma)
Regional Director

233666 **To,**

The Manager,
Govt. of India Press
Department of Publications, (Gazette Section)
Civil Lines, Delhi – 110054.

Copy to:

233667 1. **The Principal,** Maa Sharda Vidhyapeeth, Plot/Khasra Number-115, 130, Street Number-NA, Village-Sehra, Post Office-Sehra, Tehsil/Taluka- Siyana, Town/City-Siyana, District-Bulandshahr (UP)-245411, State- Uttar Pradesh

233668 2. **The Secretary,** Maa Sharda Vidyapeeth Trust, Vill. & Post Sehra, Distrcit-Bulandshahr-203411, Uttar Pradesh

233669 3. **The Registrar,** Chaudhary Charan Singh University, University Road Meerut, Uttar Pradesh.

233670 4. **The Principal Secretary,** (Higher Education), Government of Uttar Pradesh, Secretariat Lucknow-226001, Uttar Pradesh.

-2-

जी-7, सेक्टर-10, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
Phone : +91-11-20893262

233671 5. **The Secretary,** Department of School Education and Literacy, Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110001

233672 6. **The US (Computer),** National Council for Teacher Education, G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075.

Regional Director

$~943

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% *Judgment Delivered on: 26.08.2025*

\+ **W.P.(C) 11742/2025 & CM APPL. 48041/2025**

MAA SHARDA VIDYAPEETH .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi Kant, Mr. Vineet Upadhayay and Mr. Jayant Dubey, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal and Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Advs. for NCTE.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

JUDGMENT

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner has assailed the impugned decision taken by the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) in its 442nd meeting held on 11th and 12th June, 2025 whereby the recognition granted to the petitioner has been withdrawn.

2. Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that a decision of withdrawal of recognition must be preceded by a show cause notice in terms of first proviso to Section 17(1) of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 (herein referred as the Act).

3. He submits that in the present case, no such show cause notice has been given. Inviting attention of the Court to the first show cause notice

dated 10.01.2025, he submits that the same is only a communication and cannot be construed as show cause notice in terms of first proviso to Section 17(1) of the NCTE Act, inasmuch as by way of purported show cause notice, the petitioner has only been asked to submit certain documents, and no allegation has been made, which the petitioner could have responded.

4. Referring to impugned order, Mr. Sharawat submits that recognition has been withdrawn by making an allegation that the petitioner has made a fake corrigendum order and increased its intake from 50 to 100 students for B.Ed. course. It has also alleged that petitioner made a fake recognition order no. F.No. NRC / NCTE / Recognition/ B.Ed. /2016/150079-88 dated 08.06.2016, for two units of 50 seats each.

5. He contends that the allegations of forgery on which the decision of withdrawal of recognition is predicated are serious in nature but does not find mention in the Show Cause Notice, therefore, the petitioner had no opportunity, leave alone, meaningful opportunity to meet the said allegation.

6. Mr. Sharawat further invites attention of the Court to the print-out of screenshot of the relevant page from the official website of NCTE annexed as Annexure P-11, which pertains to the NRC's recognised institutions in Uttar Pradesh where name of petitioner finds mention. He submits that the order dated 08.06.2016 which is alleged by NCTE to be fake or forged is still available on the official website of the NCTE and if the download button on the said page is clicked, the same leads to the alleged fake order dated 08.06.2016.

7. *Per contra,* Mr. Hardik Rupal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/NCTE invites attention of the Court to letter dated 27.04.2023, which has been sent by the NCTE to an official of the petitioner, pointing

out that corrigendum in respect of increase of intake from 50 students to 100 students was never issued to the petitioner by NCTE.

8. He further submits that the corrigendum which is part of Annexure A (colly) to the short affidavit filed by respondent/NCTE, was supplied by the petitioner alongwith its reply to the show cause notice dated 10.01.2025. He submits that the said corrigendum has never originated from the respondent/NCTE and is a fake document.

9. Mr. Rupal further invites attention of the Court to Annexure P-7, which is a recognition order bearing File No. NRC/NCTE/Recognition/ B.Ed./2016/150079-88 dated 08.06.2016 to contend that this recognition order was issued by the NCTE in respect of the petitioner only for one unit of 50 seats, whereas Annexure P-11 which is another recognition order dated 08.06.2016 placed on record alongwith the writ petition, though bears the same file number and date, purports to be a recognition order for two units of 50 seats. He submits that the latter recognition order is apparently a forged document. He further submits that both the recognition orders, *viz*., Annexure P-7 and Annexure P-11, bears the signatures of different officials.

10. On a query posed by the Court as to whether the alleged fake recognition order dated 08.06.2016 (Annexure P-11) is still available on the website of the NCTE, Mr. Rupal on instructions, submits that the said order is still available on the website. He, however, adds that the entry with the IT Department of the NCTE reveals that some document(s) were uploaded on the website on 24.03.2022 and the same was modified on 28.06.2023, but it still needs to be investigated as to whether the said entries pertains to the original recognition order dated 08.06.2016 (Annexure P-7) which was for approval of one unit of 50 seats or it is *qua* the alleged fake recognition

order of 08.06.2016 (Annexure P-11).

11. I have heard Mr. Sharawat and Mr. Rupal. The short question which arises for consideration of this Court in the present petition is that whether the principles of natural justice have been complied with before the Regional Committee of NCTE took a decision to withdraw the recognition granted to petitioner.

12. At the outset, it may be noted that the concerned Regional Committee of NCTE may withdraw recognition of a recognized institution for the reasons to be recorded in writing if it is satisfied that the recognised institution has contravened any provisions of the Act, or rules, or orders made or issued thereunder, or any condition subject to which recognition was granted. The first proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the Act provides that no such order against a recognised institution shall be passed unless a reasonable opportunity of making representation against the proposed order has been given to such recognised institution. Section 17(1) of the Act reads thus:

> ***"17. Contravention of provisions of the Act and consequences thereof****.—(1) Where the Regional Committee is, on its own motion or on any representation received from any person, satisfied that a recognised institution has contravened any of the provisions of this Act, or the rules, regulations, orders made or issued thereunder, or any condition subject to which recognition under sub-section (3) of section 14 or permission under sub-section (3) of section 15 was granted, it may withdraw recognition of such recognised institution, for reasons to be recorded in writing:*
>
> ***Provided that no such order against the recognised institution shall be passed unless a reasonable opportunity of making representation against the proposed order has been given to such recognized institution:***
>
> *Provided further that the order withdrawing or refusing*

recognition passed by the Regional Committee shall come into force only with effect from the end of the academic session next following the date of communication of such order."

(emphasis supplied)

13. The impugned decision in the present case was taken by the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) in its 442nd meeting held on 11th and 12th June 2025. A perusal of minutes of the said meeting pertaining to petitioner mentions that first show cause notice under Section 17 of the Act was issued to the institution to submit its reply within 21 days from the date of issue of show cause notice. The relevant part of the said first show cause notice dated 10.01.2025 reads thus:

*"5. **AND WHEREAS**, the matter was placed before NRC in its 430th meeting held (Volume-1) on 28th and 29th November, 2024 and on careful perusal of the complaint, the NRC decided that First Show Cause Notice Under Section 17 of the NCTE Act, 1993 be issued to the institution to submit reply within 21 days from the date of issue of Show Cause Notice on the following grounds:*

- *Copies of affiliation order (session-wise) for B.Ed. course issued by the affiliating body since grant of recognition by NRC-NCTE.*
- *Copy of Recognition order/Revised Recognition order/Continuation order/order of additional intake issued by NRC-NCTE, if any.*
- *Year wise number of students admitted in the institution since grant of recognition by NRC-NCTE.*

6. The institution is required to submit the representation/compliance accompanied with an affidavit from the authorized representative of the Management. The representation along with an affidavit must reach this office within the time specified at the end.

7. In case the reply submitted is incomplete or factually incorrect or not received in this office by the date mentioned at the end of this letter, it shall be treated as incomplete reply to the terms of this

notice.

8. Your reply, complete in all respects must reach this office within 21 days of issuance of this notice.

9. Receipt of this Notice may please be acknowledged."

14. The said show cause notice was responded to by the petitioner *vide* its letter, which was received by NRC's office on 14.02.2025, whereby the petitioner furnished a copy of affiliation letter issued by the affiliating university, as well as, details pertaining to number of students admitted in the past academic session. The petitioner also clarified with regard to the recognition order which is available on website of NRC.

15. However, NRC in its 442nd meeting held on 11th and 12th June 2025, considered the reply submitted by the petitioner and took the impunged decision of withdrawing recognition of petitioner on the ground that petitioner made a fake corrigendum order and increased its intake from 50 to 100 students for B.Ed. course and also made a fake recognition order No. F.No. NRC/NCTE/Recognition /B.Ed./2016/150079-88 dated 08.06.2016, for two units of 50 seats each.

16. To appreciate the contention articulated by Mr. Sharawat that the ground on which the withdrawal of recognition is predicated was never put to the petitioner in the Show Cause Notice, it is apposite to extract hereinbelow the relevant excerpts from decision of NRC taken in its 442nd meeting held on 11th and 12th June 2025 pertaining to the petitioner, which read thus:

> *"1. The institution has submitted affiliation letter dated 08.08.2019 issued by C.C.S. University, Meerut for B.Ed. 100 students but recognition for B.Ed. course was granted to the institution only 50 students (one unit).*

2. *As per the decision of NRC in its 253rd Meeting Part-1, the recognition for B.Ed. Course 50 students (one unit) was granted to the institution vide order no. NRC/NCTE/ Recognition/ B.Ed./2016150079-88 dated 08.06.2016.*

3. *The institution made a fake Corrigendum Order No. F. No. NRC/NCTE/NRCAPP-7142/ 2016/150390-95 and increased its intake from 50 to 100 students for B.Ed. Course and also made a fake recognition order for two-units bearing order number F. No. NRC/NCTE/Recognition/ B.Ed./ 2016/150079-88 dated 08.06.2016."*

17. Clearly, the decision to withdraw recognition granted to petitioner has been taken on the ground that institution has made a fake corrigendum, as well as, fake recognition order for two units. However, the said allegation does not find mention in the first show cause notice dated 10.01.2025.

18. The law is well settled that the fundamental purpose behind serving of show cause notice is to make noticee understand the precise case set up against him, which he has to meet. This would require the statement of imputation detailing out the alleged breaches and defaults he has committed, so that he gets an opportunity to rebut the same.

19. Reference in this regard may be had to the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gorkha Security Services v. Government (NCT of Delhi) & Ors., (2014) 9 SCC 105,*** wherein while dealing with similar submission of non-giving of show cause notice before passing an order of blacklisting, it was observed as under:

> *"21. The central issue, however, pertains to the requirement of stating the action which is proposed to be taken.* ***The fundamental purpose behind the serving of show-cause notice is to make the noticee understand the precise case set up against him which he has to meet. This would require the statement of imputations detailing out the alleged breaches and defaults he has committed, so that he gets an opportunity to rebut the same****. Another requirement,*

according to us, is the nature of action which is proposed to be taken for such a breach*. That should also be stated so that the noticee is able to point out that proposed action is not warranted in the given case, even if the defaults/breaches complained of are not satisfactorily explained. When it comes to blacklisting, this requirement becomes all the more imperative, having regard to the fact that it is harshest possible action.*

22. The High Court has simply stated that the purpose of show-cause notice is primarily to enable the noticee to meet the grounds on which the action is proposed against him. No doubt, the High Court is justified to this extent. However, it is equally important to mention as to what would be the consequence if the noticee does not satisfactorily meet the grounds on which an action is proposed. To put it otherwise, we are of the opinion ***that in order to fulfil the requirements of principles of natural justice, a show-cause notice should meet the following two requirements viz:***

(i) The material/grounds to be stated which according to the department necessitates an action;

(ii) Particular penalty/action which is proposed to be taken. It is this second requirement which the High Court has failed to omit.

We may hasten to add that even if it is not specifically mentioned in the show-cause notice but it can clearly and safely be discerned from the reading thereof, that would be sufficient to meet this requirement."

(emphasis supplied)

20. From the above exposition of law, it is evident that a clear notice is essential for ensuring that the person against whom an action is proposed, has an adequate, informed and meaningful opportunity to show case against the proposed action.

21. A reading of show cause notice dated 10.01.2025 shows that it does not spell out the allegation of fake corrigendum and fake recognition order, which has been made the basis for taking impugned decision of withdrawal of recognition against petitioner, therefore, the petitioner never got an

opportunity to show cause against the said allegation. Therefore, the show cause notice cannot be said to constitute a valid basis of impugned decision of withdrawal of recognition.

22. Accordingly, the impugned decision of withdrawal of recognition being in excess of the allegations of the show cause notice cannot be sustained and, thus, it is quashed and set aside.

23. The next question that would arise in the facts and circumstances of the present case is as to what consequential relief is to be granted to petitioner since there is a factual dispute with regard to recognition having been granted to petitioner. The petitioner has placed reliance on recognition order dated 08.06.2016 (Annexure P-11) which is in respect of two units of 50 students each, and the said order is admittedly, available on the official website of the respondents. The respondents, on the other hand, have taken a stand that the said order is fake and manufactured. However, there is no dispute with regard to the recognition order dated 08.06.2016 (Annexure P-7) which is for approval of one unit of 50 seats.

24. Mr. Sharawat submits that since there is no dispute insofar as the recognition granted to petitioner for one unit of 50 seats, is concerned, the consequential relief may be confined to 50 seats for the time being.

25. In that view of the matter, it is directed that respondent/NCTE shall pass consequential order for restoration of recognition of petitioner in respect of one unit of 50 seats and the name of the petitioner shall be included in the ongoing counselling for the academic session 2025-26 in respect of the undisputed one unit of 50 seats. The respondent/NCTE is further directed to issue necessary public notice and update status of petitioner on its website thereby intimating all concerned, including state

authority, affiliating body and counselling authorities that the petitioner has been permitted to participate in counselling and admit students for academic session 2025-2026, which shall be complied with. This may be done within one week from today.

26. However, the respondent/NCTE is at liberty to initiate the proceedings against the petitioner by issuing a fresh show cause notice keeping in view the observations made hereinabove.

27. Before parting with this case, it may be observed that respondent has taken a stand that recognition letter dated 08.06.2016 (Annexure P-11), which is in respect of two units of 100 seats each, as well as, the corrigendum, are forged documents. Incidentally, the forged recognition letter dated 08.06.2016 (Annexure P-11) is admittedly, uploaded on the official website of the respondents. This could not have been possible without active connivance of an employee/staff of NCTE.

28. On being queried by the Court, as to whether any criminal action has been initiated in that behalf by NCTE, Mr. Rupal submits that the matter is being internally inquired into, and necessary action will be taken. It is intriguing as to why criminal law has not been set into motion till date when the forgery of an order and tampering with official website of respondent had come to light. Let respondents/NCTE do the needful in accordance with law within a period of two weeks from the date of this order.

29. The petitioner along with pending application, is disposed of in the above terms.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

AUGUST 26, 2025/N.S. ASWAL**/aj**