



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-445/E- 385880/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202514980 /E- 89359

Excel College of Education, Plot No.- NH 544, Salem Main Road, Pallakapalayam, Sankari, Namakkal, Tamilnadu – 637303	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Dr. J. Simon Arun Barathkumar, Principal
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	29.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Excel College of Education, Plot No.- NH 544, Salem Main Road, Pallakapalayam, Sankari, Namakkal, Tamilnadu - 637303** dated 19.03.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / SRC / 25262024050927 / TAMIL NADU / 2024 / REJC / 1015** dated 20.01.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The Final Show Cause Notice was issue to the institution vide date 27.12.2024 with a direction to submit reply within 15 days. The institution has not furnished reply in respect of the Final Show Cause Notice issued on 27.12.2024 and the stipulated time period is over."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Dr. J. Simon Arun Barathkumar, Principal of Excel College of Education, Plot No.- NH 544, Salem Main Road, Pallakapalayam, Sankari, Namakkal, Tamilnadu - 637303** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. Reply sent with documents through mail on 05.11.2024. 2. Reply to the Final Show Cause Notice was sent with relevant supportive documents through mail on 07.01.2025. Hard copies of reply and documents sent through courier on 07.01.2025 which was received at NCTE, Delhi on 09.01.2025."

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 29th January 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had applied to the Southern Regional Committee (SRC) on 18.05.2024 seeking recognition for running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), and that the SRC refused recognition vide order dated 20.01.2025 after issuance of Show Cause Notice and Final Show Cause Notice and upon consideration of the material on record.

The matter was earlier considered in the 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 20.11.2025 and the 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025. After examining the Appeal Report, records, and documents submitted, the Committee, in order to examine the case on merits, resolved to afford an opportunity to the appellant institution to submit specified documents.

The instant matter was placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee noted the submission of the appellant institution that replies along with supporting documents were submitted by email on 05.11.2024, and that a reply to the Final Show Cause Notice, together with relevant documents, was submitted by email on 07.01.2025. It was further stated that hard copies of the reply and documents were dispatched by courier on 07.01.2025 and received in the office of the NCTE on 09.01.2025.

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after due and conscious application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has failed to discharge the statutory burden cast upon it to establish, through cogent, credible, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the material placed on record is deficient, inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in

the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The institution has failed to place on record any cogent and substantive material demonstrating that it satisfies the prescribed shortlisting criteria applicable for processing of ITEP applications from Multidisciplinary Institutions for the academic session 2025–2026. The NAAC certificate relied upon by the appellant expired on 20.02.2019, and no valid, current, and subsisting accreditation has been produced. In the absence of a valid NAAC accreditation, the institution does not meet the threshold eligibility conditions under the notified shortlisting framework.
- (ii) The appellant has not furnished authentic and verifiable land and building documents in accordance with the statutory requirements. The documents submitted in support of the building plan and mutation particulars are either illegible photocopies or otherwise lacking in authenticity and certification and therefore cannot be relied upon for regulatory purposes. A perusal of the Appeal Report further confirms that the material placed on record does not substantiate the institution's claim of compliance with the infrastructural norms prescribed under the applicable Regulations.
- (iii) The appellant institution failed to submit any reply to the Final Show Cause Notice dated 27.12.2024 issued by the Southern Regional Committee within the stipulated timeframe and has not furnished any satisfactory explanation for such non-compliance. Even during the appellate proceedings, despite being afforded opportunity to produce specific and substantive documents, the institution has failed to submit complete, verifiable, and legally sustainable records. The purported compliance remains deficient, fragmented, and incapable of establishing adherence to the mandatory requirements under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply and supporting documents; and the deficiencies were specifically identified and communicated. The grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility, infrastructural adequacy, and regulatory compliance under the

NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The deficiencies identified are substantive and foundational in nature and relate to threshold conditions for grant of recognition. They cannot be treated as technical irregularities capable of post facto rectification by explanation. It is settled that grant of recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is not automatic upon submission of an application. Recognition is conditional upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the statutory framework at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by applying for recognition. In the present case, despite adequate opportunity granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 20.01.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 20.01.2025 issued by SRC is confirmed.

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Excel College of Education, Plot No.- NH 544, Salem Main Road, Pallakapalayam, Sankari, Namakkal, Tamilnadu - 637303.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Govt. of Tamil Nadu, Fort St. George, Chennai, Tamil Nadu-600009.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-456/E- 386786/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515404/E-89359

Jain (Deemed-to-be-university), Plot no. 91/2, Basavanagudi H.O. Dr. A N Krishnarao Road, Bangalore, Karnataka – 560004	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	The Representative
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	29.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Jain (Deemed-to-be-university), Plot no. 91/2, Basavanagudi H.O. Dr. A N Krishnarao Road, Bangalore, Karnataka - 560004** dated 14.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / SRC / 2627202505124278 / KARNATAKA / 2025 / REJC / 1871** dated 26.08.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "In reply to SCN, the institution has agreed that the land is on lease basis for a period of 20 years from Private party which is not acceptable as per Clause 8(4) (i) of NCTE Regulations 2014"

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**The Representative of Jain (Deemed-to-be-university), Plot no. 91/2, Basavanagudi H.O. Dr. A N Krishnarao Road, Bangalore, Karnataka - 560004** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "When the application was made to NCTE, the Land Details sought therein were furnished selecting one of our campuses located in the heart of the Bangalore City which has been duly recognized by the UGC & AICTE for offering the UG & PG programmes of the University. • The Campus houses 13500 students admitted for UG & PG Programmes under various specializations. The Extension of Approval to conduct BCA, MCA & BMS Programmes coming under the purview of the AICTE for the Academic Year 2025-26 from the Campus address in which the New Teacher Education Programme was proposed to be conducted is enclosed for kind perusal. • The intention of making Jain (Deemed to be University) 44/4, District Fund Road, Behind Big Bazar, 9th Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, Bangalore Urban, Karnataka, 560069 a choice of the location for offering Teaching Education Programmes mentioned in the application was primarily due to its proximity and commutation shall be easier for the students. However, the Regional Committee in its 470th Meeting dated 20/08/2025 refused the

said submission of the University on 06/08/2025 stating that the land on lease basis for a period of 20 years from Private party is not acceptable as per Clause 8(4)(i) of NCTE Regulations 2014 and the Jain Trust sponsoring the institution must have its own property and in possession of required land with demarcated land area as per the norms. In view of the above, the University hereby dedicate its own land and building for running the Teacher Training Programme located in JAIN Global Campus, 45th km, NH-209, Jakkasandra Post, Kanakapura Taluk Ramanagara District – 562112 and the Land Details are as below: Land Area 13950 sq. mtrs Land Area (in acres) 4 Acres Built-up Area 7354.89 sq. mtrs Survey Number 161 The required Affidavit to be furnished as stipulated in the NCTE Regulations 2014 mentioning the above details amongst other information by the Head of the Institution is enclosed for kind perusal.”

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 29th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 26.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the SRC vide order dated 26.08.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 20.11.2025 and 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the appellant institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it was stated that, at the time of submission of the application, land details of one of its campuses located in Bengaluru, duly recognized by UGC and AICTE for UG and PG programmes, were furnished. It was submitted that the said campus caters to a substantial student population and holds valid AICTE approvals for relevant programmes. The appellant further submitted that the proposed location was selected on grounds of proximity and ease of access for students; however, the Regional Committee, in its 470th Meeting held on 20.08.2025, declined the proposal on the ground that the land was held on lease from a private party, which is not permissible under Clause 8(4)(i) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. In view thereof, the appellant institution submitted that it has now earmarked its own land and building for the proposed teacher education programme at its JAIN Global Campus, Kanakapura Taluk, Ramanagara District, Karnataka, and has furnished details of land and built-up area along with the requisite affidavit as prescribed under the NCTE Regulations.

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after due and conscious application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has failed to discharge the statutory burden cast upon it to establish, through cogent, credible, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the material placed on record is deficient, inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory

requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that the appellant institution, at the time of submission of its original application, furnished land details pertaining to a campus situated at Bengaluru, which was stated to be recognized by UGC and AICTE for other academic programmes. However, the record unequivocally establishes that the said land was held on lease from a private party. Such arrangement is expressly impermissible under Clause 8(4)(i) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, which mandates that the institution shall possess land either in its own name or in the name of the sponsoring society/trust, free from encumbrances, and does not permit reliance on privately leased land for the purpose of grant of recognition. The initial application, therefore, suffered from a fundamental statutory defect at inception, rendering the proposal non-compliant with the threshold eligibility criteria prescribed under the Regulations.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that subsequent to refusal of recognition by the Southern Regional Committee, the appellant institution sought to alter the foundational basis of its application by proposing to shift the ITEP programme to a different campus, namely its purportedly owned land and building at JAIN Global Campus, Kanakapura Taluk, Ramanagara District, Karnataka, and furnished fresh land details and an affidavit in support thereof. Such post facto modification of the essential particulars of the application, after culmination of the statutory scrutiny process and issuance of the refusal order, is legally untenable. The purported compliance is, therefore, fragmented, belated, and incapable of curing the original statutory ineligibility, and does not establish adherence to the mandatory provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply and supporting documents; and the deficiencies were specifically identified and communicated. The grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility, infrastructural adequacy, and regulatory compliance under the

NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The deficiencies identified are substantive and foundational in nature and relate to threshold conditions for grant of recognition. They cannot be treated as technical irregularities capable of post facto rectification by explanation. It is settled that grant of recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is not automatic upon submission of an application. Recognition is conditional upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the statutory framework at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by applying for recognition. In the present case, despite adequate opportunity granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 26.08.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 26.08.2025 issued by SRC is confirmed.

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. The Principal, Jain (Deemed-to-be-university), Plot no. 91/2, Basavanagudi H.O. Dr. A N Krishnarao Road, Bangalore, Karnataka - 560004.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-461/E- 387291/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515417/E-89359

KBR Integrated Teacher Education Programme, Plot No. 1, 7th Ward, Survey No. 132, 132/2A, 132/2B, 132-3, 132/4B, 132-8A, Narasareddy Kandriga Village, Thummuru Revenue VI, Andhra Pradesh – 524126	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, SRC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	29.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **KBR Integrated Teacher Education Programme, Plot No. 1, 7th Ward, Survey No. 132, 132/2A, 132/2B, 132-3, 132/4B, 132-8A, Narasareddy Kandriga Village, Thummuru Revenue VI, Andhra Pradesh – 524126** dated 24.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / SRC / 2627202505194817 / ANDHRA PRADESH / 2025 / REJC / 1957** dated 26.08.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “In the application form, the institution has mentioned itself as a category 1 institution, however, on perusal of reply to SCN submitted by the institution, it is clear that the institution is not a category 1 institution, hence, not eligible to apply for ITEP course as per shortlisting criteria prescribed by the Council (NCTE) for processing of applications for ITEP from Multidisciplinary institutions for academic session 2026-2027. The institution has not uploaded the latest Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Competent Authority of the State Government.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**No one** from **KBR Integrated Teacher Education Programme, Plot No. 1, 7th Ward, Survey No. 132, 132/2A, 132/2B, 132-3, 132/4B, 132-8A, Narasareddy Kandriga Village, Thummuru Revenue VI, Andhra Pradesh – 524126** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “The NCTE, SRC, Govt of India complied out of several points with all documentary proof was consider to this establish organization and raised no more points documentary evidences shall be submitted. The principal secretary, Higher Education, amaravathi, Govt of A.P. 2. The Member secretary, Office chairman, NAAC accreditation board, Bangalore orders shall be submitted before requested time and period. The required documents above 2 orders are already submitted. With all documentary evidences waiting for the orders to be received to be submitted. Since our proposals pertaining to the year 2026-27 which as be begin July / august 2026 more than 10 months period available in the NAAC the kindly consider this proposal before 31/03/2026. Kindly consider our

explanation on humanitarian grounds on our appeal to the Member secretary NCTE, SRC, Regional Director kindly permitted pertaining orders from authorities and humbly submitted to NCTE, and kindly action. For which act of kindness, we shall be ever grateful to you sir, Note: NB the urgent request the Appeal fees online fees submitted well with in the time of Final show cause notice issued to this organization. we shall submitted.”

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 29th January 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 23.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the SRC vide order dated 26.08.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 20.11.2025 and 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025 before the Appeal Committee. The appellant institution did not appear online to present its case before the Appellate Authority on both meetings. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the appellant institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it was contended that the deficiencies pointed out by the Southern Regional Committee have largely been complied with and that relevant documentary evidence has already been submitted. The appellant further submitted that certain orders from the Principal Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh, and from the NAAC

authorities are awaited and would be submitted upon receipt. It was stated that the proposal pertains to the academic session 2026–27, with sufficient time available for completion of the remaining formalities, and a request was made for consideration of the appeal on humanitarian grounds. The appellant also submitted that the appeal fee was deposited within the prescribed timeline in response to the Final Show Cause Notice.

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the relevant records available on file, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after due and conscious application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has failed to discharge the statutory burden cast upon it to establish, through cogent, credible, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the material placed on record is deficient, inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that the appellant institution has failed to place on record any cogent, credible, and legally sustainable material demonstrating that it fulfills the prescribed shortlisting criteria applicable for processing of ITEP applications from Multidisciplinary Institutions for the academic session 2025–2026, as notified by the Council. The institution has merely produced a copy of an application/request letter dated 07.06.2025 addressed to NAAC, which, by its very nature, does not constitute proof of valid and subsisting accreditation. In terms of the applicable regulatory framework and the notified shortlisting criteria, possession of a valid, current, and subsisting NAAC accreditation is a threshold eligibility condition and must exist on the date of consideration. In the absence of such accreditation, duly evidenced by a valid certificate, the institution fails to satisfy the mandatory

eligibility parameters and is rendered ineligible for further processing of its ITEP application.

- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution failed to submit an appropriate and substantive reply to the Final Show Cause Notice dated 31.07.2025 issued by the Southern Regional Committee within the stipulated period, as mandated under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. No satisfactory or legally tenable explanation has been furnished for such default. Even during the appellate proceedings under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, despite being afforded adequate opportunity to produce specific and material documents, the institution has failed to submit complete, authentic, and verifiable records establishing compliance with the statutory requirements. The purported compliance remains partial, fragmented, and legally insufficient, and does not discharge the statutory burden cast upon the institution to demonstrate strict adherence to the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply and supporting documents; and the deficiencies were specifically identified and communicated. The grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility, infrastructural adequacy, and regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The deficiencies identified are substantive and foundational in nature and relate to threshold conditions for grant of recognition. They cannot be treated as technical irregularities capable of post facto rectification by explanation. It is settled that grant of recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is not automatic upon submission of an application. Recognition is conditional upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the statutory framework at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by applying for recognition. In the present case, despite adequate opportunity granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the relevant records available on file, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 26.08.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, the relevant records available on file, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution during the online hearing, Appeal Committee concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 26.08.2025 issued by SRC is confirmed.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Appeal ID: APPLSRC202515417

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, KBR Integrated Teacher Education Programme, Plot No. 1, 7th Ward, Survey No. 132, 132/2A, 132/2B, 132-3, 132/4B, 132-8A, Narasareddy Kandriga Village, Thummuru Revenue VI, Andhra Pradesh – 524126.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Andhra Pradesh, J Block, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Room No. 312, Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Hyderabad-500022.



एन सी टी ई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-442/E- 384506/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515394 / E-89359

Sahrdaya College of Advanced Studies (Autonomous), Kodakara, Plot No. 1667/1, Pulipparakkunnu, Thrissur, Kerala – 680684	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Ms. Sheena Sarah Winny, Head and Assistant Professor
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	29.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUND OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **Sahrdaya College of Advanced Studies (Autonomous), Kodakara, Plot No. 1667/1, Pulipparakkunnu, Thrissur, Kerala - 680684** dated 03.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / SRC / 2627202505295682 / KERALA / 2025 / REJC / 2307** dated 25.08.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution was issued First Show Cause Notice and Final Show Cause Notice to submit written representation on the deficiencies observed by SRC, however, the institution has not submitted any reply to the Show Cause Notice."

### **II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -**

**Ms. Sheena Sarah Winny, Head and Assistant Professor of Sahrdaya College of Advanced Studies (Autonomous), Kodakara, Plot No. 1667/1, Pulipparakkunnu, Thrissur, Kerala - 680684** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "We were not aware of submission of written representation through the portal, and so submitted it via e-mail and submitted hard copy via speed post."

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 29th January 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 30.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the SRC vide order dated 25.08.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 20.11.2025 and 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the appellant institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Committee noted the submission of the appellant institution that it was unaware of the requirement to submit a written representation through the online portal and, therefore, submitted the representation by email and also forwarded a hard copy through Speed Post. The Committee further noted that, vide letter dated 21.11.2025, the appellant institution submitted that as per the shortlisting criteria prescribed by the NCTE for processing of applications for the ITEP programme for the academic session 2026–27, institutions securing a minimum of 10 points are eligible for further processing. The appellant institution claimed that it secured the requisite 10 points on the basis of NAAC 'A' Grade accreditation (6 points), status as a multidisciplinary institution running for more than 10 but less than 25 years (2 points), and operation of NCTE-recognised programmes through an institution managed by the same Trust (2 points).

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after due and conscious application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has failed to discharge the statutory burden cast upon it to establish, through cogent, credible, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The

Appeal Committee finds that the material placed on record is deficient, inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that the appellant institution has failed to place on record any cogent, credible, and legally sustainable material demonstrating fulfillment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria applicable for processing of ITEP applications from Multidisciplinary Institutions for the academic session 2025–2026, as notified by the Council. The appellant contended that it is running an NCTE-recognized course and, on that basis, sought allocation of additional points. However, the record reveals that the NCTE-recognized programme pertains to “Jesus Training College,” whereas the present applicant institution is “Sahrdaya College of Advanced Studies.” The entities are distinct, and no legally valid order evidencing merger, common identity, or regulatory approval establishing their equivalence has been produced. The Memorandum of Understanding placed on record between the two institutions is not shown to have been approved by any competent statutory authority and, therefore, cannot be relied upon for regulatory purposes. In the absence of demonstrable, institution-specific recognition or valid accreditation in its own name, the appellant fails to meet the threshold eligibility criteria under the notified shortlisting framework and is consequently ineligible for further processing of its ITEP application.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution failed to submit a substantive and legally compliant reply to the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice dated 31.07.2025 issued by the Southern Regional Committee within the stipulated period, as required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. No satisfactory, bona fide, or legally tenable explanation has been furnished for such non-compliance. The material subsequently placed on record remains partial, inconsistent, and legally insufficient to discharge the statutory burden cast upon the institution to establish strict and continuous adherence to the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Such default constitutes substantive non-compliance and disentitles the appellant from any equitable or discretionary relief at the appellate stage.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or

violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply and supporting documents; and the deficiencies were specifically identified and communicated. The grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility, infrastructural adequacy, and regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The deficiencies identified are substantive and foundational in nature and relate to threshold conditions for grant of recognition. They cannot be treated as technical irregularities capable of post facto rectification by explanation. It is settled that grant of recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is not automatic upon submission of an application. Recognition is conditional upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the statutory framework at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by applying for recognition. In the present case, despite adequate opportunity granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly

within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 25.08.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 25.08.2025 issued by SRC is confirmed.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Sahrdaya College of Advanced Studies (Autonomous), Kodakara, Plot No. 1667/1, Pulipparakkunnu, Thrissur, Kerala - 680684.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Annex II, Government Secretariat, Thiruvananthapuram–1, Kerala.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)

जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-63/E-357699/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202514932 / E-89359

M.E.T. College of Education, Muslim Educational Trust, 105, 108, 1051/109, 1179/85, 110, 111, 112, 1052/109, Tulibal Sopore, Tulibal Road Sopore, Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir-193201	<b>बनाम / Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. Irshad Ahmad Wani, Trustee</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, NRC</b>
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing</b>	29.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **M.E.T. College of Education, Muslim Educational Trust, 105, 108, 1051/109, 1179/85, 110, 111, 112, 1052/109, Tulibal Sopore, Tulibal Road Sopore, Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir-193201** dated 22.02.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 against the Order No. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / FR-2122-NRC-474165111 / JAMMU AND KASHMIR / 2021 / REJC / 183** dated 08.01.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "Institution has submitted a copy of Registration Certificate Shops & Establishment Act 1966. Registration No. 74360444 in the name of M/s Muslim Educational Institute, Sopore, Baramulla but the name mentioned in online application and Service Rules as Muslim Educational Trust, Sopore. An affidavit on Non-Judicial Stamp Paper of Rs. 100/-, attested by Notary Public/Oath Commissioner submitted by prescribed institution but it is not in format and the detail of the land is also not mentioned in the Affidavit. A copy of the registered land documents as per provisions of the NCTE Regulation, 2014 as amended from time to time is not submitted by institution. The institution has submitted the land related documents, which are in Urdu language. The institution was required to submit the Certificate dated 23/12/2020 issued by the translated version in English / Hindi. As per the Tehsildar, Sopore, uploaded by the institution, the Tehsildar has given a Certificate that the land is in the name of Sh. Hassan Bacha, who is the administrator of the trust. As per this statement, the land of the institution is in individual name, which is not acceptable as per clause 8 (4) (0) Completion of NCTE Regulations Certificate etc. 2014. are not the acceptable other documents viz NEC, CLU, Mutation, Building Plan, Building in view of the fact that the land is on Individual name, which is not acceptable as per NCTE Regulations. Original Affidavit on Rs. 100/- stamp paper submitted. Hence, regarding land is not the Committee decided to reject/refuse the application for B.Ed. course of the institution on the grounds mentioned above under Section 14 of the NCTE Act 1993."

## II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Irshad Ahmad Wani, Trustee of M.E.T. College of Education, Muslim Educational Trust, 105, 108, 1051/109, 1179/85, 110, 111, 112, 1052/109, Tulibal Sopore, Tulibal Road Sopore, Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir-193201 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, it is submitted that "(i) This is due to oversight by the said office. This may kindly read as Muslim Educational Trust. Annexure-1 (ii) could not download the format at that time. Annexure-2 (A), 2(B) (iii) since the land document was available in Urdu language. The translated copy is submitted. Annexure-3 (iv) It is clarified that the land is in the name of Muslim Educational Trust. Annexure-4. (v) Cleared at Sr. No. 4 above (vi) Attached as Annexure -5(A), 5(B)."

## III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 29th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The instant matter was placed in its 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 28.05.2025 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee of the Council vide order No. **89-63/E-357699/2025 Appeal/6<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2025 APPLNRC202514932** dated 24.06.2025 holds that the institution is still lacking *inter alia* on the above grounds and continues to be non-compliant with the mandatory infrastructure (land & building) requirements as stipulated under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The NRC was justified in passing the order dated 08.01.2025 thereby refusing to grant recognition for B.Ed. course. The Appeal Committee further decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore the impugned order dated 08.01.2025 issued by NRC is confirmed.

The Appeal Committee noted that aggrieved with the decision of the Appeal Committee, the Appellant Institution filed a Writ Petition bearing CM (8697/2025) in WP(C) 3052/2025 before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh at Srinagar and the Hon'ble High Court passed an order dated 29.12.2025. The operative part of the order is stating as under: -

***“...In view of above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to treat present petition as representation and accord consideration to the same as per law, within a period of two weeks from the date a copy of this order along with copy of petition, copy of CM No. 8697/2025 and annexures are made available.***

***Disposed of.”***

In compliance of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court, the appeal was taken up in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026. Nevertheless, the Appeal Committee examined the written submissions and documents placed on record. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution that the discrepancy in the name of the management was due to an inadvertent oversight and clarified that the correct name is “Muslim Educational Trust.” The institution submitted that certain prescribed formats could not be downloaded earlier and has now furnished the same. It was further stated that the land documents were originally in Urdu and that an authenticated translated copy has been submitted. The institution clarified that the land stands in the name of Muslim Educational Trust and enclosed supporting documents in this regard. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution submitted an affidavit dated 30.01.2026 executed by its authorized signatory, affirming that the institution is managed by Muslim Educational Trust and that the land is legally owned by the said Trust. The affidavit further states that authenticated and attested land documents have been furnished in compliance with the directions issued during the hearing and undertakes that the documents submitted are true and valid as per revenue records.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with various documents in purported fulfilment of the deficiencies cited in the refusal order. At the same time, the Committee observed that a substantial part of the material relied upon by the appellant institution was either not before the NRC at the time of passing the impugned order dated 08.01.2025 or requires authentication and factual verification by the competent Regional Committee.

The Appeal Committee observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication, additional documents submitted during appellate proceedings cannot be ignored

outright. Reliance was placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 – Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, wherein it has been held that such documents are required to be considered. However, the Committee emphasized that consideration of additional material does not amount to acceptance of the same and must necessarily be preceded by strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, having regard to the above judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the case, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 08.01.2025 warrants interference to the limited extent that subsequent material placed on record by the appellant institution has not been subjected to verification and consideration by the competent Regional Committee. The Committee is further of the view that the ends of justice would be met by remanding the matter for limited factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims. Accordingly, without diluting the statutory authority of the Northern Regional Committee and without creating any equity in favour of the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned withdrawal order dated 08.01.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh factual verification and regulatory reassessment. The Northern Regional Committee is directed to re-examine the case of the appellant institution afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted, afford reasonable opportunity of hearing to the institution, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the guidelines issued by the Council from time to time, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined only to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish full compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with law. The Regional Committee concerned, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure

time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is directed to forward all documents relied upon in appeal to the Northern Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order.

**IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 08.01.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, M.E.T. College of Education, Muslim Educational Trust, 105, 108, 1051/109, 1179/85, 110, 111, 112, 1052/109, Tulibal Sopore, Tulibal Road Sopore, Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir-193201.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Mini Block Civil Secretariat, Jammu, J&K.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-32/E-396408/2026 Appeal/2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202515408 /E-89359

Amar Shaheed Baba Ajit Singh Jujhar Singh Memorial College, Khasra No. 50, 51, 52/1, 52/2, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 179/1/2, 180/1, 180/2, Bela, Patwar Circle Bela, The-Chamkaur Sahib, Ropar, Punjab – 140111	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. Satwant Kaur Shahi, Principal</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	29.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Amar Shaheed Baba Ajit Singh Jujhar Singh Memorial College, Khasra No. 50, 51, 52/1, 52/2, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 179/1/2, 180/1, 180/2, Bela, Patwar Circle Bela, The-Chamkaur Sahib, Ropar, Punjab - 140111** dated 16.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2627202505265388 / PUNJAB / 2025 / REJC / 2181** dated 22.08.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "As per the Public Notice F. No. NCTE/Regl012/1/2025-Reg Section – HQ dated 06.05.2025 and 27.05.2025 issued by NCTE (Hqrs.), the institutions which obtained the minimum 10 points will be shortlisted for processing on the basis of extant norms and standards prescribed by NCTE. The details of points obtained by this institution is tabulated as under:- Criteria Status Points awarded Category 1 institutions as per UGC Proof for category 1. Institution as per UGC is not uploaded 00 Multidisciplinary institution (Whether programme(s) other than Teacher Education Programme(s) is being offered by the institution) Yes 04 institution running NCTE recognized course(s) Yes 02 Total 06. The committee noted that the institution is obtained only 06 points whereas a minimum of 10 points is required to be obtained for short listing of application of ITEP for processing as per Public Notice No. Regl011/3/2025-Reg.Sec-HQ dated 06.05.2025."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Dr. Satwant Kaur Shahi, Principal of Amar Shaheed Baba Ajit Singh Jujhar Singh Memorial College, Khasra No. 50, 51, 52/1, 52/2, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 179/1/2, 180/1, 180/2, Bela, Patwar Circle Bela, The-Chamkaur Sahib, Ropar, Punjab - 140111** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "The institution respectfully submits that as per the NCTE Public Notice F.No. NCTE/Regl012/1/2025-Reg Section-HQ dated 06/05/2025 and 27/05/2025, a minimum of 10 points is required for shortlisting of ITEP applications. The institution was awarded only 6 points as per the refusal order dated 22/08/2025. However, the institution is NAAC accredited with B++ grade, valid up to 31/12/2030, which as per

NCTE criteria carries 6 additional points. These marks were not counted in the evaluation. Considering the NAAC accreditation, the institution fulfills the required 10-point criteria for shortlisting and is therefore eligible for recognition of the ITEP programme. It is requested that the appeal be kindly considered and the application be processed accordingly.”

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Northern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 16.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 22.08.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution, which contended that under NCTE Public Notice F.No. NCTE/Regl012/1/2025-Reg Section-HQ dated 06.05.2025 and 27.05.2025, a minimum of 10 points is required for shortlisting of ITEP applications. The institution submitted that it was awarded only 6 points in the refusal order dated 22.08.2025; however, it holds valid NAAC accreditation with B++ grade up to 31.12.2030, which, as per the prescribed criteria, carries 6 additional points. The institution contended that these marks were not taken into account during evaluation and, if considered, it would meet the minimum 10-point requirement for shortlisting. The institution accordingly requested reconsideration of its application for recognition of the ITEP programme.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with various documents in purported fulfilment of the deficiencies cited in the refusal order. At the same time, the Committee observed that a substantial part of the material relied upon by the appellant institution was either not

before the NRC at the time of passing the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 or requires authentication and factual verification by the competent Regional Committee.

The Appeal Committee observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication, additional documents submitted during appellate proceedings cannot be ignored outright. Reliance was placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 – Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, wherein it has been held that such documents are required to be considered. However, the Committee emphasized that consideration of additional material does not amount to acceptance of the same and must necessarily be preceded by strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

Noting the submissions placed on record and the documents submitted, the Appeal Committee observes that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification on the basis of the submissions and documents placed before the Appeal Committee. In the interests of justice, the Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants limited interference, strictly within the statutory framework. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims and without diluting or negating the findings recorded in the impugned order, the Appeal Committee sets aside the order dated 22.08.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee. The Northern Regional Committee shall re-examine the case afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted during the appellate proceedings, and assess compliance with the applicable shortlisting criteria, the requirements of a bona fide multidisciplinary institution, and the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines, if applicable. The said Regional Committee shall conduct such verification strictly in accordance with law and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed timeframe. The said Regional Committee, being the statutory custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity, completeness, and

genuineness of all connected records, including those forming part of the original application and the documents submitted during appellate proceedings, before passing any consequential order. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules, and Regulations. The appellant institution shall forward to the said Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the said Regional Committee shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and the directions contained herein.

#### **IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme with the directions specified hereinabove. The NRC shall take a reasoned and speaking decision after considering all documents and subsequent submissions of the appellant, including compliance with the deficiencies cited in the impugned order. The appellant institution is also directed to forward the documents submitted in appeal to the NRC within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



**उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)**

#### **Copy to :-**

- 1. The Principal, Amar Shaheed Baba Ajit Singh Jujhar Singh Memorial College, Khasra No. 50, 51, 52/1, 52/2, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 179/1/2, 180/1, 180/2, Bela, Patwar Circle Bela, The-Chamkaur Sahib, Ropar, Punjab - 140111.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Block E, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali)-Punjab-160062.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)

जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-34/E-396043/2026 Appeal/2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202615491/E-89359

G S College of Commerce and Economics, Plot No. 89, South Civil Lines, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh – 482001	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. Dimple Bhalla, Asstt. Professor</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	29.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL**

The appeal of **G S College of Commerce and Economics, Plot No. 89, South Civil Lines, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh – 482001** dated 01.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. WRC / APW01396 / 223234 / B.Ed. / 310<sup>th</sup> / 2019 / 205544** dated 28.08.2019 of the Western Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “1. The institution has submitted photocopy or Staff list 1+12, not approved by the affiliating university. 2. The staff members at Sr. No. 7 is with less than 55% marks at P.G. level. 3. FDRS of Rs. 5+7 lakhs, Building Completion Certificate signed by Govt. Engineer are not submitted by the institution.”

### **II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -**

**Dr. Dimple Bhalla, Asstt. Professor of G S College of Commerce and Economics, Plot No. 89, South Civil Lines, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh – 482001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “During Academic session 2019-20 & 2020-21 G. S. College of Commerce and Economic, Jabalpur had insufficient staff in B.Ed. Department. Due to Covid Management Body was not constituted. Hence college could not appoint required staff. On 26 September 2021our Managing Secretary also died due to Covid. Hence situation was not normal, and college principal was not in position to take any decision.”

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course vide order dated 20.07.2005. A Revised Recognition Order was issued to the institution for two basic units of (50 students each) on 31.05.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the WRC vide order dated 28.08.2019.

The instant matter was placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2025 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee, upon careful examination of the Appeal Report, relevant records, and documents submitted by the appellant institution decided to call upon the appellant institution to submit the status of submission of the hard copy of the appeal application along with the requisite supporting documents, in compliance with the applicable NCTE Rules and Regulations.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026. The Appeal Committee examined the Appeal Report, relevant records, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submission of the appellant institution that during the academic sessions 2019–20 and 2020–21, G.S. College of Commerce and Economics, Jabalpur, had insufficient faculty in the B.Ed. Department. The institution attributed this to the COVID-19 pandemic, stating that the Management Body could not be constituted during that period, which prevented timely appointments of the required staff. It was further submitted that the Managing Secretary of the institution passed away on 26.09.2021 due to COVID-19, and as a result, the administrative functioning of the college was adversely affected, and the Principal was not in a position to take necessary decisions at the relevant time. The Committee further noted that the appellant institution has preferred the present appeal only on 01.01.2026, i.e., after an inordinate delay of **6 years, 2 months and 4 days** from the date of the impugned withdrawal order. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any satisfactory explanation or sufficient cause justifying such an extraordinary delay. The Appeal Committee also noted order dated 10.01.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Suo Motu Writ Petition (Civil) No. 3 of 2020*, wherein it was held as under:

***“In cases where the limitation would have expired during the period between 15.03.2020 till 28.02.2022, notwithstanding the actual balance period of limitation remaining, all persons shall have a limitation period of 90 days from 01.03.2022. In the event the actual balance period of limitation remaining, with effect from 01.03.2022 is greater than 90 days, that longer period shall apply.”***

Applying the aforesaid binding judicial pronouncement, the period from 15.03.2020 to 28.02.2022 stands excluded; however, even thereafter, the appellant

was required to file the appeal within 90 days from 01.03.2022, i.e., on or before 30.05.2022. The appeal having been filed only on 01.01.2026 remains clearly and substantially barred by limitation. The Committee reiterates that under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, condonation of delay is not automatic and can be granted only upon demonstration of reasonable and sufficient cause. In the present case, no such cause has been shown. The doctrine of delay and laches squarely applies, rendering the appeal not maintainable. The Appeal Committee also finds that the withdrawal of recognition was effected by the SRC in exercise of its statutory powers under Section 17(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993, due to non-compliance with mandatory regulatory requirements. No material has been placed before the Appeal Committee to dislodge the findings recorded by the WRC.

Noting the submission made in the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council holds that the appeal suffers from gross delay and laches, is barred by limitation, the appeal is accordingly not maintainable and stands rejected. The WRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be dismissed and therefore, the impugned order dated 28.08.2019 issued by WRC is confirmed.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and oral submissions advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee of the Council holds that the appeal suffers from gross delay and laches, is barred by limitation, and is therefore not maintainable and stands rejected. The WRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be dismissed and therefore, the impugned order dated 28.08.2019 issued by WRC is confirmed.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)  
Appeal ID: APPLWRC207615491

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, G S College of Commerce and Economics, Plot No. 89, South Civil Lines, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh – 482001.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, 2nd floor, Annex-3, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh-462004.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-22/E-395481/2026 Appeal/2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLERC202615503/E-89359

Mudo Tamo Memorial College Ziro, Siya Road, Lower Subansiri, Arunachal Pradesh – 791120	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Mr. Tripul Halдар, OSD</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, ERC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	29.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Mudo Tamo Memorial College Ziro, Siya Road, Lower Subansiri, Arunachal Pradesh – 791120** dated 09.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / ERC / 2627202509172697 / ARUNACHAL PRADESH / 2025 / REJC / 1958** dated 01.01.2026 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “the institution has stated in reply that the Ground, first and Second floor are completed. It means the third floor is incomplete as BCC shows that third floor also exists. Further, the BCC has been issued without the date and letter number. It indicates that BCC seems not to be genuine. 2. The BCC also shows that the institution is located on two plots which are 1.5 km apart. 3. The institution is showing infrastructural facilities of the new building in reply against show cause notice, whereas as per regulation, the four year B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. courses were to be transited into ITEP courses at the same address at which initial recognition was granted if the shifting has not been allowed by the NCTE. 4. In the instant case, shifting has not been done. 5. Further, perusal of the VT reports reveal that the inspection has been carried out on the new address.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Mr. Tripul Haldar, OSD of Mudo Tamo Memorial College Ziro, Siya Road, Lower Subansiri, Arunachal Pradesh – 791120** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “NCTE regulation 2014, appendix-13 has been abolished and as per ITEP regulation 2021 required land for ITEP program is 3000 sq. m instead of 2500 sq. m. The institute was established and recognized B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. – 4 Year Integrated Program by NCTE regulation 2014 appendix-13 As per Regulation 2014 appendix-13 B.A. B.SC B.Ed. program recognition order was granted after fulfilling of all required area but as per regulation 2021 ITEP (4-year integrated program) 500 sq. m land increased. The land and building of initial institution where we are running all teacher education program as well as degree

program that locked by 4 side (Market Area and Other personal land). Hence land cannot be increased. For additional intake 200 sq. m build up area also increased. Building cannot be constructed more than 5 stories because of 3-5 seismic zones (High Alert Zone) due to that the managing committee decided to shift to meet all the requirements of regulation 2021 for ITEP program. Building is constructed by spending more than 6-7 crore. Initially we are going to shift only teacher education program like B.Ed. /B.A. B.Ed. (ITEP). further on whole college along with degree program will be shifted with due permission from NCTE.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) on 05.10.2025 seeking recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The ERC, after consideration, refused recognition vide order dated 01.01.2026, on account of multiple deficiencies recorded in the Online Visiting Team report.

The matter was earlier placed before the Appeal Committee in its 1st Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026, wherein the Committee, upon preliminary examination, directed the appellant institution to clarify the status of submission of the hard copy of the appeal along with requisite supporting documents, in compliance with the applicable NCTE Rules and Regulations.

The appeal was thereafter taken up in the 2nd Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026. The Appeal Committee examined the Appeal Report, relevant records, and submissions made by the appellant institution. The appellant submitted that recognition for the B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. four-year integrated programme had earlier been granted under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, in accordance with Appendix-13, after fulfillment of the then-prescribed land and built-up area norms. It was stated that Appendix-13 has since been abolished, and that the

ITEP Regulations, 2021 now prescribe enhanced infrastructural requirements, including minimum land area of 3000 sq. metres. The appellant institution contended that the existing campus is geographically constrained, being surrounded by market areas and private land, and that further expansion is not feasible, particularly in view of seismic restrictions applicable to the region. It was further submitted that, in order to comply with the enhanced norms under the ITEP Regulations, 2021, the management has acquired land at a different location and commenced construction of a new building, with a proposal to shift the teacher education programmes, including ITEP, to the new premises, subject to statutory approvals.

The Appeal Committee noted the submission of the appellant institution that it is located in a hilly and seismically sensitive region of Arunachal Pradesh and, being an existing institution, is unable to augment its present land to meet the additional land and infrastructural requirements prescribed for implementation of the ITEP under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The appellant further submitted that it has acquired land at an alternative site in conformity with the ITEP norms and that construction of the requisite building is presently in progress. The Appeal Committee observed that compliance with land ownership, built-up area, instructional facilities, and other infrastructural norms is a mandatory statutory precondition under the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Such compliance must be complete, functional, and verifiable as on the date of consideration and prior to commencement of the academic session. The geographical or seismic characteristics of a region, while relevant for structural safety and compliance with the National Building Code and allied laws, do not dilute or relax the binding statutory requirements under the NCTE regulatory framework. The Appeal Committee is of the considered view that, if the appellant institution intends to run the ITEP programme at the newly acquired premises, it must first complete construction strictly in accordance with the prescribed norms, obtain all requisite statutory approvals including building completion, structural stability, fire safety, and land use certifications from the competent authorities, and thereafter seek consideration from the concerned Regional Committee in accordance with the provisions governing change of premises/shift of location under the NCTE Regulations.

The Appeal Committee reiterates that under the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the statutory burden to establish strict, continuous, and demonstrable compliance with the prescribed norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Recognition or continuation thereof is conditional upon fulfillment of mandatory requirements relating to land, building, instructional and infrastructural facilities, and other regulatory parameters. Mere assertions of compliance, unsupported by authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence, cannot displace or invalidate the factual findings recorded by the concerned Regional Committee in exercise of its statutory jurisdiction. The Appeal Committee, having regard to the nature of the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order, the appellant institution's categorical assertion of rectification, and the principles governing appellate scrutiny under Section 18 of the Act, is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted strictly for the purpose of factual re-verification. Such interference is confined to ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory consistency and shall not be construed as dilution of the binding statutory standards or as an expression of opinion on the merits of the appellant's claims. The Appeal Committee makes it explicit that any consideration of recognition shall arise only upon the appellant institution completing construction strictly in accordance with the prescribed norms under the NCTE Regulations, obtaining all requisite statutory approvals - including building completion, structural stability, fire safety, and land use certifications - from the competent authorities, and thereafter seeking consideration before the concerned Regional Committee in accordance with the provisions governing change of premises or shifting of location under the applicable Regulations. Compliance must be complete and demonstrable as on the date of consideration. The Appeal Committee further notes that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification within the statutory framework. The documents placed on record during appellate proceedings are relevant to the grounds of refusal and warrant examination in the interest of procedural fairness, consistent with the principle recognized by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in Rambha College of Education v. NCTE [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016]. However, such examination shall be confined strictly to verification of compliance with the mandatory provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

Noting the submission made in the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 decides to set aside the impugned order dated 01.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee solely for factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee as per the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Prior to such re-verification, the appellant institution shall deposit the requisite fee and submit a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon, along with certified copies of approvals issued by the competent authorities. The Online Visiting Team shall verify the specific infrastructural and instructional deficiencies noted in the impugned order and assess overall compliance with the norms and standards prescribed for implementation of the ITEP programme. The Regional Committee shall ensure strict adherence to the applicable provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Regulations framed thereunder, the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025 (where applicable), and all relevant academic, legal, and regulatory standards. Thereafter, the Eastern Regional Committee shall examine the Visiting Team report, the affidavit, and all supporting documents, and pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations herein, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny; it does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish strict compliance upon re-verification shall entail rejection in accordance with law, without further opportunity. The concerned Regional Committee, being custodian of its records, shall also ensure authenticity and completeness of the record before passing any consequential order and shall ensure time-bound disposal of the matter. The appellant institution shall forward, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal to the Regional Committee for further action in accordance with law.

#### IV. DECISION:

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and oral submissions advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee decides to set aside the impugned order dated 01.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee for limited factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee and strict compliance with the directions contained herein. The appellants institution shall forward the relevant documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within the stipulated timeframe.

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Mudo Tamo Memorial College Ziro, Siya Road, Lower Subansiri, Arunachal Pradesh – 791120.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, City-Itanagar, Arunachal Pradesh -791111.



एन सी टी ई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-38/E-396739/2026 Appeal/2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202615525 / E-89359

Shri Sanatan Dharam Girls College, Khasra No. 1809 (1-0), 1810 (7-17), 1813 (15-17), Bathinda, Amrik Singh Road, Punjab – 151001  अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT	<b>बनाम /</b>  <b>Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075  प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT
---	--------------------------------	--

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Dr. Neeru Garg, Principal
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	29.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF ORDER

The appeal of **Shri Sanatan Dharam Girls College, Khasra No. 1809 (1-0), 1810 (7-17), 1813 (15-17), Bathinda, Amrik Singh Road, Punjab - 151001** dated 25.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2526202405273379 / PUNJAB / 2024 / Recognition Order** dated 13.01.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, granting recognition for conducting ITEP Course, and as per appeal report the Appellant Institution submitted that "As per Appeal Report:- Applied for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. but only B.A. B.Ed. (1 unit) has been granted."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Dr. Neeru Garg, Principal of Shri Sanatan Dharam Girls College, Khasra No. 1809 (1-0), 1810 (7-17), 1813 (15-17), Bathinda, Amrik Singh Road, Punjab - 151001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "applied for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. but only B.A. B.Ed. (1 unit) has been granted."

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Committee noted that the appellant institution had applied on 30.05.2024 to the NRC seeking recognition under the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The NRC granted recognition vide order dated 13.01.2026; however, the Appellant Institution submitted in appeal that it has applied for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. but only B.A. B.Ed. (1 unit) was granted, which forms the sole subject matter of the present appeal.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2025 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal

Committee noted the submissions of the Appellant Institution, which has preferred the appeal against the grant of recognition for only one unit of B.A. B.Ed. under the four-year integrated teacher education programme, despite having applied for recognition for both B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes. The appellant institution submitted that it had applied for recognition for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes (Application No. 2526202405273379), and that it had obtained a No Objection Certificate from the affiliating body dated 30.05.2024 for running both programmes. It was further submitted that the institution is a Government-aided college, imparting education to girl students since 1966, accredited with 'A' grade by NAAC in both its first and second cycles, and conferred autonomous status by the UGC w.e.f. 13.11.2023. The appellant further contended that the institution is a multidisciplinary institution, offering undergraduate, postgraduate, and professional programmes in Arts, Commerce, Science, Management, Computer Applications, Library Science, and allied disciplines. It was also submitted that the institution has a total land area of 20,234 sq. m., with 12,309 sq. m. of built-up area, out of which 9,662.47 sq. m. has been earmarked exclusively for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme.

The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, the submissions advanced by the appellant institution, and the applicable statutory framework, namely the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition, Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021, read with Appendix-15 prescribing the Norms and Standards for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The Committee noted that Appendix-15 specifically governs faculty requirements, stage-wise implementation, and programme-specific compliance, and mandates that faculty shall be appointed in accordance with prescribed qualifications, specializations, and unit-wise intake norms. Inclusion of a programme in an application does not confer any automatic, vested, or accrued right to recognition. The statutory burden to establish strict and demonstrable compliance with Appendix-15 and the applicable Regulations rests entirely upon the applicant institution. In the present case, while the appellant institution has asserted availability of faculty and infrastructural facilities, the Committee finds that the decision of the Northern Regional Committee declining recognition for the B.Sc. B.Ed. discipline of ITEP program, without first affording a specific and focused opportunity to clarify

compliance under Appendix-15, renders the impugned action procedurally premature to that limited extent. The deficiencies relating to faculty deployment, specialization mapping, and stage-wise allocation are matters capable of objective verification upon submission of a comprehensive faculty matrix and supporting documentary evidence.

Noting the submissions placed on record and the documents produced during the appellate proceedings, and having regard to the limited issue concerning compliance with Appendix-15 of the NCTE (Recognition, Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended in 2021, the Appeal Committee, strictly for the limited purpose of ensuring procedural fairness, regulatory consistency, and faithful adherence to the statutory framework—without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant's claim and without in any manner diluting the mandatory standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder - hereby, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the Act, remands the matter to the concerned Regional Committee solely to the limited extent of re-examining the issue relating to non-grant of recognition for the B.Sc. B.Ed. discipline under ITEP programme, in accordance with law. The matter is remanded to the Northern Regional Committee for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with law and the applicable regulatory framework. The Northern Regional Committee shall: (a) Afford the appellant institution a personal or virtual hearing and grant one final and non-extendable opportunity of fifteen (15) days from receipt of this order to submit a comprehensive, documentary explanation establishing strict and contemporaneous compliance with Appendix-15, including a detailed faculty matrix specifying qualifications, subject specializations, stage-wise deployment, unit-wise allocation, and proof of approval by the competent affiliating authority; (b) Independently and objectively verify all documents and explanations submitted, and apply the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition, Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended in 2021) in their true letter and spirit, uninfluenced by prior proceedings but confined to the statutory parameters governing programme-specific recognition; (c) Record clear, reasoned, and item-wise findings on each regulatory requirement, particularly those arising under Appendix-15, and pass a reasoned and speaking order within thirty (30) days from receipt of the appellant's submissions. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to regulatory re-examination of compliance

under Appendix-15 and does not create any presumption, equity, legitimate expectation, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Recognition under the NCTE framework is conditional, programme-specific, and contingent upon strict, demonstrable, and verifiable compliance with statutory norms. Failure to establish such compliance upon remand shall entail rejection of the claim for recognition without any further opportunity. The appellant institution is directed to forward, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents relied upon in the appeal to the Northern Regional Committee. The Regional Committee shall thereafter proceed strictly in accordance with law and in light of the directions contained herein, ensuring time-bound disposal of the matter.

#### IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Shri Sanatan Dharam Girls College, Khasra No. 1809 (1-0), 1810 (7-17), 1813 (15-17), Bathinda, Amrik Singh Road, Punjab - 151001.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Block E, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali)-Punjab-160062.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)

जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-52/E-397532/2026 Appeal/2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLNRC202615522/E-89359

Indian Institute of Technology Jammu, NH-44, Khasra No. 1299, 1297, 1300, 1301, 1319, 1320/1, 1325/1, Jagti, Nagrota, Jammu & Kashmir – 181221	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Sh. Karshan Pareek, Deputy Registrar
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	29.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Indian Institute of Technology Jammu, NH-44, Khasra No. 1299, 1297, 1300, 1301, 1319, 1320/1, 1325/1, Jagti, Nagrota, Jammu & Kashmir - 181221** dated 22.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2627202505235171 / JAMMU AND KASHMIR / 2025 / REJC / 2073** dated 27.11.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. As per decision of NRC in its 449<sup>th</sup> Meeting (Volume-1) of NRC Final SCN for Deficiency- Preliminary Scrutiny was issued to the institution on 17.10.2025. 2. The institution has not uploaded reply of Final SCN For Deficiency-Preliminary Scrutiny till date."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Karshan Pareek, Deputy Registrar of Indian Institute of Technology Jammu, NH-44, Khasra No. 1299, 1297, 1300, 1301, 1319, 1320/1, 1325/1, Jagti, Nagrota, Jammu & Kashmir - 181221** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The rejection of the application is purely procedural in nature and is not based on any substantive deficiency relating to infrastructure, faculty, land, or academic preparedness of the Institute. b. The request for extension of time against the first Show Cause Notice was made in good faith, but not considered, and a reply for the final SCN could not be submitted due to a technical issue faced. c. The Institute made Bonafide efforts to comply with all requirements of NCTE and submitted replies through alternate modes due to technical constraints beyond its control. d. The pointwise reply for the final SCN is once again submitted herewith. 2. IIT Jammu is an Institute of National Importance, established in 2016 vide Gazette Notification No. 41 of 2016 dated 9 August 2016, by amendment to the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961, under the aegis of the Ministry of Education. In this regard, it is submitted that the building plan has been created by M/s Suresh Goel & Associates and approved by the Block Development Office Nagrota, Jammu JK UT. It is further stated that the regular classes for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme

(ITEP) will be conducted in ten operational classrooms located on the said floor. The total built-up area of the facility is 2,043 square meters, while the total land area of the Institute is 164,219 square meters. The relevant drawings and documents are enclosed herewith as Annexure 'D'. 3. The completion certificate issued by the CPWD is enclosed herewith as Annexure 'E'. 4. IIT Jammu is an Institute of National Importance, established in the year 2016 vide Gazette Notification No. 41 of 2016 dated 9 August 2016 by amendment of the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961. Further, Clause 6(1)(a) and 6(1)(b) of the said Act (Act No. 59 of 1961) empowers the Institutes of Technology to confer degrees, and accordingly, no separate affiliation with any university or examining body is required. The relevant statutory provisions are enclosed herewith as Annexure 'F'. 5. IIT Jammu is an Institute of National Importance, established in the year 2016 vide Gazette Notification No. 41 of 2016 dated 9 August 2016, by amendment of the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961, under the aegis of the Ministry of Education. In this regard, it is submitted that the building plan has been created by M/s Suresh Goel & Associates and approved by the Block Development Office Nagrota, Jammu JK UT. The legible copy is once again enclosed at Annexure 'D' duly highlighting the govt competent authority approval of the same. It is further stated that the regular classes for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) will be conducted in ten operational classrooms located on the said floor. The total built-up area of the facility is 2,043 square metres, while the total land area of the Institute is 164,219 square metres. The relevant drawings and documents are enclosed herewith as Annexure 'D'. 6. The Structural Safety Certificate issued by the CPWD and the Occupancy certificate issued by the Jammu Development Authority are enclosed as Annexure 'G'. 7. The requisite document is enclosed herewith as Annexure 'H'. 8. The buildings are compliant with the latest provisions of the National Building Code which mandates barrier-free accessibility. A certificate to this effect, duly signed by the Registrar, is enclosed as Annexure 'I'. The same can also be physically verified. Further, it is stated that IIT Jammu has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Central Public Works Department (CPWD). As per Clause 16 of the said MoU, CPWD, being a department of the Government of India and entrusted with the construction works at IIT Jammu, is mandatorily required to comply with all applicable laws, statutes, rules, orders, norms, and procedures laid down by the Government

of India. Annexure 'I'. The completion certificate issued by CPWD is already enclosed at Annexure 'E'. 9. The Central Public Works Department (CPWD), a department of the Government of India, undertook the construction works of IIT Jammu and has issued the completion certificate, which is enclosed herewith as Annexure 'E'. 10. The requisite document enclosed at Annexure 'J'."

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Northern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 27.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 27.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2025 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution that the rejection of its application was procedural in nature and not based on any substantive deficiency relating to infrastructure, land, faculty, or academic preparedness. It was contended that an extension of time was sought in response to the first Show Cause Notice in good faith; however, due to technical issues, the reply to the Final Show Cause Notice could not be uploaded on the portal. The institution submitted that bonafide efforts were made to comply with all requirements and that the pointwise reply to the Final Show Cause Notice has been resubmitted during the appellate proceedings. The appellant further submitted that IIT Jammu, established in 2016 as an Institute of National Importance under Gazette Notification No. 41 of 2016 dated 09.08.2016 through amendment to the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961, is empowered to confer degrees under Clause 6(1)(a) and 6(1)(b) of the said Act and does not require separate affiliation with any University or examining body. It was stated that the building plan, prepared by M/s Suresh Goel & Associates and approved by the Block Development Office, Nagrota, Jammu, along with structural

safety certificate, occupancy certificate issued by Jammu Development Authority, and completion certificate issued by CPWD, have been submitted. The Institute stated that ten operational classrooms are earmarked for ITEP, with a built-up area of 2,043 sq. metres and total land area of 164,219 sq. metres. The institution also submitted that the buildings comply with the National Building Code, including barrier-free accessibility provisions, and placed reliance on the Memorandum of Understanding with CPWD, stating that construction has been undertaken in accordance with applicable Government norms. Relevant documents were enclosed in support of the above submissions.

The Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution and observed that subsequent documents placed on record are also required to be considered for fair adjudication. Accordingly, the Regional Committee concerned shall re-examine the matter afresh and verify the authenticity and relevance of all documents and pass a reasoned order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act and Regulations. The Committee also took cognizance of the legal precedent set by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 - Rambha College of Education vs. NCTE, wherein it was held that any additional documents furnished by the appellant must be duly considered by the Appeal Committee while adjudicating the appeal.

Noting the submissions placed on record and the documents submitted, the Appeal Committee observes that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification on the basis of the submissions and documents placed before the Appeal Committee. In the interests of justice, the Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants limited interference, strictly within the statutory framework. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims and without diluting or negating the findings recorded in the impugned order, the Appeal Committee sets aside the order dated 27.11.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee. The Northern Regional Committee shall re-examine the case afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted during the appellate proceedings, and assess compliance with the applicable

shortlisting criteria, the requirements of a bona fide multidisciplinary institution, and the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines, if applicable. The said Regional Committee shall conduct such verification strictly in accordance with law and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed timeframe. The said Regional Committee, being the statutory custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity, completeness, and genuineness of all connected records, including those forming part of the original application and the documents submitted during appellate proceedings, before passing any consequential order. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules, and Regulations. The appellant institution shall forward to the said Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the said Regional Committee shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and the directions contained herein.

#### IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to remand back the case to NRC with a direction to verify the authenticity of the documents submitted before Appeal and then appropriate action shall be taken by the NRC as per provisions of the NCTE Regulations. The Appellant institution is directed to forward to the NRC the documents submitted in appeal within 15 days from the receipt of order of the Appeal and after receipt of the same the NRC to take further necessary action as per the NCTE Regulation, 2014, guidelines and amendments issued from time to time as per direction given herein above.

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Appeal ID : APPLNRC 202615522

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Indian Institute of Technology Jammu, NH-44, Khasra No. 1299, 1297, 1300, 1301, 1319, 1320/1, 1325/1, Jagti, Nagrota, Jammu & Kashmir - 181221.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Mini Block Civil Secretariat, Jammu, J&K.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-47/E-397263/2026 Appeal/2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLSRC202615526 / E-89359

Sri Utakanoor Basavalinga Tata D.Ed. College, Survey No. 63/01, Lingasugur, Bangalore By Pass Road, Raichur, Karnataka - 584122	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector - 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Venkatesh, Principal</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, SRC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	29.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Sri Utakanoor Basavalinga Tata D.Ed. College, Survey No. 63/01, Lingasugur, Bangalore By Pass Road, Raichur, Karnataka - 584122** dated 25.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. NCTE/SRC/PAR/ORDER/APSO1689/149673** dated 27.06.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting D.El.Ed. Course on the grounds that "The institution has not submitted any reply to the Show Cause Notice."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Venkatesh, Principal of Sri Utakanoor Basavalinga Tata D.Ed. College, Survey No. 63/01, Lingasugur, Bangalore By Pass Road, Raichur, Karnataka - 584122** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "It is respectfully submitted that, the respondent was pleased to grant recognition/permission to the appellant under section 14/15 of NCTE act, 1993 for the teacher education program. It is submitted that, the above said recognition/permission was granted vide recognition/ Permission No: F.SRO/NCTE/D.ED/2004-2005/8661/APS01689, Dated:25-11-2004. It is submitted that, after obtaining the recognition/ permission from the respondent, the appellant had been obediently following the guidelines, rules and regulations and institutions issued by the respondent, as law abiding the citizen. The appellant never intended to violate any direction issued by the respondent. It is submitted that, in obedience of the orders of the respondent about uploading of Performance Appraisal Report (PAR) for the academic session (s) 2021-22 and 2022-2023 and other related documents, the appellant filled the online par application and at last step due to technical issue and server error the appellant could not complete the application for those academic year. Thus, all possible effort made by the appellant failed. Non-uploading of the said information by the appellant is for Bonafide reason and unintentional one. It is submitted that the appellant does not receive any show cause notice. The appellant had to go through documents to give reply to the show cause notice hence, the

appellant after going through the documents try to upload the reply again the net system did not open for the said reason the appellant has sent hard of the replied to the show cause notice to the respondent 22/08/2025.the the copy of the same is enclosed for kind perusal of the honorable appellant authority. It is submitted that the respondent has placed that to withdraw the recognition/ permission granted vide his order bring file no: NCTE/2025/SRC/PAR/ORDER/APS01689/149673, Dated 27/06/2025.The copy of the same is enclosed for kind perusal of the honorable appellant authority.”

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for the D.El.Ed. course of two years' duration with an annual intake of 50 students. The recognition of the institution was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 04.06.2025 on the ground of non-submission of the mandatory Performance Appraisal Reports (PARs) for the academic sessions 2021–22 and 2022–23. Although the deadline for submission of PARs, initially fixed as 10.11.2024, was extended up to 31.12.2024 through successive Public Notices, the appellant institution failed to comply.

The Committee thereafter took note of the binding decision of the General Body of NCTE adopted in its 68<sup>th</sup> (Emergent) Meeting held on 25.11.2025, which is reproduced below verbatim:

#### **“3. DECISION OF THE COUNCIL**

**3.1 *In modification of the scope of the decision taken in the 67th General Body Meeting and to ensure procedural fairness, the General Body, after detailed deliberation, unanimously RESOLVED as follows:***

##### **(A) Approval of Final Opportunity:**

***The Council approves the reopening of the online PAR portal for a final, one-time opportunity for all TEIs to submit PAR for the Academic Sessions 2021-22 and 2022-23.***

**(B) Scope of Submission:**

***The opportunity is structured as follows:***

- ***TEIs Recognized up to Academic Session 2021-22: Must submit PAR for both 2021-22 and 2022-23.***
- ***TEIs Recognized in Academic Session 2022-23: Must submit PAR for 2022-23 only.***
- ***TEIs Recognized in/after 2023-24: Are not required to submit PAR for this specific cycle.***

**(C) Stipulation of Consequence:**

***The Council reiterates that the submission of PAR is mandatory for the continuation of recognition. It is also categorically clarified that any TEI that fails to submit the PAR within this final stipulated window shall be liable for appropriate action being instituted against it in terms of Section 17 of the NCTE Act, 1993 for withdrawal of its recognition.***

**(D) Mechanism for Withdrawn TEIs:**

***Access to the PAR portal shall remain restricted to TEIs whose recognition status is 'Active' or 'under judicial stay'.***

- ***The Council notes that the status of 'Withdrawn' recognition, once finalized, creates a jurisdictional bar (functus officio) that prevents the Regional Committee from unilaterally reopening the matter.***
- ***For TEIs whose recognition currently stands 'Withdrawn' on account of non-submission of PAR till 31.12.2024 and who have not approached any court; the onus is on the institution to demonstrate its operational intent. To avail of this final opportunity, such TEIs must first obtain an order of restoration or stay from a competent legal authority (i.e., the Hon'ble High Court or the NCTE Appellate Committee u/s 18) before the closing date of the portal window."***

The Committee also took note of the judicial pronouncements of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, including *Rambha College of Education v. NCTE* [W.P. (C) 3231/2016, judgment dated 23.02.2017], as well as orders dated 08.04.2021 in W.P.

(C) 4382/2021 and 30.07.2021 in W.P. (C) 7260/2021, which mandate that subsequent documents submitted in the appeal must be considered.

Appeal Committee further noted that the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 08.04.2021, passed in W.P. (C) 4382/2021 has observed as follows: -

***“Appellate Committee of NCTE, is directed to ensure that, whenever an order of remand is passed, the status of the impugned is clearly spelt out so that the institution is not compelled to approach the Court in this manner.”***

Appeal Committee noted that the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 30.07.2021, passed in W.P. (C) 7260/2021 has observed as follows: -

***“Although the Appellate Committee of the NCTE would be well advised to expressly quash the original order of the concerned Regional Committee while remanding the matter, the position in law is that the order automatically stands quashed. The institution is, therefore, entitled to the benefits of recognition until a fresh withdrawal order is passed.”***

The Appeal Committee, noting the above directives and the binding resolution of the General Body, finds that although the appellant institution was indeed deficient for failing to submit the PARs within the prescribed timelines, it nevertheless falls within the category of institutions permitted to avail the final, one-time opportunity for PAR submission, subject strictly to fulfilment of the conditions stipulated by the General Body. Accordingly, the appeal warrants disposal by way of remand, solely to give effect to the Council's binding decision and to ensure procedural fairness.

Noting the submissions and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, and guided by the binding resolution of the General Body of the NCTE adopted in its 68th (Emergent) Meeting held on 25.11.2025, the Appeal Committee hereby remands the matter to the Southern Regional Committee (SRC) with a specific direction that the appellant institutions shall be permitted to apply afresh and re-submit duly completed

PARs upon reopening of the PAR Portal, in accordance with the General Body's mandate. The concerned Regional Committees shall assume complete and undiluted responsibility for ensuring strict compliance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014, the General Body decision dated 25.11.2025, all applicable SOPs, and relevant Public Notices. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the SRC, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted before the Appeal Committee, whereupon the SRC shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and in conformity with the directions set out herein.

#### **IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 04.06.2025 and remand back the case to Southern Regional Committee for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with the directions contained hereinabove, the applicable law, and the binding decision of the General Body of the Council. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the directions contained herein.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### **Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Sri Utakanoor Basavalinga Tata D.Ed. College, Survey No. 63/01, Lingasugur, Bangalore By Pass Road, Raichur, Karnataka - 584122.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-511/E- 394096/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLERC202515461/E-89359

Bethesda Women Teachers Training College, Plot no. 793, 794, Gel Church Road, Compound, Ranchi Sadar, Jharkhand – 834001	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Raj Mani Tiwari, Edu. Advisor</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, ERC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Bethesda Women Teachers Training College, Plot no. 793, 794, Gel Church Road, Compound, Ranchi Sadar, Jharkhand - 834001** dated 09.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / ERC / 2526202405072666 / JHARKHAND / 2024 / REJC / 971** dated 25.10.2024 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The Final Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution vide dated 09.09.2024 with a direction to submit reply within 15 days, on the deficiencies, but the institution has not submitted its reply within specific time."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Raj Mani Tiwari, Edu. Advisor of Bethesda Women Teachers Training College, Plot no. 793, 794, Gel Church Road, Compound, Ranchi Sadar, Jharkhand - 834001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. As per direction of NCTE reply was submitted late due of EXIGENCIES of service in institution. 2. A institution obtained 10 points as per NCTE criteria. 3. The institution is multidisciplinary institution mom by the Gossner college of our society. More ever institution is opening own degree college after building completion will over upto 2027. 4. B.Ed. - 200 M.Ed. – 100. 5. Being uploaded. 6. Our society issued leased dead is being upload. 7. Building plan and building completion certificate are being upload issued by the competent authority of the Jharkhand state govt. 8. NOC from higher education and Ranchi university Ranchi is under process application for the same is being upload. 9. Building safety certificate is being upload. 10. Fire safety certificate is being upload. 11. Being upload. 12. Due to lease deed by the society non encumbrance certificate. 13. Already replied in late due to Exigencies of service."

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Eastern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 21.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 25.10.2024.

The instant matter was placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant another (second) opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter was placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that the delay in filing reply was due to exigencies of service within the institution. The institution contended that it has secured 10 points as per the NCTE shortlisting criteria and qualifies as a multidisciplinary institution, being managed by the same society that runs Gossner College, with a proposal to establish its own degree college upon completion of the building by 2027. It was further submitted that the institution is presently conducting B.Ed. (200 intake) and M.Ed. (100 intake) programmes and has uploaded the requisite documents, including the registered lease deed issued by the society, approved building plan, Building Completion Certificate, Building Safety Certificate, and Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority of the State Government of Jharkhand. The institution also stated that the Non-Encumbrance Certificate is linked to the leased land and that the NOC from the Higher Education Department and Ranchi University is under process, with the application already uploaded.

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18

of the NCTE Act, 1993, after due and conscious application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has failed to discharge the statutory burden cast upon it to establish, through cogent, credible, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the material placed on record is deficient, inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The institution has failed to place on record any cogent and substantive material demonstrating that it satisfies the prescribed shortlisting criteria applicable for processing of ITEP applications from Multidisciplinary Institutions for the academic session 2025–2026. The NAAC certificate relied upon by the appellant expired on 08.06.2022, and no valid, current, and subsisting accreditation has been produced. In the absence of a valid NAAC accreditation, the institution does not meet the threshold eligibility conditions under the notified shortlisting framework.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee finds that the appellant institution has failed to furnish authentic, certified, and verifiable land and building documents as mandated under the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The land documents placed on record indicate that the property is held on private lease, which does not satisfy the mandatory requirement of lawful possession in the name of the institution or its sponsoring society/trust as prescribed under the applicable Regulations governing recognition. Such non-fulfilment constitutes a threshold statutory non-compliance affecting eligibility for grant or continuation of recognition. The Appeal Committee further observes that the documents submitted in purported compliance are either illegible photocopies or lack proper authentication, certification, and evidentiary reliability. Documents of such character cannot be relied upon for regulatory determination under the statutory scheme. A perusal of the Appeal Report confirms that the material placed on record does not substantiate the institution's claim of compliance with the infrastructural norms and standards prescribed under the applicable Regulations. Accordingly, the deficiency is substantive, material, and goes to the root of eligibility under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder.

- (iii) The appellant institution failed to submit any reply to the Final Show Cause Notice dated 09.09.2024 issued by the Eastern Regional Committee within the stipulated timeframe and has not furnished any satisfactory explanation for such non-compliance. Even during the appellate proceedings, despite being afforded opportunity to produce specific and substantive documents, the institution has failed to submit complete, verifiable, and legally sustainable records. The purported compliance remains deficient, fragmented, and incapable of establishing adherence to the mandatory requirements under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply and supporting documents; and the deficiencies were specifically identified and communicated. The grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility, infrastructural adequacy, and regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The deficiencies identified are substantive and foundational in nature and relate to threshold conditions for grant of recognition. They cannot be treated as technical irregularities capable of post facto rectification by explanation. It is settled that grant of recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is not automatic upon submission of an application. Recognition is conditional upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the statutory framework at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by applying for recognition. In the present case, despite adequate opportunity granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the

Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Eastern Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 25.10.2024 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

#### IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee concluded that the ERC was justified in refusing recognition and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned Refusal order dated 25.10.2024 issued by ERC is confirmed.

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Bethesda Women Teachers Training College, Plot no. 793, 794, Gel Church Road, Compound, Ranchi Sadar, Jharkhand - 834001.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher and Technical Education, Nepal house, Yojna Bhawan, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Jharkhand.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-513/E- 394539/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202515476/E-89359

D. A. V. College, Khasra No. 83, 87, 97/84, 98/84, 99/85, 100/85, 113/75, 116/86, Chandigarh Road, Hoshiarpur, Punjab – 146001	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. Vinay Kumar, Principal</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **D. A. V. College, Khasra No. 83, 87, 97/84, 98/84, 99/85, 100/85, 113/75, 116/86, Chandigarh Road, Hoshiarpur, Punjab - 146001** dated 24.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2526202405283409 / PUNJAB / 2024 / REJC / 1632** dated 29.10.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “The institution has appointed faculty as Associate Professors-2 and Assistant Professors-5. The institution has not appointed faculty members for History, Geography, Economics and 2 Professors for Educational Studies for offering B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 Unit). The institution has also not appointed faculty members for Maths, Physics, Zoology/Life Science/Bioscience, Botany/Life Science/Bioscience, Communicative skills in English and 2 Professors for Educational Studies for offering B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 Unit). The institution has also not appointed faculty for Health and Physical Education, Arts Education and Career Guidance and Counselling. The institution was required to upload list of all the staff members along with photographs, subject of teaching and other details in the prescribed format separately for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 Unit) and B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 Unit) courses duly approved by the University concerned as per Norms and Standards for ITEP notified on 26.10.2021.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Dr. Vinay Kumar, Principal of D. A. V. College, Khasra No. 83, 87, 97/84, 98/84, 99/85, 100/85, 113/75, 116/86, Chandigarh Road, Hoshiarpur, Punjab - 146001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “Explanation regarding recruitment process and reasons for delay in appointment of faculty for ITEP To The Regional Director Northern Regional Committee National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka New Delhi – 110075 Subject: Comprehensive explanation regarding steps taken and reasons for delay in appointment of faculty for Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) Respected Sir/Madam, With due respect, this is submitted in reference to the Refusal Order issued vide F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2526202405283409 / PUNJAB / 2024 / REJC

/ 1632 dated 29.10.2025 regarding grant of recognition to D.A.V. College, Hoshiarpur for Integrated Teacher Education Programme (B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed.) for the session 2025–26. It is submitted that after due VT the LOI has been issued to the college vide letter No. F. No. NCTE/NRC/2526202405283409/PUNJAB/2024/LOI dated 02-06-2025. There were three further requirements in the LOI. The college has submitted the partial list of the staff and remaining recruitment of the staff in process. The requirement regarding website has been fulfilled. The FDR for rupees 12 lakh related to the endowment and reserve fund has been made. The institution respectfully submits a complete and factual chronology of actions taken for recruitment of faculty, clearly demonstrating that the entire process was conducted strictly as per NCTE norms, UGC Regulations and Panjab University guidelines, and that the delay was procedural and beyond the control of the college. Chronology of Actions Taken

1. Permission to advertise Assistant Professor posts for ITEP (B.A. B.Ed. & B.Sc. B.Ed.) was sought from the D.A.V. College Managing Committee (The concerned Governing body of the institution) on 04.06.2025 (Letter No. PB-3655) and was granted on 09.06.2025.
2. The college sought approval from Panjab University, Chandigarh on 10.06.2025 (Letter No. 7691/DAV/HSP dated 09-06-2025). On 26.06.2025, the Dean College Development Council (DCDC) office intimated that the advertisement was in the old format. The revised advertisement as per latest guidelines was submitted on 28.06.2025 and was found in order by the DCDC office, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
3. The posts were duly advertised on 04.07.2025 in The Tribune, Punjab Kesari and Jagbani (The newspapers as specified by Panjab University Chandigarh). Panjab University Chandigarh uploaded the advertisement on its Recruitment Portal vide Advertisement No. 262, with 02.08.2025 as the last date for submission of online applications along with hard copies to the college. The college received a substantial number of applications in the due course.
4. On 25.08.2025, the college received the consolidated list of candidates through email from the DCDC office, Panjab University, Chandigarh. The college checked and verified the university list with the hard copies received and prepared the subject-wise consolidated lists.
5. As directed telephonically by the office of DCDC Panjab University, Chandigarh, the college was instructed to conduct scrutiny at the college level. Accordingly, the college constituted a Pre-Screening Committee on 14.11.2025 to scrutinize and verify all applications and prepare

summary score sheets strictly as per UGC Regulations, 2018. 6. The Pre-Screening Committee submitted its detailed report to the Principal on 19.11.2025, and the same was formally intimated to the DCDC Panjab University, Chandigarh office vide Letter No. 8128/DAV/HSP dated 20.11.2025 7. On 24.11.2025, the college received an email from the DCDC office informing that the meeting of the University-constituted Short-Listing Committee would be held on 27.11.2025 at the DCDC office, Panjab University, Chandigarh. The college representatives attended the meeting with all required documents, and the records were duly examined. 8. The college has received the panel of Vice-Chancellor's nominees and subject experts for the selection of Assistant Professors on 24.12.2025 vide Letter No. 605 OS/VC/DS dated 22-12-2025 issued by the Special Officer to the Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh. Next Course of Action The college shall now fix the meeting of the Selection Committee in consultation with the Vice-Chancellor's nominees and subject experts, strictly as per Panjab University norms and UGC Regulations, 2018 shortly and the recruitment of the staff will be made by the committee duly constituted by the Panjab University, Chandigarh. Submission It is submitted that the entire selection process shall be completed within the next month and immediately after completion of the selection and appointment process, the same shall be duly intimated NCTE for kind consideration and approval of the ITEP (B.A. B.Ed. /B.Sc. B.Ed.) course for the session 2026-27 to the institution. From the above, it is evident that the recruitment process has progressed to its final stage and any delay that occurred earlier was procedural and beyond the control of the institution. The college has acted diligently and in full compliance with statutory provisions at every stage. The institution humbly requests that this explanation may kindly be taken on record and considered sympathetically while deciding the appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993."

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Northern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 31.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 29.10.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant another (second) opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that, pursuant to the Visiting Team report, a Letter of Intent dated 02.06.2025 was issued by NRC for the ITEP (B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed.) programme. The institution stated that the requirements regarding website updation and creation of Endowment and Reserve Fund (FDR of ₹12 lakh) have been complied with, and that partial faculty details were submitted while the remaining recruitment is under process. The institution furnished a detailed chronology of the recruitment process, stating that approval to advertise posts was obtained from the Managing Committee and Panjab University; the advertisement was issued in prescribed newspapers and uploaded on the University portal; applications were received and scrutinized through a duly constituted Pre-Screening Committee; and shortlisting was conducted in coordination with the Dean College Development Council, Panjab University. It was further submitted that the panel of Vice-Chancellor's nominees and subject experts has been received and that the Selection Committee meeting will be convened shortly as per University and UGC norms. The appellant contended that the delay in appointment of faculty was procedural and attributable to University-level processes beyond the control of the college, and requested that the same be considered while deciding the appeal.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with various documents in purported fulfilment of the deficiencies cited in the refusal order. At the same time, the Committee observed that a substantial part of the material relied upon by the appellant institution was either not before the NRC at the time of passing the impugned order or requires authentication and factual verification by the competent Regional Committee.

The Appeal Committee also took note of the settled legal position as laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 – Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, wherein it has been held that material and documents placed on record by an appellant must be duly examined during appellate scrutiny and cannot be disregarded without verification. The Committee reiterates that such consideration does not imply acceptance and must be subject to strict regulatory scrutiny by the competent Regional Committee.

Noting the submissions placed on record and the documents submitted, the Appeal Committee observes that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification on the basis of the submissions and documents placed before the Appeal Committee. In the interests of justice, the Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants limited interference, strictly within the statutory framework. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims and without diluting or negating the findings recorded in the impugned order, the Appeal Committee sets aside the order dated 29.10.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee. The Northern Regional Committee shall re-examine the case afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted during the appellate proceedings, and assess compliance with the applicable shortlisting criteria, the requirements of a bona fide multidisciplinary institution, and the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines, if applicable. The said Regional Committee shall conduct such verification strictly in accordance with law and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order

within the prescribed timeframe. The said Regional Committee, being the statutory custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity, completeness, and genuineness of all connected records, including those forming part of the original application and the documents submitted during appellate proceedings, before passing any consequential order. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules, and Regulations. The appellant institution shall forward to the said Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the said Regional Committee shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and the directions contained herein.

#### **IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 29.10.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme with the directions specified hereinabove. The NRC shall take a reasoned and speaking decision after considering all documents and subsequent submissions of the appellant, including compliance with the deficiencies cited in the impugned order. The appellant institution is also directed to forward the documents submitted in appeal to the NRC within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### **Copy to :-**

- 1. The Principal, D. A. V. College, Khasra No. 83, 87, 97/84, 98/84, 99/85, 100/85, 113/75, 116/86, Chandigarh Road, Hoshiarpur, Punjab - 146001.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Block E, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali)-Punjab-160062.



एन सी टी ई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में / IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील /  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-02/E- 394603/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLWRC202515477 / E-89359

GD Rungta College of Science and Technology, Khasra No. 1139/2, 4, 6, 1140/2, Kohka Kurud Road, Jamul, Dhamdha, Durg, Chhattisgarh – 490024	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Prakash Chandra Wahaney, Deputy Registrar</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **GD Rungta College of Science and Technology, Khasra No. 1139/2, 4, 6, 1140/2, Kohka Kurud Road, Jamul, Dhamdha, Durg, Chhattisgarh - 490024** dated 25.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / WRC / 2627202505154560 / CHATTISGARH / 2025 / REJC / 1903** dated 27.10.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “that  
“1. As per BCC uploaded by the institution, the total land area 3.60 acres and total built-up area 40,000 sq. ft. earmarked for teacher education programmers in which the institution offers B.Ed. (2 Units), D.El.Ed. (1 Units) and M.Ed. (1 Unit) which requires 4,000 sq. mtr. Built-up area as per NCTE Norms (NCTE Regulations, 2014). The sufficiency of built-up area for proposed ITEP (6 units in total) cannot be ascertained.  
2. The website of institution has not been updated and maintained in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14), and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Prakash Chandra Wahaney, Deputy Registrar of GD Rungta College of Science and Technology, Khasra No. 1139/2, 4, 6, 1140/2, Kohka Kurud Road, Jamul, Dhamdha, Durg, Chhattisgarh - 490024** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “Since the space in this box is short to give reasoned explanation hence a separate sheet is uploaded with this online appeal giving the reasoned explanations against the ground on which the grant of recognition has been rejected.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Western Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 27.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 27.05.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant another (second) opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that, due to limited space available in the online appeal format, it was unable to furnish detailed explanations within the prescribed text box. Accordingly, the institution uploaded a separate detailed note along with the online appeal, providing reasoned explanations in response to the grounds on which recognition was refused.

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after due and conscious application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has failed to discharge the statutory burden cast upon it to establish, through cogent, credible, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the material placed on record is deficient, inadequate,

and incapable of demonstrating substantive compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that the appellant institution initially submitted a Building Completion Certificate (BCC) indicating a built-up area of 40,000 sq. ft. Subsequently, at the appellate stage, the institution produced another BCC reflecting a built-up area of 80,000 sq. ft., purportedly issued by Sky Line Associates and stated to have been certified by the Building Officer, Nagar Palia. The Appeal Committee finds that the later document lacks proper authentication and verifiable certification by the competent statutory authority as required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The substantial variation in the declared built-up area, without cogent explanation or contemporaneous statutory approval, raises serious doubts regarding the credibility and evidentiary value of the document. Under the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the applicable Regulations and Norms, submission of an authentic and duly certified Building Completion Certificate from the competent local authority is a mandatory precondition for establishing infrastructural adequacy. The appellant has failed to furnish a consistent, authenticated, and legally sustainable BCC in conformity with the prescribed requirements. Accordingly, the documents placed on record cannot be relied upon for regulatory determination, and the deficiency constitutes material non-compliance with the mandatory infrastructural norms under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply and supporting documents; and the deficiencies were specifically identified and communicated. The grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility, infrastructural adequacy, and regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The

deficiencies identified are substantive and foundational in nature and relate to threshold conditions for grant of recognition. They cannot be treated as technical irregularities capable of post facto rectification by explanation. It is settled that grant of recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is not automatic upon submission of an application. Recognition is conditional upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the statutory framework at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by applying for recognition. In the present case, despite adequate opportunity granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Western Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 27.10.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee concluded that the WRC was justified in refusing recognition and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned Refusal order dated 27.10.2025 issued by WRC is confirmed.

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. The Principal, GD Rungta College of Science and Technology, Khasra No. 1139/2, 4, 6, 1140/2, Kohka Kurud Road, Jamul, Dhamdha, Durg, Chhattisgarh - 490024.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Government of Chhattisgarh, First floor, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh, 492002.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-04/E- 394905/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515489/E-89359

Prema Kanthi College of Education, Survey No. 6a, Bhandarkar Complex, Kulur, Mannagudda, Mangalore, Karnataka- 575003	<u>बनाम /</u> <u>Vs</u>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Sh. Ajesh V S, Correspondent
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	30.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Prema Kanthi College of Education, Survey No. 6a, Bhandarkar Complex, Kulur, Mannagudda, Mangalore, Karnataka- 575003** dated 07.09.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. SRO / NCTE / APS03757 / B.Ed. / KA / 2021 / 29831** dated 07.01.2022 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “The institution was issued a Last Reminder Letter on 29.06.2021. The institution failed to submit reply to the last reminder letter.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Ajesh V S, Correspondent of Prema Kanthi College of Education, Survey No. 6a, Bhandarkar Complex, Kulur, Mannagudda, Mangalore, Karnataka- 575003** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Petition is allowed. 2. High Court Order is not accepted by Regional Committee. 3 But not accepted by SRC. The institution further vide letter dated 30.12.2025 submitted that in compliance with the directions of the Hon’ble High Court of Karnataka and the requirements of NCTE, it has furnished all requisite documents in support of its claim for recognition/intake. The submissions include certified copies of the sale deed and land-use documents, latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (English version), approved building plan, Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed NCTE format, proof of creation of Endowment Fund and Reserve Fund through FDRs in the joint account for the stipulated period, duly approved staff profile as per NCTE norms, notarized trust registration documents, affidavit relating to land and building, and a copy of the High Court order dated 10.12.2025 condoning the delay. The institution contended that all statutory and regulatory requirements now stand complied with and requested consideration of its case accordingly.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was originally granted recognition for the Secondary (B.Ed.) programme of one-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 03.02.2006. Pursuant to the promulgation of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, the institution submitted an affidavit dated 21.01.2015 expressing its willingness to comply with the revised norms. Consequently, a Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued permitting the institution to conduct the B.Ed. programme of two-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 27.05.2015. The Committee further noted that the recognition of the institution was withdrawn by the Southern Regional Committee (SRC) vide order dated 07.01.2022, and that such withdrawal has remained in force since then.

The matter was first placed before the Appeal Committee in its 1st Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026. After examining the Appeal Report, records, and documents submitted, the Committee, in order to examine the case on merits, resolved to afford an opportunity to the appellant institution to submit specified documents.

The instant matter was placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee examined the Appeal Report, written representations, and documents placed on record. The appellant institution submitted that, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka and the requirements of NCTE, it had furnished documents including sale deed and land-use records, Non-Encumbrance Certificate, approved building plan, Building Completion Certificate, proof of Endowment Fund and Reserve Fund through FDRs, staff profile, trust registration documents, affidavit relating to land and building,

and the High Court order condoning delay. It was contended that statutory requirements now stood complied with and the case deserved consideration.

The Appeal Committee noted that appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru by filing Writ Petition No. 36102 of 2025. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

***“...(iii) If the petitioner files such an appeal before the appropriate authority within a period of eight (8) weeks from today, the Appellate Authority shall condone the delay on the part of the petitioner in filing such an appeal and dispose of the appeal on merits and in accordance with law.***

***(iv) Immediately upon the petitioner filing such an appeal, the Appellate Authority shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders after providing sufficient and reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and hearing the petitioner, in accordance with law.***

***(v) It is made clear that the present order is passed in the peculiar/special/unique facts and circumstances of the instant case and this order shall not be treated as precedent nor shall it carry as precedential value for any purpose or whatsoever.”***

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the mandatory and threshold recognition standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the material produced is manifestly deficient, legally inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive, verifiable, and continuous compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant or restoration of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of strict and demonstrable adherence to the regulatory regime, no vested, accrued, equitable, or enforceable right can be

asserted by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, proceeds to record the following findings: -

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that recognition of the institution stood withdrawn in January 2022 and has not been restored at any point thereafter. The record further reflects that the concerned University has not extended or renewed affiliation subsequent to such withdrawal. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any order evidencing subsisting recognition, continuation of affiliation, or any judicial direction authorizing continued academic operation. In the absence of lawful recognition and valid affiliation, the institution cannot, in the eyes of law, be regarded as an existing or functional teacher education institution and is, for regulatory purposes, non-existent.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including proof of appointment approval by the affiliating University or payment of salary. The faculty list placed on record is not approved by the competent affiliating authority, as mandatorily required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of duly approved faculty would amount to sanctioning a grave, substantive, and continuing breach of the statutory framework, striking at the very foundation of quality assurance in teacher education.
- (iii) The Appeal Committee observes that the appellant institution failed to submit any reply to the Show Cause Notice, the Final Show Cause Notice, and the last Reminder dated 29.06.2021 issued by the Southern Regional Committee within the stipulated period, and has furnished no cogent or satisfactory explanation for such persistent default. Even during the appellate proceedings, despite being afforded adequate opportunity to produce specific and material documents, the institution has failed to place on record complete, authentic, and legally sustainable evidence of compliance. The purported submissions remain fragmented, deficient, and incapable of establishing adherence to the mandatory requirements of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting

documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, and in due compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go

to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 07.01.2022 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and after due consideration in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Any further opportunity would be contrary to the NCTE Act, 1993 and destructive of regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 07.01.2022 passed by the Southern Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Prema Kanthi College of Education, Survey No. 6a, Bhandarkar Complex, Kulur, Mannagudda, Mangalore, Karnataka- 575003.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-05/E- 394910/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515448 /E-89359

Sahil College of Education, Survey No. 209, Chidri Road, Chidri Bidar, Karnataka – 585403	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Dr. S. M. Nadaf, Correspondent
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	30.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Sahil College of Education, Survey No. 209, Chidri Road, Chidri Bidar, Karnataka - 585403** dated 25.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F.SRO/NCTE/APS07378/B.Ed./KA/2020/14098-4104** dated 20.01.2020 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “1. The Management of the institution had not submitted required documents in response to Show Cause Notice (SCN) issued to the institution on 05.02.2019. 2. The Registrar, Gulbarga University, Karnataka vide letter no. Sl. No.GUK/ACA?B.Ed./2019-20/1231 dated 06.11.2019 has informed that the University has discontinued the extension of affiliation from the academic year 2016-2017 in respect of the institution Sahil College of Education, Shanti Nikethan Educational Campus, Chidri Road, Bidar, Dist. – 585403, Karnataka”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Dr. S. M. Nadaf, Correspondent of Sahil College of Education, Survey No. 209, Chidri Road, Chidri Bidar, Karnataka - 585403** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “Reply is not did not Show Cause Notice”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of two-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 30.08.2007. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 the institution has submitted affidavit dt. 10.02.2015 for its willingness for adherence of provisions of new Regulations. A Revised Provisional

Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 (two basic units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 16.05.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 20.01.2020.

The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein. Simultaneously, the Appeal Committee also decided to call upon the Regional Director, SRC, to furnish a detailed status report of the case of the institution, including the sequence of events and actions taken by the SRC leading to the withdrawal of recognition.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution, Sahil College of Education (B.Ed.), Bidar, Karnataka, vide its letter dated 29.12.2025, submitted that it has furnished the requisite documents in support of its B.Ed. programme (50+50 intake, two units). The institution submitted notarized copies of the registered sale deed, tax paid receipts, electricity bill, and land use certificate confirming educational use of the land; the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent authority along with notarized English translation; the approved building plan duly sanctioned by the competent authority; the Building Completion Certificate in the NCTE prescribed format; the staff profile approved by the competent authority as per NCTE norms; the notarized copy of the Society Registration Certificate; and the notarized affidavit relating to land and building. The institution also submitted a copy of the Hon'ble High Court Order in WP No. 34003/2025 and requested that the submitted documents be taken on record and its case be considered accordingly.

The Appeal Committee noted that appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru by filing Writ Petition No. 34003 of 2025. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

- (i) ***“The petition is disposed of.***
- (ii) ***Liberty is reserved in favour of the petitioner to file an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 before the appropriate Appellate Authority.***
- (iii) ***If the petitioner files such an appeal before the appropriate authority within a period of eight (8) weeks from today, the Appellate Authority shall condone the delay on the part of the petitioner in filing such an appeal and dispose off the appeal on merits and in accordance with law.***
- (iv) ***Immediately upon the petitioner filing such an appeal, the Appellate Authority shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders after providing sufficient and reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and hearing the petitioner, in accordance with law.***
- (v) ***It is made clear that the present order is passed in the peculiar/special/unique facts and circumstances of the instant case and this order shall not be treated as precedent nor shall it carry any precedential value for any purpose or whatsoever.”***

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the mandatory and threshold recognition standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the material produced is manifestly deficient, legally inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive, verifiable, and continuous compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant or restoration of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of strict and demonstrable adherence to the regulatory regime, no vested, accrued, equitable, or enforceable right can be asserted by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, proceeds to record the following findings: -

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that recognition of the institution stood withdrawn in January 2020 and has not been restored at any point thereafter. The record further reflects that the concerned University has not extended or renewed affiliation subsequent to such withdrawal. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any order evidencing subsisting recognition, continuation of affiliation, or any judicial direction authorizing continued academic operation. In the absence of lawful recognition and valid affiliation, the institution cannot, in the eyes of law, be regarded as an existing or functional teacher education institution and is, for regulatory purposes, non-existent.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including proof of appointment approval by the affiliating University or payment of salary. The institution failed to submit faculty list approved by the competent affiliating authority, as mandatorily required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of duly approved faculty would amount to sanctioning a grave, substantive, and continuing breach of the statutory framework, striking at the very foundation of quality assurance in teacher education.
- (iii) The Appeal Committee observes that the appellant institution failed to submit any reply to the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice issued by the Southern Regional Committee within the stipulated period and has furnished no cogent or satisfactory explanation for such persistent default. Even during the appellate proceedings, despite being afforded adequate opportunity to produce specific and material documents, the institution has failed to place on record complete, authentic, and legally sustainable evidence of compliance. The purported submissions remain fragmented, deficient, and incapable of establishing adherence to the mandatory requirements of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy,

instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, and in due compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the

binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 20.01.2020 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and after due consideration in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Any further opportunity would be contrary to the NCTE Act, 1993 and destructive of regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 20.01.2020 passed by the Southern Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Sahil College of Education, Survey No. 209, Chidri Road, Chidri Bidar, Karnataka - 585403.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-06/E- 394915/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515488/E-89359

Gurukull College of Education B.Ed., Survey No. 46, Metagalli, Belgola, Mysore, Karnataka – 570016	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Sh. Rajappa, Principal
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	30.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Gurukull College of Education B.Ed., Survey No. 46, Metagalli, Belgola, Mysore, Karnataka - 570016** dated 05.09.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. SRO / NCTE / APSO2383 / B.Ed. / KA / 2019 / 10092 / 0097** dated 01.10.2019 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “ The Committee noted the as per the VT report submitted by the VT member there is no such institution (Gurukull College of Education) with the physical structure of the building. There is no building or premises in the name of Gurukul College of Education. On one side corner of the Plot No. 120 construction of ¾ shops were carried out and two masons were doing their work. It was ascertained by the VT members that Plot No. 120 is a vacant site and there is no such institution in the above address.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Rajappa, Principal of Gurukull College of Education B.Ed., Survey No. 46, Metagalli, Belgola, Mysore, Karnataka - 570016** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Not allowed. 2. Not given Restoration Order.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for conducting B.Ed. course of one-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 08.11.2006. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 01.10.2019.

The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The

Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein. Simultaneously, the Appeal Committee also decided to call upon the Regional Director, SRC, to furnish a detailed status report of the case of the institution, including the sequence of events and actions taken by the SRC leading to the withdrawal of recognition.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution, in its appeal and during the hearing, submitted that it has furnished all requisite documents in support of its application, including land ownership documents, approved building plan, building completion certificate, land use certificate, Non-Encumbrance Certificate, staff profile approved by the competent authority, Society registration documents, and Fixed Deposit Receipts towards Endowment and Reserve Funds, as prescribed under the NCTE Regulations. The institution further submitted that the Hon'ble High Court has passed an order directing consideration of its case, and a copy of the said order has been submitted to the Council. The appellant contended that its application was not allowed earlier and that no restoration order was issued, and therefore requested the Appeal Committee to consider its case in light of the documents submitted and the directions of the Hon'ble High Court.

The Appeal Committee noted that appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru by filing Writ Petition No. 36096 of 2025. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

- (i) ***“The petition is disposed of.***
- (ii) ***Liberty is reserved in favour of the petitioner to file an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 before the appropriate Appellate Authority.***
- (iii) ***If the petitioner files such an appeal before the appropriate authority within a period of eight (8) weeks from today, the Appellate Authority shall condone the delay on the part of the petitioner in filing such an appeal and dispose of the appeal on merits and in accordance with law.***

- (iv) ***Immediately upon the petitioner filing such an appeal, the Appellate Authority shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders after providing sufficient and reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and hearing the petitioner, in accordance with law.***
- (vi) ***It is made clear that the present order is passed in the peculiar/special/unique facts and circumstances of the instant case and this order shall not be treated as precedent nor shall it carry as precedential value for any purpose or whatsoever."***

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the mandatory and threshold recognition standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the material produced is manifestly deficient, legally inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive, verifiable, and continuous compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant or restoration of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of strict and demonstrable adherence to the regulatory regime, no vested, accrued, equitable, or enforceable right can be asserted by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, proceeds to record the following findings: -

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that recognition of the institution stood withdrawn in October 2019 and has not been restored at any point thereafter. The record further reflects that the concerned University has not extended or renewed affiliation subsequent to such withdrawal. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any order evidencing subsisting recognition, continuation of affiliation, or any judicial direction authorizing continued academic operation. In the absence of lawful recognition and valid affiliation, the institution cannot, in the eyes of law, be regarded as an existing or functional teacher education institution and is, for regulatory purposes, non-existent.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including proof of appointment approval by the affiliating University or payment of salary. The Appeal Committee observed that the faculty list placed on record is a coloured

photocopy in which the seal and signature are not clearly visible and appears to be an outdated document. The institution has, therefore, failed to submit a faculty list duly approved by the competent affiliating authority, as mandatorily required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of duly approved faculty would amount to sanctioning a grave, substantive, and continuing breach of the statutory framework, striking at the very foundation of quality assurance in teacher education.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds the grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, and in

due compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 01.10.2019 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and after due consideration in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Any further opportunity would be contrary to the NCTE Act, 1993 and destructive of regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 01.10.2019 passed by the Southern Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Appeal ID: APPLSR/20>515488

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Gurukull College of Education B.Ed., Survey No. 46, Metagalli, Belgola, Mysore, Karnataka - 570016.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-07/E- 394893/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515482 / E-89359

Bidar Vidya Kendra College, Survey No. 209, Shantiniketan Educational Campus, Chidri Bidar, Karnataka – 585403	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Ms. Asha Mudhale, Principal</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, SRC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL**

The appeal of **Bidar Vidya Kendra College, Survey No. 209, Shantiniketan Educational Campus, Chidri Bidar, Karnataka - 585403** dated 28.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. SRO / NCTE / APSO2216 / B.Ed. / KA / 2019 / 12966-2972** dated 10.12.2019 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “The institution was issued Final Show Cause Notice on 10.10.2019. But the institution has not yet submitted its reply till date.”

### **II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -**

**Ms. Asha Mudhale, Principal of Bidar Vidya Kendra College, Survey No. 209, Shantiniketan Educational Campus, Chidri Bidar, Karnataka - 585403** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “For Show Cause Notice reply not given”

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 03.12.2004 from the academic session 2004-2005. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 the institution has submitted affidavit dt. 06.02.2015 for its willingness for adherence of provisions of new Regulations. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 (two basic units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 16.05.2015.

The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 10.12.2019.

The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein. Simultaneously, the Appeal Committee also decided to call upon the Regional Director, SRC, to furnish a detailed status report of the case of the institution, including the sequence of events and actions taken by the SRC leading to the withdrawal of recognition.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution, in its written submission, stated that it has furnished all requisite documents in support of its application for B.Ed. programme (50+50 units) at Shantiniketan Campus, Chidri Road, Bidar. The institution submitted copies of the registered sale deed, tax paid receipts, electricity bill, land use certificate for educational purposes, and possession certificate in respect of the land. It also submitted the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent authority along with its notarized English version. Further, the institution submitted the approved building plan, building completion certificate in the prescribed format, and staff profile duly approved by the competent authority as per NCTE norms. The notarized copy of the Society Registration Certificate and affidavit regarding land and building were also furnished. Additionally, the institution submitted a copy of the Hon'ble High Court Order in W.P. No. 34184/2025 for consideration of its case. The institution requested that the submitted documents, along with the Hon'ble High Court's order, may be considered while deciding its appeal.

The Appeal Committee noted that appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru by filing Writ Petition No. 34184 of 2025. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

- (i) ***“The petition is disposed of.***
- (ii) ***Liberty is reserved in favour of the petitioner to file an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 before the appropriate Appellate Authority.***
- (iii) ***If the petitioner files such an appeal before the appropriate authority within a period of eight (8) weeks from today, the Appellate Authority shall condone the delay on the part of the petitioner in filing such an appeal and dispose off the appeal on merits and in accordance with law.***
- (iv) ***Immediately upon the petitioner filing such an appeal, the Appellate Authority shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders after providing sufficient and reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and hearing the petitioner, in accordance with law.***
- (v) ***It is made clear that the present order is passed in the peculiar/special/unique facts and circumstances of the instant case and this order shall not be treated as precedent nor shall it carry as precedential value for any purpose or whatsoever.”***

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the mandatory and threshold recognition standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the material produced is manifestly deficient, legally inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive, verifiable, and continuous compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant or restoration of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of strict and demonstrable adherence to the regulatory regime, no vested, accrued, equitable, or enforceable right can be

asserted by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, proceeds to record the following findings: -

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that recognition of the institution stood withdrawn in December 2019 and has not been restored at any point thereafter. The record further reflects that the concerned University has not extended or renewed affiliation subsequent to such withdrawal. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any order evidencing subsisting recognition, continuation of affiliation, or any judicial direction authorizing continued academic operation. In the absence of lawful recognition and valid affiliation, the institution cannot, in the eyes of law, be regarded as an existing or functional teacher education institution and is, for regulatory purposes, non-existent.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including proof of appointment approval by the affiliating University or payment of salary. The appellant institution also failed to submit faculty list approved by the competent affiliating authority, as mandatorily required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of duly approved faculty would amount to sanctioning a grave, substantive, and continuing breach of the statutory framework, striking at the very foundation of quality assurance in teacher education.
- (iii) The Appeal Committee observes that the appellant institution failed to submit any reply to the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice issued by the Southern Regional Committee within the stipulated period, and has furnished no cogent or satisfactory explanation for such persistent default. Even during the appellate proceedings, despite being afforded adequate opportunity to produce specific and material documents, the institution has failed to place on record complete, authentic, and legally sustainable evidence of compliance. The purported submissions remain fragmented, deficient, and incapable of establishing adherence to the mandatory requirements of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically

identified, and formally communicated. The grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, and in due compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such

non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 10.12.2019 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and after due consideration in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Any further opportunity would be contrary to the NCTE Act, 1993 and destructive of regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 10.12.2019 passed by the Southern Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Bidar Vidya Kendra College, Survey No. 209, Shantiniketan Educational Campus, Chidri Bidar, Karnataka - 585403.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-08/E- 394890/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515447/E-89359

Bangalore City College of Education, Survey No. 10, ITI Campus near Meenakshi Temple, Hulimavu, National Park Road, Bangalore South, Karnataka – 560076  अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075  प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT
--	----------------------------	---

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Ms. Manjunatha Naik, Principal
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	30.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL**

The appeal of **Bangalore City College of Education, Survey No. 10, ITI Campus near Meenakshi Temple, Hulimavu, National Park Road, Bangalore South, Karnataka - 560076** dated 24.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. SRO / NCTE / APSO02413 / B.Ed. / KA / 2013-14 / 51697** dated 16.05.2013 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “The proposed visit of VT members to the institution for inspection could not be carried out by the VT members as the management had prevented the VT from discharging its official responsibilities as per the norms of NCTE. An ongoing institution asking for at least 15 days notice for inspection would only indicate that it is not up to the standard, at any point on time.”

### **II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -**

**Ms. Manjunatha Naik, Principal of Bangalore City College of Education, Survey No. 10, ITI Campus near Meenakshi Temple, Hulimavu, National Park Road, Bangalore South, Karnataka - 560076** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “For Show Cause Notice reply not given”

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 29.11.2004. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 16.05.2013.

The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein. Simultaneously, the Appeal Committee also decided to call upon the Regional Director, SRC, to furnish a detailed status report of the case of the institution, including the sequence of events and actions taken by the SRC leading to the withdrawal of recognition.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution submitted that the recognition granted to its B.Ed. programme (APS02413, 50+50 intake) was withdrawn by NCTE. The institution informed that the Hon'ble High Court, vide W.P. No. 33912/2025, has condoned the delay and the order of the Hon'ble High Court has been enclosed for consideration. The institution further submitted that it has complied with and rectified all deficiencies pointed out in the withdrawal order. In this regard, the institution stated that it possesses its own land and a separate building with adequate built-up area exclusively for the B.Ed. programme, supported by approved building plan, building completion certificate issued by the competent authority, and land use certificate. It was also submitted that requisite infrastructural and academic facilities, including Psychology Lab, ET Lab, Physical Education facilities, and Language Learning Lab, have been established and strengthened. The institution additionally submitted that it has appointed 16 qualified faculty members, and the relevant faculty details have been enclosed. In view of the above compliance and the Hon'ble High Court's order, the appellant institution requested the Appeal Committee to consider its case and grant recognition to conduct the B.Ed. programme from the academic session 2025–26.

The Appeal Committee noted that appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru by filing Writ Petition No. 33912 of 2025. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

- (i) “The petition is disposed of.**
- (ii) Liberty is reserved in favour of the petitioner to file an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 before the appropriate Appellate Authority.**
- (iii) If the petitioner files such an appeal before the appropriate authority within a period of eight (8) weeks from today, the Appellate Authority shall condone the delay on the part of the petitioner in filing such an appeal and dispose off the appeal on merits and in accordance with law.**
- (iv) Immediately upon the petitioner filing such an appeal, the Appellate Authority shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders after providing sufficient and reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and hearing the petitioner, in accordance with law.**
- (vi) It is made clear that the present order is passed in the peculiar/special/unique facts and circumstances of the instant case and this order shall not be treated as precedent nor shall it carry any precedential value for any purpose or whatsoever.”**

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the mandatory and threshold recognition standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the material produced is manifestly deficient, legally inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive, verifiable, and continuous compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant or restoration of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of strict and demonstrable adherence to the regulatory regime, no vested, accrued, equitable, or enforceable right can be

asserted by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, proceeds to record the following findings: -

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that recognition of the institution stood withdrawn in May 2013 and has not been restored at any point thereafter. The record further reflects that the concerned University has not extended or renewed affiliation subsequent to such withdrawal. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any order evidencing subsisting recognition, continuation of affiliation, or any judicial direction authorizing continued academic operation. In the absence of lawful recognition and valid affiliation, the institution cannot, in the eyes of law, be regarded as an existing or functional teacher education institution and is, for regulatory purposes, non-existent.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including proof of appointment approval by the affiliating University or payment of salary. The appellant institution failed to submit faculty list approved by the competent affiliating authority, as mandatorily required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of duly approved faculty would amount to sanctioning a grave, substantive, and continuing breach of the statutory framework, striking at the very foundation of quality assurance in teacher education.
- (iii) The Appeal Committee observes that the appellant institution failed to submit any reply to the Show Cause Notice, issued by the Southern Regional Committee within the stipulated period, and has furnished no cogent or satisfactory explanation for such persistent default. Even during the appellate proceedings, despite being afforded adequate opportunity to produce specific and material documents, the institution has failed to place on record complete, authentic, and legally sustainable evidence of compliance. The purported submissions remain fragmented, deficient, and incapable of establishing adherence to the mandatory requirements of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the Show Cause Notice was duly issued; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The

grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, and in due compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such

non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 16.15.2013 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and after due consideration in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Any further opportunity would be contrary to the NCTE Act, 1993 and destructive of regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 16.05.2013 passed by the Southern Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Bangalore City College of Education, Survey No. 10, ITI Campus near Meenakshi Temple, Hulimavu, National Park Road, Bangalore South, Karnataka - 560076.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)

जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-12/E- 394899/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026

APPLSRC202515490 / E-89359

Sarvodaya College of Education, Survey No. 33, Agrahara Magadi, Bangalore, Karnataka – 560079	<u>बनाम /</u>  <u>Vs</u>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Sh. Venkatesh. S, Principal
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	30.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Sarvodaya College of Education, Survey No. 33, Agrahara Magadi, Bangalore, Karnataka - 560079** dated 10.09.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the order no. **F. No. APS01936 / B.Ed. / KA / 2011-12 / 36076** dated 18.01.2012 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “1. The total Built-up area earmarked for the B.Ed. Programme is only 9035.71 Sq. ft. which is grossly inadequate for the Teacher Education Programme as per NCTE Norms, 16,000 sq. ft. of built up area is required. The same is also corroborated by the management by affixing their signature in the essential data. 2. The institution is running B.Ed. programme which is being shared with a school in the same building, which is against the NCTE Norms. 3. Approved Building Plan from competent Civil Authority is not submitted. 4. Building Completion Certificate from the approved Competent Govt. authorized engineer is to be submitted. 5. Notarized copy of Land Usage Certificate issued by Competent Authority is not submitted. 6. Psychology lab is to be strengthened. 7. Education Technology lab and other labs/Physical Education is shared with school, which is against the norms of NCTE. 8. Language learning lab is not available. 9. Out of eight Faculty Members, only one faculty member is qualified as per NCTE Norms and others are not qualified. The management did not produce approved staff list from the affiliating University/Authority. The Recognition was granted in rented premises with a condition to shift its own premises on or before 04.04.2009. The institution did not shift to its own premises even after the lapse of stipulated time period of three (3) years on or before 04.04.2009 and even after the lapse of time period of 5 years & 8 months. This is against NCTE Norms. The institution is requesting time for construction of its own building which is not permissible. The institution's reply is unsatisfactory and not convincing.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Venkatesh. S, Principal of Sarvodaya College of Education, Survey No. 33, Agrahara Magadi, Bangalore, Karnataka - 560079** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “Court Order is not accepted.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course with an intake of 100 students vide order dated 04.04.2006. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 18.01.2012.

The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The instant matter placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein. Simultaneously, the Appeal Committee also decided to call upon the Regional Director, SRC, to furnish a detailed status report of the case of the institution, including the sequence of events and actions taken by the SRC leading to the withdrawal of recognition.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution submitted that its recognition for the B.Ed. programme (APS01936) was withdrawn earlier; however, the Hon'ble High Court, vide Order in W.P. No. 36057/2025, has condoned the delay and the said Order has been enclosed for consideration. The institution further submitted that it has since complied with all deficiencies pointed out in the withdrawal order. In this regard, it stated that it possesses its own land and a separate building with adequate built-up area exclusively for the B.Ed. programme. The approved building plan, building completion certificate issued by the competent authority, and land use certificate

have been submitted. It was also submitted that the institution has established the requisite infrastructure, including Psychology Lab, ET Lab, Language Lab, and Physical Education facilities. Further, the institution stated that 16 qualified faculty members have been appointed and the relevant documents in support thereof have been enclosed. In view of the above and in light of the Hon'ble High Court's Order, the appellant institution requested that its case be considered and recognition for the B.Ed. programme be granted from the academic session 2025–2026.

The Appeal Committee noted that appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru by filing Writ Petition No. 36057 of 2025. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

- (i) ***“The petition is disposed of.***
- (ii) ***Liberty is reserved in favour of the petitioner to file an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 before the appropriate Appellate Authority.***
- (iii) ***If the petitioner files such an appeal before the appropriate authority within a period of Eight (8) weeks from today, the Appellate Authority shall condone the delay on the part of the petitioner in filing such an appeal and dispose off the appeal on merits and in accordance with law.***
- (iv) ***Immediately upon the petitioner filing such an appeal, the Appellate Authority shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders after providing sufficient and reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and hearing the petitioner, in accordance with law.***
- (v) ***It is made clear that the present order is passed in the peculiar/special/unique facts and circumstances of the instant case and this order shall not be treated as precedent nor shall it carry as precedential value for any purpose or whatsoever.”***

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the mandatory and threshold recognition standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure)

Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the material produced is manifestly deficient, legally inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive, verifiable, and continuous compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant or restoration of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of strict and demonstrable adherence to the regulatory regime, no vested, accrued, equitable, or enforceable right can be asserted by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, proceeds to record the following findings: -

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that recognition of the institution stood withdrawn in January 2012 and has not been restored at any point thereafter. The record further reflects that the concerned University has not extended or renewed affiliation subsequent to such withdrawal. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any order evidencing subsisting recognition, continuation of affiliation, or any judicial direction authorizing continued academic operation. In the absence of lawful recognition and valid affiliation, the institution cannot, in the eyes of law, be regarded as an existing or functional teacher education institution and is, for regulatory purposes, non-existent.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including proof of appointment approval by the affiliating University or payment of salary. The appellant institution failed to submit faculty list approved by the competent affiliating authority, as mandatorily required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of duly approved faculty would amount to sanctioning a grave, substantive, and continuing breach of the statutory framework, striking at the very foundation of quality assurance in teacher education.
- (iii) The Appeal Committee observed that the appellant institution failed to furnish point wise reply to the Show Cause Notice issued by the Southern Regional Committee. The Committee further noted that the institution did not shift to its own premises within the stipulated period of three years, i.e., on or before 04.04.2009, and has continued to operate without compliance even after a lapse of more than five years and eight months. Such failure constitutes non-compliance with the applicable norms and conditions prescribed under the NCTE Regulations.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the Show Cause Notice was duly issued; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies

were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, and in due compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go

to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 18.01.2012 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and after due consideration in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Any further opportunity would be contrary to the NCTE Act, 1993 and destructive of regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 18.01.2012 passed by the Southern Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Sarvodaya College of Education, Survey No. 33, Agrahara Magadi, Bangalore, Karnataka - 560079.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-15/E- 395043/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515474 / E-89359

Venkateshwara College of Education, Plot No. 5/188, 5/189, Near RTC Complex, Ambajipeta, Machavaram Main Road, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh - 533214  अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT	<u>बनाम /</u>  <u>Vs</u>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector - 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075  प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT
--	--------------------------------	---

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	Ms. Padala Janaki Devi, Computer Faculty
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	30.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Venkateshwara College of Education, Plot No. 5/188, 5/189, Near RTC Complex, Ambajipeta, Machavaram Main Road, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh - 533214** dated 23.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. SRC / NCTE / APSO9477 / B.Ed. / 471<sup>st</sup> / Mtg. / AP / 2025 / 151918** dated 24.10.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “1. The Affiliating Body has already de-affiliated the institution for the academic session 2024-2025 vide letter no. AKNU/CDC/Speaking orders/31924/3 dated 18.09.2024 on account of lack of infrastructural and instructional facilities. 2. The institution was issued Final Show Cause Notice dated 16.09.2025 to submit point wise reply to ground of SCN of the university to NCTE. Instead of replying to NCTE, the institution has simply forwarded the reply submitted by them to the University in 2024. 3. The affiliating university i.e. Adikavi Nannaya University vide letter dated 25.09.2025 has also clarified that the institution is not affiliated for the academic session 2025-2026. The college has applied for shifting of the institution to other premises.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Ms. Padala Janaki Devi, Computer Faculty of Venkateshwara College of Education, Plot No. 5/188, 5/189, Near RTC Complex, Ambajipeta, Machavaram Main Road, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh - 533214** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “We have already submitted the points wise reply to the University vide letter dated 26/08/2024.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for Secondary (B.Ed.) course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students vide order dated 10.08.2008. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 the institution has submitted affidavit dt. 15.07.2015 for its willingness for adherence of provisions of new Regulations. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students (one basic units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 16.07.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 24.10.2025.

The instant matter was placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein. Simultaneously, the Appeal Committee also decided to call upon the Regional Director, SRC, to furnish a detailed status report of the case of the institution, including the sequence of events and actions taken by the SRC leading to the withdrawal of recognition.

The instant matter was placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution, namely Venkateshwara College of Education, Ambajipeta (Mandalam), East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh, submitted that it had been granted recognition by the SRC, NCTE for conducting the B.Ed. programme with an annual intake of 50 students. However, the SRC, NCTE, after consideration of the matter in its 475th meeting held from 16th to 17th October 2025, issued a Withdrawal Order dated 24.10.2025 withdrawing the recognition of the institution for the B.Ed. programme. The institution submitted that the affiliating body, Adikavi Nannaya University, conducted an inspection on 08.08.2024 and subsequently issued a Show Cause Notice dated 20.08.2024 citing certain deficiencies. The institution stated that

it submitted its reply dated 26.08.2024 to the said Show Cause Notice and thereafter the affiliating university, vide order dated 18.09.2024, refused to extend affiliation for the academic session 2024–25 and also restrained the institution from participating in counselling for that academic year. The appellant further submitted that it challenged the order dated 18.09.2024 before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh. The Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 06.11.2024, remanded the matter to the affiliating university with directions to reconsider the documents submitted by the institution. The institution stated that it complied with all requirements and submitted point-wise replies to the Show Cause Notices issued by the affiliating university as well as the SRC, NCTE, including replies dated 26.08.2024, 19.05.2025, and 20.05.2025, along with supporting documents and compliance details. The appellant contended that it duly responded to all communications and submitted the required documents to the SRC, NCTE and the affiliating university from time to time, and requested that its submissions and compliance be duly considered while deciding the appeal.

The Appeal Committee also noted that appellant institution had approached the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravati by filing Writ Petition No. 23666 of 2024. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

- “...5. Furthermore, learned counsel submitted that the appellate authority has arbitrarily and mechanically disposed of the petitioner’s appeal petition without any application of mind to the grounds of the appeal and the materials on record.**
- 6. Upon perusal of the impugned order, it does not appear that the explanation offered by the NCTE (SRC) has been considered, as the order merely indicates that the petitioner-institution has not rectified the deficiencies, without referencing any part of the explanation. Accordingly, the matter is remitted to the competent authority to consider the facts and evidence and to address the explanation, dated 26.08.2024, provided by the petitioner-institution.**
- 7. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.**  
**As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in these Writ Petition shall stand closed.”**

The Appeal Committee noted from the record that the appellant institution has been functioning since 2008 and that the affiliating University had extended affiliation

in previous academic years. It is further noted that the affiliating University has subsequently declined to extend affiliation. The impugned order dated 24.10.2025, however, does not clearly record the reasons for such disaffiliation or examine its regulatory implications under NCTE Act, 1993 read with NCTE Regulations, 2014, which mandate subsisting recognition and lawful affiliation as essential conditions for continued conduct of a teacher education programme. The Appeal Committee further noted that the appellant institution claims to have deposited the prescribed fee for shifting of premises in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and to have taken steps to comply with the infrastructural requirements. However, the impugned withdrawal order does not clearly indicate whether an inspection/verification by a Visiting Team was conducted in connection with the proposed shifting, as contemplated under the applicable Regulations governing change of premises. The Appeal Committee observes that the appellant institution has placed on record, at the appellate stage, a compliance report along with certain supporting documents in purported rectification of the deficiencies cited in the withdrawal order. A substantial portion of this material was either not available before the Regional Committee at the time of passing the impugned order or requires due authentication and factual verification by the competent Regional Committee in terms of the statutory framework. Under NCTE Act, 1993 read with the applicable Regulations, determination of compliance with infrastructure, instructional, and other mandatory norms must be based on verified and duly authenticated records. Accordingly, such material cannot be acted upon without proper regulatory scrutiny by the competent authority.

The Appeal Committee observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication, additional documents submitted during appellate proceedings cannot be ignored outright. Reliance was placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 – Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, wherein it has been held that such documents are required to be considered. However, the Committee emphasised that consideration of additional material does not amount to acceptance of the same and must necessarily be preceded by strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

The Appeal Committee also took note of the observations of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) 4382/2021 dated 08.04.2021, wherein it was observed: -

***“Appellate Committee of NCTE, is directed to ensure that, whenever an order of remand is passed, the status of the impugned is clearly spelt out so that the institution is not compelled to approach the Court in this manner.”***

The Appeal Committee further noted the observations of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) 7260/2021 dated 30.07.2021, wherein it was observed: -

***“Although the Appellate Committee of the NCTE would be well advised to expressly quash the original order of the concerned Regional Committee while remanding the matter, the position in law is that the order automatically stands quashed. The institution is, therefore, entitled to the benefits of recognition until a fresh withdrawal order is passed.”***

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, having regard to the above judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the case, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 24.10.2025 warrants interference to the limited extent that subsequent material placed on record by the appellant institution has not been subjected to verification and consideration by the competent Regional Committee. The Committee is further of the view that the ends of justice would be met by remanding the matter for limited factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims. Accordingly, without diluting the statutory authority of the Southern Regional Committee and without creating any equity in favour of the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned withdrawal order dated 24.10.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh factual verification and regulatory reassessment. The Southern Regional Committee is directed to re-examine the case of the appellant institution afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted, afford reasonable opportunity of hearing to the institution, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms

and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the guidelines issued by the Council from time to time, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined only to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish full compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with law. The Regional Committee concerned, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and pass the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time-bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is directed to forward all documents relied upon in appeal to the Southern Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order.

**IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 24.10.2025 and remand the matter to the Southern Regional Committee (SRC) for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



**उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)**

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Venkateshwara College of Education, Plot No. 5/188, 5/189, Near RTC Complex, Ambajipeta, Machavaram Main Road, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh - 533214.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Andhra Pradesh, J Block, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Room No. 312, Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Hyderabad-500022.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)**  
**G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075**

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-490/E-389854/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLNRC202515435 / E-89359**

Delhi College of Studies, Plot No. A-45, Site IV, Sahibabad, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh - 201010	<b><u>बनाम /</u></b> <b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector - 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	Dr. Rekha Sharma, Principal & Dr. K.C. Singh, Secretary
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / <b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Delhi College of Studies, Plot No. A-45, Site IV, Sahibabad, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh - 201010** dated 13.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. NRC / NCTE / UP-1207 / B.Ed. / 443<sup>rd</sup> Meeting (Volume-2) SI No. 08 / UP / 2025 / 233892-233898** dated 23.09.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “1. The institution has not submitted certified registered land documents issued by the Registering Authority. 2. The institution has submitted a copy of Building Plan which is not approved by UP State Industrial Development Corporation Limited. 3. The institution has not submitted Land Use Certificate issued by the Completion Government Authority to use the land for educational purpose. 4. The institution has not submitted Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Competent Government Authority indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances. 5. The institution has not submitted certified copy of site plan with demarcated land area for running different courses. 6. The institution has not submitted Certificate to the effect that the Building is differently abled friendly from the Competent Government Authority. 7. The institution has submitted a notarized copy of Building Completion Certificate which is not issued by UP State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. As submitted BCC, total built up area is only 16200 sq. ft., which is not sufficient for offering B.Ed. & B.P.Ed. Course. 8. The institution has not submitted faculty list duly approved by Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut for B.Ed. course.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Dr. Rekha Sharma, Principal & Dr. K.C. Singh, Secretary of Delhi College of Studies, Plot No. A-45, Site IV, Sahibabad, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh - 201010** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The relevant documents were already submitted at the time of recognition and along with our reply of SCN vide letter dated 06.09.2023. The institution is CONDUCTING B.Ed. course On the same land since inception (2004). a copy of same is enclosed herewith - Land Documents. 2. The institution has already submitted copy of approved building plan

by UP State Industrial Development Corporation Limited. copy is enclosed herewith - Building Plan. 3. It is very well mentioned in the registered land documents of the institution. Copy of land use certificate issued by UP State Industrial Development corporation is also submitted. Copy is enclosed herewith - Land Use Certificate. 4. Non-encumbrance certificate issued by the competent government authority was submitted with our reply of SCN dated 6.9.23. same is enclosed herewith - Non-Encumbrance Certificate. 5. Already submitted. copy of same is enclosed herewith - Site Plan. 6. Building is differently abled friendly. certificate from competent authority to this effect is enclosed herewith - Differently Abled Certificate. 7. The submitted BCC was issued by approved architect and competent government authority. As per submitted BCC the total built up area is 3520 sqm which is sufficient. 16200SFT is built up area of one building. Copy is enclosed herewith - Building Completion Certificate. 8. The duly approved faculty list by CCS university, Meerut is enclosed herewith - Faculty List. 9. Delhi College Of Studies is running B.Ed. course since 2004 on a registered institutional land. NRC decided to withdraw the recognition of B.Ed. course on 06.01.2010. This order was challenged before the Appellate Authority, NCTE and the appellate authority passed an order dated 29.04.2010 in which the appeal was accepted and NRC's withdrawal order dated 06.01.2010 was reversed with a direction to the NRC for restoring the recognition of the B.Ed. course. As per the decision of NRC taken in its 164th meeting held on 28th to 29th 2010, the committee decided as under: "Orders be issued immediately". However, Restoration Order was never issued to the institution to this day. The NRC after an interval of 13 years issued an impugned first show cause notice dated 03.05.2023 in which institution was directed to submit the restoration order which the NRC office had never issued to the institution till this day despite the order of Appellate Authority of NCTE Hqr dated 06.01.2010. The institution had submitted its reply of SCN dated 16.05.23. NRC without careful consideration of facts of the matter issued a FRESH SCN in the name of FINAL SCN to the institution on 20.7.2023. In this notice the NRC error in calling explanation from the institution and its affiliating university as to on what basis B.Ed. course is continued once the recognition was withdrawn in the year 2010 whereas the fact was that the withdrawal order was reversed by the Appellate Authority dated 29.04.2010. The institution has complied and submitted its reply vide letter dated 06.09.2023. After an interval of almost two years of our reply,

NRC issued this withdrawal order dated 23.09.25. The NRC has erred in its withdrawal order by mentioning that the institution shall not be entitled to admit the students from the academic session 2025-2026 which is also not in accordance of NCTE act which clearly says" withdrawal order will take effect from the end of academic session next following the date of communication". Therefore, it is our humble prayer that the order appealed against may be set aside and appropriate relief may be granted to us."

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students from the academic session 2004-2005 vide order dated 05.08.2004. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 06.01.2010. The Appellant Institution filed an appeal against the withdrawal order before the Appellate Authority and the Appellate Authority remanded the case back to NRC vide order dated 29.04.2010. Therefore, the Council reversed the order appealed against; However, the Restoration Order was not issued to the Appellant Institution. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 23.09.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2025 held on 16.12.2025 and 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The appellant institution did not appear online to present its case before the Appellate Authority in both meetings. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution submitted that all requisite land and building documents, including registered land documents, approved building plan, land use certificate, non-encumbrance certificate, site plan, building completion certificate, and differently abled accessibility certificate, had already been submitted earlier, including with its reply to the Show Cause Notice dated 06.09.2023. It stated that the B.Ed. programme has been conducted on the same registered institutional land since its inception in 2004 and that the existing built-up area is adequate as per norms. The institution further submitted that the faculty list duly approved by CCS University, Meerut has also been submitted. The institution further contended that although the NRC had withdrawn recognition of the B.Ed. programme on 06.01.2010, the said withdrawal order was set aside by the Appellate Authority, NCTE vide Order dated 29.04.2010, with a direction to restore recognition. However, the restoration order was never issued by NRC. It was submitted that after a gap of several years, NRC issued Show Cause Notices in 2023 seeking clarification regarding continuation of the programme. The institution stated that it duly replied to all such notices and submitted the required documents. The appellant institution further contended that the impugned withdrawal order dated 23.09.2025 was issued without proper consideration of the facts and submissions made. It was also submitted that the direction restraining admissions from the academic session 2025–2026 is not in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, which provide that withdrawal orders take effect from the end of the academic session following the date of communication. In view of the above, the appellant institution requested that the impugned withdrawal order be set aside, and appropriate relief be granted.

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast

upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the mandatory and threshold recognition standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the material produced is manifestly deficient, legally inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive, verifiable, and continuous compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant or restoration of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of strict and demonstrable adherence to the regulatory regime, no vested, accrued, equitable, or enforceable right can be asserted by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, proceeds to record the following findings: -

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that the Building Completion Certificate placed on record pertains to the D.El.Ed. programme and is not relevant to the programme under consideration. The building plan submitted is illegible, and the land and building documents furnished are neither duly certified nor authenticated by the competent authority. Under Sections 14 and 15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), submission of authenticated and programme-specific infrastructural documents is a mandatory precondition for grant or continuation of recognition. The documents placed on record, being uncertified and deficient, do not establish compliance with the prescribed infrastructural norms and therefore cannot be relied upon for regulatory purposes.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further records that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating the continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including approval of appointments by the affiliating University and proof of payment of salary. The faculty list produced is a photocopy of a letter dated 29.02.2004 and is not accompanied by the prescribed Staff Profile Format mandated by the NCTE, nor does it disclose qualifications, appointments, or approval status of faculty members. No documentary proof of educational qualifications of the faculty has been furnished. In terms of the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the 2014 Regulations (as amended), appointment and continuation of duly qualified and approved faculty is a core statutory requirement. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of verified and approved faculty would amount to condoning a substantive and continuing breach of the statutory framework governing teacher education.
- (iii) The Appeal Committee observes that the appellant institution failed to submit a proper and substantive reply to the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice issued by the Northern Regional Committee within the stipulated period, as required under the applicable Regulations. No cogent or legally tenable explanation has been furnished for such persistent default. Even at the appellate stage, despite being afforded adequate opportunity under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the institution has failed to place on record complete, authentic, and legally sustainable evidence demonstrating compliance with the

Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. The material submitted remains fragmented and deficient and does not discharge the statutory burden cast upon the institution to establish strict adherence to the mandatory norms.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Northern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 23.09.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After perusal of the Appeal Report and documents on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing the Appeal Committee of the Council concluded that the NRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 23.09.2025 issued by NRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)  
Appeal ID: APPLNRC202515435

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Delhi College of Studies, Plot No. A-45, Site IV, Sahibabad, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh - 201010.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, Room No. 03, Naveen Bhawan, U.P. Secretariat, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226001.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)

जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-496/E- 392052/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026

APPLNRC202515457/E-89359

GHG Khalsa College Gurusar Sadhar Ludhiana, Khasra No. 50/2, 7/1, 7/2, 49, 49/10, 48/17, Gurusar Sadhar, Rajkot Road, Ludhiana, Punjab – 141104	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Inderjit Singh, Officiating Principal</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUND OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **GHG Khalsa College Gurusar Sadhar Ludhiana, Khasra No. 50/2, 7/1, 7/2, 49, 49/10, 48/17, Gurusar Sadhar, Rajkot Road, Ludhiana, Punjab - 141104** dated 05.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2627202505204899 / PUNJAB / 2025 / REJC / 1977** dated 26.09.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "As per the decision of NRC taken in its 449<sup>th</sup> Meeting, Final Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 17.10.2025. The institution has not uploaded the reply of Final Show Cause Notice till date."

### **II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -**

**Sh. Inderjit Singh, Officiating Principal of GHG Khalsa College Gurusar Sadhar Ludhiana, Khasra No. 50/2, 7/1, 7/2, 49, 49/10, 48/17, Gurusar Sadhar, Rajkot Road, Ludhiana, Punjab - 141104** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "We are writing to seek your assistance regarding the rejection of the B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. ITEP Document Upload application due to the non-receipt of the final show cause notice. We applied for the transition from B.A./B.Sc. B.Ed. to ITEP (Application ID: 2627202505204899) on 23 May 2025 and successfully uploaded all required documents on the portal. Subsequently, we also uploaded the documents after receiving the first show cause notice. However, we did not receive the final show cause notice mentioning the remaining discrepancies. As a result, we were unable to upload the required documents on the portal after 24 October 2025, leading to the rejection of the application reference to F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2627202505204899 / PUNJAB / 2025 / REJC / 1977 dated 25 Nov 2025."

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Northern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 23.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 25.11.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2025 held on 16.12.2025 and 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution that it had applied for transition from B.A./B.Sc. B.Ed. to ITEP (Application ID: 2627202505204899) on 23.05.2025 and uploaded all required documents on the portal. The institution stated that it had also submitted documents in response to the first Show Cause Notice. However, it contended that the Final Show Cause Notice indicating the remaining deficiencies was not received, due to which it could not upload further documents after 24.10.2025. The institution submitted that the application was consequently rejected vide order dated 25.11.2025 and requested reconsideration of the matter.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with various documents in purported fulfilment of the deficiencies cited in the refusal order. At the same time, the Committee observed that a substantial part of the material relied upon by the appellant institution was either not before the NRC at the time of passing the impugned order dated 25.11.2025 or requires authentication and factual verification by the competent Regional Committee.

The Appeal Committee observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication, additional documents submitted during appellate proceedings cannot be ignored outright. Reliance was placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 – Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, wherein it has been held that such documents are required to be considered. However, the Committee emphasized that consideration of additional material does not amount to acceptance of the same and must necessarily be preceded by strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

Noting the submissions placed on record and the documents submitted, the Appeal Committee observes that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification on the basis of the submissions and documents placed before the Appeal Committee. In the interests of justice, the Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants limited interference, strictly within the statutory framework. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims and without diluting or negating the findings recorded in the impugned order, the Appeal Committee sets aside the order dated 25.11.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee. The Northern Regional Committee shall re-examine the case afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted during the appellate proceedings, and assess compliance with the applicable shortlisting criteria, the requirements of a bona fide multidisciplinary institution, and the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines, if applicable. The said Regional Committee shall conduct such verification strictly in accordance with law and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed timeframe. The said Regional Committee, being the statutory custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity, completeness, and genuineness of all connected records, including those forming part of the original application and the documents submitted during appellate proceedings, before passing any consequential order. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined

solely to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules, and Regulations. The appellant institution shall forward to the said Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the said Regional Committee shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and the directions contained herein.

**IV. DECISION: -**

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 25.11.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme with the directions specified hereinabove. The NRC shall take a reasoned and speaking decision after considering all documents and subsequent submissions of the appellant, including compliance with the deficiencies cited in the impugned order. The appellant institution is also directed to forward the documents submitted in appeal to the NRC within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, GHG Khalsa College Gurusar Sadhar Ludhiana, Khasra No. 50/2, 7/1, 7/2, 49, 49/10, 48/17, Gurusar Sadhar, Rajkot Road, Ludhiana, Punjab - 141104.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Block E, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali)-Punjab-160062.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-494/E-391301/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLWRC202515453/E-89359

Sadguru Institute of Professional Education, Sadguru Campus, Khasra No. 955/2, Village Mohana, Sanganer, Jaipur, Rajasthan – 302029	<u>बनाम /</u> <u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT		प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT

अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि / Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
प्रतिवादी द्वारा / Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
सुनवाई की तिथि / Date of Hearing	30.01.2026
निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि / Date of Pronouncement	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Sadguru Institute of Professional Education, Sadguru Campus, Khasra No. 955/2, Village Mohana, Sanganer, Jaipur, Rajasthan – 302029** dated 29.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. NCTE / WRC / CF-55980 / RJ-886 / 432<sup>nd</sup> (Part -II) / 2025 / 7744** dated 30.09.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “1. The institution has not submitted Fire Safety Certificate issued by Competent Authority of Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL [https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track\\_application.aspx](https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx). 2. The institution stated in its reply that approval of faculty is under process. However, the institution has not submitted the latest list of teaching staff approved and countersigned by the Registrar of affiliating body in the prescribed format of NCTE as per qualification contained in the NCTE Norms and Regulations as amended from time to time. 3. Copy of Affiliation from 2024-25 in connection with provisional extension applied to University of Rajasthan generated on 24.02.2024 countersigned by Principal. 4. Copy of Bank statement submitted without mentioning account details of each faculty. 5. Documentary proof on the complaint has not been received from the institution.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**No one** from **Sadguru Institute of Professional Education, Sadguru Campus, Khasra No. 955/2, Village Mohana, Sanganer, Jaipur, Rajasthan – 302029** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The institution is situated in rural area and the institution submitted Fire Safety Certificate issued by Gram Panchayat. Thereafter the institution applied in the office of Nagar Nigam for the same and the application of the institution is on final stage for issuing Fire Safety Certificate and the same is received from the Nagar Nigam the institution submitted before the appellate authority before hearing. 2. The institution submitted faculty list approved by the affiliating body alongwith this appeal. 3. Affiliation order in favor of institution for the academic session 2024-25 & 2025-26 is attached with

this appeal. 4. Copy Bank Statement of last six months is attached with this Appeal. 5. Documentary proof in regard to complaint submitted by the institution vide letter dated 22-11-2018 and thereafter after documentary evidence the Northern Regional Committee was considered and decided the complaint was fake. Copy of order/letter dated 14.01.2019 is attached with this appeal."

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students from the academic session 2008-2009 vide order dated 12.08.2008. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two basic units) from the academic session 2015-2016 vide order dated 21.04.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the WRC vide order dated 30.09.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2025 held on 16.12.2025 and 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The appellant institution did not appear online to present its case before the Appellate Authority on both dates. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution that, being situated in a rural area, it had initially obtained a Fire Safety Certificate from the Gram Panchayat and subsequently applied to the Nagar Nigam for issuance of the requisite Fire Safety

Certificate. It was submitted that the application was at the final stage and that the Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Nagar Nigam has since been obtained and placed on record during the appellate proceedings. The institution further submitted that it has enclosed the faculty list duly approved by the affiliating body, affiliation orders for the academic sessions 2024–25 and 2025–26, and copies of bank statements for the last six months evidencing payment of salary. Additionally, the institution referred to a complaint dated 22.11.2018 and submitted that the same had earlier been examined by the Northern Regional Committee and found to be baseless, enclosing a copy of the communication/order dated 14.01.2019 in support thereof. Subsequently the institution vide letter dated 27.1.2026 submitted a copy of NOC regarding Fire Safety, staff list etc.

The Appeal Committee also noted that appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan Bench at Jaipur by filing S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17937 of 2025. The Hon'ble High Court passed an order dated 25.11.2025. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

***“...As the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to file appeal against the order dated 30.09.2025 under Section 18 of the Act of 1993, the Court refrains from travelling into merits of the matter. However, it is directed that if the petitioner avails the remedy of appeal under Section 18 of the Act of 1993, the protection as available to the petitioner in terms of Section 17, more particularly the second proviso to the same would be applicable.***

***Accordingly, with the above direction, the present writ petition stands disposed of.***

***It is needless to say that the respondents would duly adhere to the provisions of Section 17 of the Act of 1993.”***

The Appeal Committee notes that the Northern Regional Committee, in its Withdrawal Order dated 30.09.2025 issued under Section 17 of the NCTE Act, 1993, recorded receipt of a complaint and addressed communications to the Commissioner, Department of College Education, Government of Rajasthan, and to the affiliating body seeking comments on the allegations. The record indicates that no response was received from the said authorities prior to issuance of the withdrawal order. The impugned order does not reflect any determination on the merits of the complaint, or

a conclusive finding based on verified material, thereby leaving the core allegations factually unexamined. The Appeal Committee further notes that, at the appellate stage under Section 18 of the Act, the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with supporting documents in purported rectification of the deficiencies cited in the withdrawal order. A substantial portion of this material was either not available before the Regional Committee at the time of passing the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority as required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). In terms of the statutory scheme under NCTE Act read with the applicable Regulations, compliance with recognition norms must be established through duly verified and authenticated records. Consequently, the material now relied upon requires factual scrutiny and regulatory examination by the competent Regional Committee before any determination can be made.

The Appeal Committee observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication, additional documents submitted during appellate proceedings cannot be ignored outright. Reliance was placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 – Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, wherein it has been held that such documents are required to be considered. However, the Committee emphasised that consideration of additional material does not amount to acceptance of the same and must necessarily be preceded by strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

The Appeal Committee also took note of the observations of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) 4382/2021 dated 08.04.2021, wherein it was observed: -

***“Appellate Committee of NCTE, is directed to ensure that, whenever an order of remand is passed, the status of the impugned is clearly spelt out so that the institution is not compelled to approach the Court in this manner.”***

The Appeal Committee further noted the observations of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) 7260/2021 dated 30.07.2021, wherein it was observed: -

***“Although the Appellate Committee of the NCTE would be well advised to expressly quash the original order of the concerned Regional Committee while remanding the matter, the position in law is that the order automatically stands quashed. The institution is, therefore, entitled to the benefits of recognition until a fresh withdrawal order is passed.”***

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, having regard to the above judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the case, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 30.09.2025 warrants interference to the limited extent that subsequent material placed on record by the appellant institution has not been subjected to verification and consideration by the competent Regional Committee. The Committee is further of the view that the ends of justice would be met by remanding the matter for limited factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims. Accordingly, without diluting the statutory authority of the Western Regional Committee and without creating any equity in favour of the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned withdrawal order dated 30.09.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh factual verification and regulatory reassessment. The Western Regional Committee is directed to re-examine the case of the appellant institution afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted, afford reasonable opportunity of hearing to the institution, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the guidelines issued by the Council from time to time, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined only to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish full compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with law. The Regional Committee concerned, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents

presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is directed to forward all documents relied upon in the appeal to the Western Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order.

**IV. DECISION: -**

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 30.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Sadguru Institute of Professional Education, Sadguru Campus, Khasra No. 955/2, Village Mohana, Sanganer, Jaipur, Rajasthan – 302029.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Block-4, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan Shiksha Sankul, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302015.



एन सी टी ई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)  
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)  
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दिनांक/ Date - 25.02.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-18/E-396027/2025 Appeal/2nd Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202013842/E-89359

Aadi Lakshmi College of Education, 120/2, Navakhandavada, Pithapuram, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh – 533450	<b>बनाम /</b> <b>Vs</b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
<b>अपीलकर्ता / APPELLANT</b>		<b>प्रतिवादी / RESPONDENT</b>

<b>अपीलकर्ता का प्रतिनिधि /</b> <b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>The Representative</b>
<b>प्रतिवादी द्वारा /</b> <b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, SRC
<b>सुनवाई की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.01.2026
<b>निर्णय सुनाने की तिथि /</b> <b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	25.02.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL**

The appeal of **Aadi Lakshmi College of Education, 120/2, Navakhandavada, Pithapuram, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh - 533450** dated 04.12.2020 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. SRO / NCTE / APS09536 / B.Ed. / AP / 2020 / 120014** dated 21.11.2020 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “The institution has failed in submission of written representation along with required documents in response to Last Reminder (Letter)”

### **II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -**

**The Representative of Aadi Lakshmi College of Education, 120/2, Navakhandavada, Pithapuram, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh – 533450** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “We received letter from NCTE-SRC, Delhi, with F. No. SRC/NCTE/APS09536/B.Ed. /AP/2019/112490 dt. 05.12.2019 by our institution on 09.12.2019. We have sent reply letter on 16.12.2019 with written representation and original latest faculty list approved by affiliating university AP, but the recognition committee did not peruse our reply letter and original latest staff approval of affiliating university AP. We request you kindly reinstate my recognition order in original position, other wise our management and staff and students will be put to serious and irreparable loss.”

### **III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -**

**The Appeal Committee in its 2nd Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th January, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 01.01.2008. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 the institution submitted affidavit dt. 13.01.2015 for its willingness for adherence of provisions of new Regulations. A Revised Provisional Recognition

Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two basic units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 20.03.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 21.10.2020.

The instant matter was placed in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The appellant institution did not appear online to present its case before the Appellate Authority on 12.01.2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the appellant institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The instant matter was placed in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution that it had received communication dated 05.12.2019 from the Southern Regional Committee and submitted its reply on 16.12.2019 along with a written representation and the original, latest faculty list duly approved by the affiliating University in Andhra Pradesh. The appellant contended that the said reply and approved faculty list were not duly considered by the Regional Committee while passing the impugned order. The institution requested reinstatement of its recognition, submitting that non-restoration would result in serious hardship to the management, staff, and students.

The Appeal Committee also noted that appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravati by filing Writ Petition No. 27699 of 2025. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

**“...At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner institution submits that pursuant to the said order, a representation dated 11.09.2025 has been made by the petitioner institution to respondent stating that they are ready to comply with any formalities, inspections or documentation required by the respondent authorities and, accordingly, petitioner**

institution submitted all the documents before respondent authorities including list of faculty members.

This Court, while allowing similar Writ Petition Nos.26846 of 2024 and batch, vide common order dated 27.10.2025, observed at paragraph Nos.7 and 8 as follows:

**“7. in the cases on hand, the main ground on which the NCTE withdrew recognition of petitioners institutions is non submission of material documents. The ground on which the NCTE withdrew recognition of the petitioners institutions does not fall within the grounds envisaged in Section 17 of the Act.**

**8. As regards compliance of principles of natural justice, 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 cause against the proposed action. The noticee is able to understand the precise case set up against him, which he has to meet, and the notice shall contain the nature of action which is proposed to be taken for such breach. In the case on hand, none of the aforesaid requirements has been complied with, before taking the extreme step of withdrawal of recognition of petitioners institutions. Further, law requires that a substantial opportunity of hearing should be given before any adverse order can be passed. Mere giving an opportunity to file reply, while denying a right of oral hearing, reduces the opportunity of hearing, which is a substantive right, to a mere illusion. The impugned action of withdrawal of recognition cannot be sustained, on that ground alone.”**

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, there shall be interim suspension as prayed for, for a period of six (6) weeks. Further, the respondents are directed to consider the representation dated 11.09.2025 made by the petitioner institution and pass appropriate orders thereon, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.

**List the matter after three (3) weeks.”**

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast

upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the mandatory and threshold recognition standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the material produced is manifestly deficient, legally inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive, verifiable, and continuous compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant or restoration of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of strict and demonstrable adherence to the regulatory regime, no vested, accrued, equitable, or enforceable right can be asserted by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, proceeds to record the following findings: -

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that recognition of the institution stood withdrawn in October 2020 and has not been restored at any point thereafter. The record further reflects that the concerned University has not extended or renewed affiliation subsequent to such withdrawal. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any order evidencing subsisting recognition, continuation of affiliation, or any judicial direction authorizing continued academic operation. In the absence of lawful recognition and valid affiliation, the institution cannot, in the eyes of law, be regarded as an existing or functional teacher education institution and is, for regulatory purposes, non-existent.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including proof of appointment approval by the affiliating University or payment of salary. The appellant institution failed to submit approved faculty list by the competent affiliating authority, as mandatorily required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of duly approved faculty would amount to sanctioning a grave, substantive, and continuing breach of the statutory framework, striking at the very foundation of quality assurance in teacher education.
- (iii) The Appeal Committee observes that the appellant institution failed to submit satisfactory explanation before SRC. Even during the appellate proceedings, despite being afforded adequate opportunity to produce specific and material documents, the institution has failed to place on record complete, authentic, and legally sustainable evidence of compliance. The purported submissions remain fragmented, deficient, and incapable of establishing adherence to the mandatory requirements of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, and in

due compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 21.10.2020 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and after due consideration in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Any further opportunity would be contrary to the NCTE Act, 1993 and destructive of regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 21.10.2020 passed by the Southern Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.**

उपरोक्त निर्णय अपील समिति की ओर से सूचित किया जा रहा है।/ The above decision is being communicated on behalf of the Appeal Committee.

Copy to :-

उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Appeal ID: APPLERC 202013842

1. **The Principal, Aadi Lakshmi College of Education, 120/2, Navakhandavada, Pithapuram, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh - 533450.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Andhra Pradesh, J Block, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Room No. 312, Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Hyderabad-500022.