



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 - 18.03.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**

**89-11/E- 394950/2025 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026 / E-89493
APPLWRC202515471**

Global Institute of B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 1288, 1285, 4021/982, NH-56 (113) Dist. Banswara Dahod Road, Barodiya, Bagidora, Rajasthan – 327604	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Rajendra Jain, Member
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF APPEAL

The appeal of **Global Institute of B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 1288, 1285, 4021/982, NH-56 (113) Dist. Banswara Dahod Road, Barodiya, Bagidora, Rajasthan - 327604** dated 23.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision taken as per the Minutes dt. 10th – 13th November, 2025 of WRC for refusing ITEP course on the grounds that “In terms of section 14(1)/15(1) of the NCTE Act 1993, the online application of institution for transition from B.A B.Ed/B.Sc B.Ed programme to 4 year Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) for the session 2026-27. The name of the institution Global Institute of B.Ed college mentioned in the application and recognition order of B.A B.Ed/ B.Sc B.Ed whereas Global Institute of Education & Research mentioned in the University letter of affiliation with regard to multi-disciplinary programmes uploaded by the institution. Both the names are different. therefore, as per NCTE regulation,2014 as amended from time to time, the application of the institution does not fall in the category of multi-disciplinary institution.” Further it shall be noted that the appellant has not submitted a copy of the impugned order before the Appeal Committee.

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Rajendra Jain, Member of Global Institute of B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 1288, 1285, 4021/982, NH-56 (113) Dist. Banswara Dahod Road, Barodiya, Bagidora, Rajasthan - 327604 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 18.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Rajendra Jain s/o Mithalal Jain Member Darshan Shikshan Sanstha Barodiya run by Global Institute of B.Ed. College Barodiya Khasra No. 1288, 1285, 4021/982, NH 56 (113) Barodiya District Banswara (Raj.) 328604 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institute on 22.12.2025 in appeal report appellant institute Global Institute of Education and Research Barodiya in which Bachelor of Arts (B.A) and Bachelor of Science (B.Sc. Math & BIO) course are being conducted and 4 year Integrated Course B.A. B.Ed. /B.Sc. B.Ed. is being conducted in the name of Global Institute of B.Ed. College in the same campus. 2. Govind Guru Tribal University, Banswara (Raj.) has issued Concern letter No. GGTU/Affiliation/2025/2346 dated 16.12.2025 in which (1) Global Institute of Education and Research Barodiya (2)

Global Institute of B.Ed. College Barodiya has been confirmed to be run by Multi-disciplinary Institute Darshan Shikshan Sanstha Barodiya in the same campus. 3. Memorandum of Collaboration (MOC) between Global Institute of Education & Research Barodiya and Global Institute of B.Ed. College Barodiya on Non-Judicial Stamp of Rs. 500/- dated 15.12.2025 by Notary Public Verified and approved by the Deputy Registrar Govind Guru Tribal University who is being submitted to WRC, NCTE.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

The Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application before the Western Regional Committee (WRC) seeking recognition for running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). However, the appellant submitted that the rejection order was not formally communicated to the institution.

The matter was earlier considered in the 1st Meeting of the Appeal Committee held on 12.01.2026, wherein the Committee, in the interest of fair adjudication, granted the appellant institution a further opportunity to submit relevant documents in support of its claim.

The Appeal Committee after reconsideration of the matter in the present meeting, noted the submission of the appellant institution that Global Institute of Education and Research, Barodiya conducts undergraduate programmes (B.A. and B.Sc.), while the four-year Integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programme is conducted by Global Institute of B.Ed. College, Barodiya, both institutions operating from the same campus under the common management of Darshan Shikshan Sanstha, Barodiya. The appellant further submitted that the affiliating University, Govind Guru Tribal University, Banswara, has issued a confirmation letter indicating the multidisciplinary functioning of the institutions under the same management. The appellant also placed on record a Memorandum of Collaboration between the

institutions, purportedly approved by the affiliating university, in support of its claim regarding multidisciplinary status.

The Appeal Committee examined the applicable regulatory framework governing recognition for Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended vide Gazette Notification dated 22.10.2021, which defines a multidisciplinary institution as follows:

“(ca) “multidisciplinary institution” means a duly recognized higher education institution involving several different subjects of study/combining or involving more than one discipline. Multidisciplinary universities and colleges will aim to establish education departments, which besides carrying out cutting-edge research in various aspects of education, will also run Integrated Teacher Education Programmes, in collaboration with other departments or field of liberal arts or humanities or social sciences or commerce or mathematics, as the case may be, at the time of applying for recognition of Integrated Teacher Education Programme.”

The Committee further examined the **“Guidelines for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions”** dated 15.05.2025, which prescribe, inter alia:

4.2.1 Merger of institutions under the same management

The managing trust/society must submit to NCTE the approval of such merger by: (i) the management committee (ii) affiliating university and (iii) State Government, as applicable.

The Appeal Committee noting the provisions laid down in the NCTE MDI guidelines and decision as per the minutes dated 10th –13th November 2025 in respect of appellant institution, the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, the Committee observed that the refusal recorded by the concerned Regional Committee was primarily founded on the conclusion that the name of the institution appearing in the application for recognition differed from the name reflected in the communication issued by the affiliating University relating to multidisciplinary status, namely: (i) Global Institute of B.Ed. College, and (ii) Global Institute of Education & Research. On the basis of the above discrepancy, the Regional Committee concluded that the institution did not qualify as a Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) under the applicable regulatory framework governing the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The Appeal

Committee further noted that the appellant institution has not completed the process of merger of institutions under the same management, as contemplated under the “Guidelines for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions” dated 15.05.2025. In the present case, the record placed before the Appeal Committee does not establish that the appellant institution has completed the merger process in accordance with the above Guidelines or has produced authenticated approvals of the competent authorities as required thereunder. 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 of establishing strict, continuous, and demonstrable compliance with the prescribed norms and standards rests entirely upon the applicant institution. Recognition or continuation thereof is conditional upon fulfilment of all mandatory statutory and regulatory requirements. Mere assertions of compliance, unsupported by authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence, cannot displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the competent Regional Committee in exercise of its statutory jurisdiction under the Act and the Regulations. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies recorded in the decision as per the minutes dt. 10th –13th November 2025, the submissions made by the appellant institution, and the principles governing appellate scrutiny under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of factual re-examination. Such interference is confined strictly to ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory consistency and shall not be construed as dilution of the binding statutory standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), nor as an expression of opinion on the merits of the appellant institution’s entitlement to recognition. The Appeal Committee further notes that the deficiencies recorded in the decision as per the minutes dt. 10th –13th November 2025 are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification within the statutory framework. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle recognized by the **Hon’ble High Court of Delhi in Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016**, wherein it was held that documents placed during appellate scrutiny may be examined for the limited purpose of verification of compliance, subject to regulatory scrutiny by the competent authority. However, such examination must

remain strictly confined 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 conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, is of the considered opinion that the matter requires factual re-examination by the competent Regional Committee. Accordingly, the impugned decision as per minutes dt. 10th –13th November 2025 is set aside, and the matter is remanded to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) solely for the purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim of fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria relating to Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status. Prior to such re-examination, the appellant institution shall: (i) deposit the prescribed processing fee in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended); and (ii) submit duly authenticated documentary evidence relating to merger of institutions under the same management, as required under the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, including approvals of: the Management Committee, the Affiliating University, and the State Government, wherever applicable. Thereafter, the concerned Western Regional Committee shall: (a) *examine the claim of the appellant institution regarding Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status strictly with reference to the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended) and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025;* (b) *verify the authenticity and validity of the documents relied upon by the appellant institution;* (c) *afford reasonable opportunity of hearing, if deemed necessary; and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the applicable Guidelines.* The Regional Committee shall ensure strict adherence to the statutory provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Regulations framed thereunder, the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025 (where applicable), and all relevant academic and regulatory standards, and shall decide the matter strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual re-examination and regulatory scrutiny and does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish strict compliance with the prescribed norms and standards upon re-examination shall entail rejection in accordance with law. The

concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of the official record, shall ensure authenticity, completeness, and proper verification of the records before passing any consequential order and shall ensure time-bound disposal of the matter. The appellant institution shall forward, within fifteen (15) days from the receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal to the concerned Regional Committee for examination and further action in accordance with law.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided to set aside the decision taken as per the minutes of WRC dated 10th–13th November 2025, and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim of Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, in accordance with the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee and compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution shall forward the relevant documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed 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, Global Institute of B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 1288, 1285, 4021/982, NH-56 (113) Dist. Banswara Dahod Road, Barodiya, Bagidora, Rajasthan - 327604.**
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.**



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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-450/E- 384773/2025 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026 / E-89493

APPLNRC202515392

Ramzan Memorial College of Education, Khasra No. 113 Min, Rangee Sopore, NH1 Highway Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir – 193201	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Ramzan Memorial College of Education, Khasra No. 113 Min, Rangee Sopore, NH1 Highway Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir – 193201** dated 01.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / FR-2122-NRC-24817697 / JAMMU AND KASHMIR / 2020 / REJC / 171** dated 06.08.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “The certificate of Land Use is not issued by the Competent Authority. It should be issued by the Revenue Department.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from **Ramzan Memorial College of Education, Khasra No. 113 Min, Rangee Sopore, NH1 Highway Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir – 193201** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 18.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Mutation Certificate and Its English Translation Issued by Competent Authority Tehsildar under Mutation Number 27 of Village Rangee. 2. Land Use Certificate is issued by Assistant Commissioner of Revenue Baramulla-193201. 3. Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by Assistant Commissioner Revenue Baramulla as highlighted in the Land Use Certificate. 4. Building Plan is prepared by the architect ideas next under registration number 6463-66 mcsopore and approved by Revenue Authority block development officer sangrama. 5. Building Completion Certificate is issued by Competent Authority block Development Officer sangrama. 6. A dedicated surface parking for LMVS is present as mentioned in site plan issued by Competent Authority. 7. A dedicated space for playground is available within the college premises as specified in the site picture in site plan issued by Competent Authority. 8. The work of STP is done as specified in the site plan. 9. It is available in the premises of college as mentioned in site plan. 10. It is available in the institution. 11. Ramp and disabled friendly toilets are provided on the ground floor of the building as shown in ground floor plan of building issued by Competent Authority. 12. The flooring is repaired, and floor tiles are installed throughout the building. 13. THE A-V Aids have been installed. 14. A dedicated reading room is available at first floor of building as shown in the first floor Building

Plan issued by Competent Authority. 15. Now WIFI and internet facility is available in institutions. 16. Labs are fully equipped and furnished. 17. A dedicated reading is available at first floor of Building as shown in the first floor Building Plan issued by Competent Authority. 18. Librarian is appointed. 19. New books have been added to the library. 20. Now the journals are available in library. 21. Seating arrangement is made in the library. 22. Now stock register is available and maintains all records. 23. Now psychological tools are available in the lab. 24. College website is developed and fully operational Ramazancollegeofeducation.com. 25. Teacher are well qualified as per the norms specified by University of Kashmir. 26. Number of teachers are sufficient as per the norms specified by University of Kashmir.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 B.Ed. Course on 31.08.2020. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 06.08.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 20.11.2025, 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025 and 1st Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. 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 Appeal Committee after reconsideration of the matter in the present meeting. However, the appellant institution did not appear online to present its case before the Appellate Authority on the scheduled date. The Committee noted the written submission of the appellant institution stating that all statutory land and

infrastructure-related documents, including mutation certificate (with English translation), land use certificate, non-encumbrance certificate, approved building plan and building completion certificate, have been obtained from the competent authorities and are available on record. The institution further submitted that requisite infrastructural facilities, including parking, playground, STP, barrier-free access and disabled-friendly amenities, have been provided as per the approved plans. It was also stated that the building has been upgraded and equipped with laboratories, library and other academic facilities, and that qualified teaching staff have been appointed as per the norms of the University of Kashmir. The appellant also submitted a certificate dated 12.02.2026 issued by the Tehsildar, Baramulla, certifying that the land stands converted for educational purposes.

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 06.08.2025 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 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 06.08.2025 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 refusal order dated 06.08.2025 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 careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided to set aside the impugned order dated 06.08.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove.

Appeal ID: APPLNRC/2025/5392

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, Ramzan Memorial College of Education, Khasra No. 113 Min, Rangee Sopore, NH1 Highway 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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-452/E- 386547/2025 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026/E-89493

APPLNRC202515406

Shri Vishwa Mitter Sekhri College of Education, Batala, Khasra No. - 1, VMS Institutes, Village said Mubarak, Amritsar Road, Gurdaspur, Punjab - 143505	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Shri Vishwa Mitter Sekhri College of Education, Batala, Khasra No. - 1, VMS Institues, Village said Mubarak, Amritsar Road, Gurdaspur, Punjab - 143505** dated 25.09.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2627202505214993 / PUNJAB / 2025 / REJC / 2002** 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/-Reg1012/1/2025-Reg Section – HQ dated 06.05.2025 and 27.05.2025 issued by NCTE (Hqrs), the institution 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 No (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	02	Institution running NCTE recognized course(s)
yes	02	Total

04 points. The committee noted that the institution is obtaining only 04 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. Reg1011/3/2025-Reg.Sec-HQ dated 06.05.2025"

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from **Shri Vishwa Mitter Sekhri College of Education, Batala, Khasra No. - 1, VMS Institues, Village said Mubarak, Amritsar Road, Gurdaspur, Punjab - 143505** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 12.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "We are submitting appeal against Refusal Order."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned

Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellants institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellants 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 22.08.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 14th Meeting, 15th Meeting, 2025 and 1st Meeting 2026 which was held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The appellants institution did not appear online to present its case before the Appellate Authority. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellants institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellants institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the appellants institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee after reconsideration of the matter in the present meeting. The appellants institution did not appear online to present its case before the Appellate Authority on 12.01.2026. The appellants institution submitted that the present appeal has been preferred against the Refusal Order passed by the concerned Regional Committee.

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 appellants 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. The NAAC certificate relied upon by the appellant expired, 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.

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 grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility 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 Northern 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 22.08.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 issued by NRC 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, Shri Vishwa Mitter Sekhri College of Education, Batala, Khasra No. - 1, VMS Institues, Village said Mubarak, Amritsar Road, Gurdaspur, Punjab - 143505.**
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, 5th 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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-464/E- 387996/2025 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026

APPLSRC202515418/E-89493

Sullamussalam Arabic College, Surve No. 280/1, Areekode, Sohss Road, Malappuram, Kerala - 673639	<u>Vs</u>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Sullamussalam Arabic College, Surve No. 280/1, Areekode, Sohss Road, Malappuram, Kerala - 673639** dated 23.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / SRC / 2627202505214941 / KERALA / 2025 / REJC / 1990** dated 26.08.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution has not uploaded the latest Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Competent Authority of the State Government. The institution has uploaded the Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued in the year 2019. Latest NEC not uploaded. The institution has not uploaded the latest Building Safety Certificate issued by the Competent Authority. The institution has not uploaded the Building Completion Certificate issued by the Competent Authority of the State Government"

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from **Sullamussalam Arabic College, Surve No. 280/1, Areekode, Sohss Road, Malappuram, Kerala - 673639** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 18.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The latest English version of non-encumbrance certificate for the year 2025 is obtained and had uploaded earlier the same documents has now been re uploaded for clarity and record. 2. The latest building safety and stability certificate has been obtained from the competent authority and is uploaded. The infrastructure fully means the safety and stability norms prescribed by NCTE. 3. The building completion certificate had been submitted earlier. A fresh copy of the completion certificate has also been re uploaded as per the direction of NCTE. 4. The fire and safety equipment have been installed."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 26.08.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 14th Meeting, 15th Meeting, 2025 and 1st Meeting 2026 which was held on 12.01.2026 before the Appeal Committee. The appellant institution did not appear online to present its case before the Appellate Authority. 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 Appeal Committee after reconsideration of the matter in the present meeting. However, the appellant institution did not appear online to present its case before the Appellate Authority on the scheduled date. The Appeal Committee noted the written submissions of the appellant institution vide letter dated 17.02.2026, along with a notarized affidavit and supporting documents placed on record. The appellant institution submitted that it has rectified all the deficiencies pointed out in the impugned order in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, and has obtained the requisite certificates from the competent statutory authorities. In support of its claim, the institution has placed on record authenticated copies of the following documents for verification by the Appeal Committee: Latest Fire and Safety Certificate issued by the competent Fire and Rescue Services Authority of the State Government. Latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (English Version) issued by the concerned Revenue Authority. Latest Building Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority. Building Completion Certificate issued by the Local Self Government authority. The appellant institution further submitted that the above certificates are valid and currently in force, and that they establish compliance of the institution with the safety, infrastructure, and statutory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The institution also stated that authenticated copies of these documents have been submitted to enable

the Appeal Committee to verify the veracity of its claim regarding rectification of the deficiencies noted earlier. The appellant institution additionally undertook through the affidavit that it shall strictly adhere to all norms, standards, and conditions prescribed by NCTE and shall maintain continuous compliance with the regulatory requirements in future. The affidavit was stated to have been filed in support of the appeal and for consideration of the Appeal Committee.

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 SRC at the time of passing the impugned order dated 26.08.2025 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 26.08.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification and remands the matter to the Southern Regional Committee. The Southern 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 careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided to set aside the impugned order dated 26.08.2025 and remand the matter to the Southern Regional Committee (SRC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme with the directions specified hereinabove. The SRC 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 SRC within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.

Appeal ID: APPLRC 2025 15418

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, Sullamussalam Arabic College, Surve No. 280/1, Areekode, Sohss Road, Malappuram, Kerala - 673639.**
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, 1st 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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-498/E- 392520/2025 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026/E-89493

APPLWRC202515454

Impulse College of Education, Khasra No. 241/4, NH 21 Agra Road, Dausa, Rajasthan – 303303	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Impulse College of Education, Khasra No. 241/4, NH 21 Agra Road, Dausa, Rajasthan - 303303** dated 01.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509223055/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/431** dated 18.11.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. Impulse Girls College and Impulse Degree college are different from Impulse College of Education. 2. The institution is not running multi-disciplinary courses in the field of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce or mathematics as per Regulation No.NCTE-Regl011/80/2018- MS(Regulation)-HQ dated 26.10.2021 as amended from time to time and Public Notice No. NCTE-Regl012/7/2025-Reg.Sec-HQ dated 12.09.2025 related with extension of timeline to existing recognized teacher education institutions for transition from B.A. B.Ed./ B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme to ITEP before the start of Academic Session 2026-27. The institution does not fall in the category of multi-disciplinary institution."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from **Impulse College of Education, Khasra No. 241/4, NH 21 Agra Road, Dausa, Rajasthan - 303303** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 18.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "I. Impulse college of education was formerly as impulse degree college, the institute has uploaded the order of name change issued by directorate of college education Jaipur (Rajasthan) and university of Rajasthan Jaipur, at the time of filling application form on dated 05.10.2025. II. The institution is running multi-disciplinary courses in the field of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, or mathematics as per Regulation No.NCTE-Regl011/80/2018- MS(Regulation)-HQ dated 26.10.2021 as amended from time to time and Public Notice No. NCTE-Regl012/7/2025-Reg.Sec-HQ dated 12.09.2025 related with extension of timeline to existing recognized teacher education institutions for transition from B.A. B.Ed./ B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme to ITEP before the start of academic session 2026-27. The copy of affiliation for the session 205-26 issued by university of Rajasthan Jaipur is enclosed here with your reference. Further institutions fulfill its eligibility within the

timeline. Hence institute is in the category of multi-disciplinary institution. So please dispose the order issued by WRC and oblige.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 05.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 18.11.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 16.12.2025 and 2nd 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 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 Appeal Committee reconsidered the matter in the present meeting and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order of the Regional Committee, the records available on file, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution. The Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution that it had placed on record a letter dated 26.09.2025 issued by the Assistant Registrar, stating that the name of the Degree College had been changed to Impulse College of Education, Agra Road, Dausa. The appellant institution submitted that the institution was earlier functioning as Impulse Degree College and that the change of name to Impulse College of Education had been duly approved by: (i) the Directorate of College Education, Jaipur (Government of Rajasthan); and (ii) the University of Rajasthan, Jaipur. The appellant further stated that the relevant orders approving the change of

name were uploaded at the time of submission of the application dated 05.10.2025. The appellant institution further submitted that it is a multidisciplinary institution offering programmes in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences and mathematics, and therefore claimed eligibility for recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) under Notification No. NCTE-Regl011/80/2018-MS (Regulation)-HQ dated 26.10.2021, as amended from time to time, read with Public Notice No. NCTE-Regl012/7/2025-Reg.Sec-HQ dated 12.09.2025 extending the timeline for transition to the ITEP programme. In support of its claim, the appellant institution placed reliance upon the affiliation order for the academic session 2025–26 issued by the University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, and requested reconsideration of the impugned order passed by the Regional Committee.

The Appeal Committee examined the applicable regulatory framework governing recognition for Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended vide Gazette Notification dated 22.10.2021, which defines a multidisciplinary institution as follows:

“(ca) “multidisciplinary institution” means a duly recognized higher education institution involving several different subjects of study/combining or involving more than one discipline. Multidisciplinary universities and colleges will aim to establish education departments, which besides carrying out cutting-edge research in various aspects of education, will also run Integrated Teacher Education Programmes, in collaboration with other departments or field of liberal arts or humanities or social sciences or commerce or mathematics, as the case may be, at the time of applying for recognition of Integrated Teacher Education Programme.”

The Committee further examined the **“Guidelines for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions”** dated 15.05.2025, which prescribe, inter alia:

4.2.1 Merger of institutions under the same management

The managing trust/society must submit to NCTE the approval of such merger by: (i) the management committee (ii) affiliating university and (iii) State Government, as applicable.

The Appeal Committee, while noting the claim of the appellant institution regarding change of name of the Degree College to Impulse College of Education, Agra Road, Dausa, reiterates that under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, read with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the statutory burden of establishing strict, continuous and demonstrable compliance with the prescribed norms and standards rests entirely upon the applicant institution. Recognition or continuation thereof is conditional upon fulfilment of all mandatory statutory and regulatory requirements. Mere assertions of compliance, unsupported by authenticated, contemporaneous and verifiable documentary evidence, cannot displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the competent Regional Committee in exercise of its statutory jurisdiction under the Act and the Regulations. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order and the submissions advanced by the appellant institution, and bearing in mind the principles governing appellate scrutiny under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of factual re-examination of the claims made by the appellant institution. Such interference is confined strictly to ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory consistency and shall not be construed as dilution of the binding statutory standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), nor as an expression of opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's entitlement to recognition. 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. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle recognized by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in *Rambha College of Education v. NCTE*, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016, wherein it has been observed that documents placed during appellate scrutiny may be examined for the limited purpose of verification of compliance, subject to regulatory scrutiny by the competent authority. However, such examination must remain strictly confined 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, the Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of

the NCTE Act, 1993, is of the considered opinion that the matter requires factual re-examination by the competent Regional Committee. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 18.11.2025 is set aside, and the matter is remanded to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) solely for the purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed criteria relating to Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status. Prior to such re-examination, the appellant institution shall submit duly authenticated documentary evidence in support of its claim regarding multidisciplinary status, including the documentary approvals relating to the change of name of the institution and its multidisciplinary academic structure. Thereafter, the concerned Western Regional Committee shall: (a) verify the authenticity of the change of name of the institution from the Directorate of College Education, Government of Rajasthan and the University of Rajasthan, Jaipur; (b) examine the claim of the appellant institution regarding Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status strictly with reference to the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended) and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025; (c) verify the authenticity and validity of the documents relied upon by the appellant institution; (d) afford reasonable opportunity of hearing, if deemed necessary; and (e) thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended) and the applicable Guidelines. The Regional Committee shall ensure strict adherence to the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Regulations framed thereunder, the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025 (where applicable), and all relevant academic and regulatory standards, and shall decide the matter strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual re-examination and regulatory scrutiny and does not create any presumption, equity or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish strict compliance with the prescribed norms and standards upon re-examination shall entail rejection in accordance with law. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of the official record, shall ensure authenticity, completeness and proper verification of the records before passing any consequential order and shall ensure time-bound disposal of the matter. The appellant institution shall forward, within fifteen (15) days from the receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal to the concerned Regional Committee for examination and further action in accordance with law.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided to set aside the impugned order dt. 18.11.2025 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim of Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, in accordance with the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution shall forward the relevant documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed 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, Impulse College of Education, Khasra No. 241/4, NH 21 Agra Road, Dausa, Rajasthan - 303303.
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.



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 - 18.03.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**

**89-28/E-396320/2025 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026 /E-89493
APPLERC202615511**

Fatika Nazrul Sukanta Educational Training College, Khata No. 739, 1881, Vill-Fatika, P.O. rol, Indas Station Road, Dist-Bankura, West Bengal - 722205	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Fatika Nazrul Sukanta Educational Training College, Khata No. 739, 1881, Vill-Fatika, P.O. rol, Indas Station Road, Dist-Bankura, West Bengal - 722205** dated 13.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202509162617/WEST BENGAL/2025/REJC/501** dated 15.11.2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution did not submit the details of the authorized person/representative on the stamp paper with admissible government rate. 2. The institution has not submitted details of students admitted. 3. The institution does not run any course in the field of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce or mathematics, therefore as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 amended from time to time the application of the institution does not fall in the category of multi-disciplinary institution. Moreover, in the application form also, the institution has stated that it is not a multi-disciplinary institution. Hence, the application of the institution cannot be considered for transition into ITEP as per amended Regulations, 2014 Gazette on 26th October 2021. 4. The institution is running two units of B.Ed. Programme and one unit of D.El.Ed. programmes. The institution submitted the transit application two units of ITEP programmes. The institution has only 5577.96 sq. mtrs. land which is less as per NCTE Regulation for running two unit of B.Ed. programme, one unit of D.El.Ed. and two unit of ITEP programmes as per Para 6.1 (b) Notified dated 26.10.2021. 5. The institution has submitted NEC which is very old one. Hence the institution is required to submit latest NEC issued by the Competent Authority. 6. The institution has submitted Building Plan without earmarked area of proposed course and existing course. Hence, the institution is requirement to submit readable copy of Building Plan with earmarked area of Existing course and proposed course as NCTE Regulation. 7. The institution has submitted BCC but not mentioned earmarked area. Hence, the institution is required to submit BCC approved by the Govt. Engineer with earmarked area of proposed course and existing course. 8. The institution has not submitted Fire Safety Certificate and Building Safety Certificate issued from Govt. Authority. 9. The institution has not submitted a certificate issued by the govt. Competent Authority

stating that the institution's campus, Building, Furniture etc. is barrier free/Accessible to all."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative of Fatika Nazrul Sukanta Educational Training College, Khata No. 739, 1881, Vill-Fatika, P.O. Rol, Indas Station Road, Dist-Bankura, West Bengal - 722205 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 18.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The institution has now submitted the details of the authorized person/representative on non-judicial stamp paper of admissible Government value, duly notarized/attested. 2. The institution hereby submits that the details of students admitted for the approved programmes have now been duly compiled and uploaded/submitted as per NCTE norms. 3. The institution is affiliated to the Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University which offers programmes in Liberal Arts / Humanities / Social Sciences through its affiliated academic framework, and the institution functions within the said multi-disciplinary academic ecosystem. Also, the institution has affiliation from the said above university. 4. The institution respectfully submits that earlier the total land area of the institution was 5577.96 sq. meters, which was observed to be less than the prescribed land requirement under the NCTE Regulations. In order to comply with the prescribed norms, the institution has purchased additional land measuring 12 (Twelve) decimal, vide registered Sale Deed No. 011003195 dated 05/06/2025. After inclusion of the said additional land, the total land area of the institution now stands at 6063.58 sq. meters, which is sufficient and fully compliant with the land requirement norms of NCTE Regulations. 5. The institution respectfully submits fresh and valid NEC THAT has been obtained from the competent authority. 6. The institution is continuing only with its existing approved courses, for which the approved Building Plan has already been submitted earlier. Since there is no proposed course and no additional construction, the requirement of separate earmarking of area for proposed or additional courses does not arise. 7. The institution is continuing only with its existing approved courses, for which the approved BCC has already been submitted earlier. Since there is no proposed course and no additional construction, the requirement of separate earmarking of area for proposed or additional courses does not arise. 8. Already submitted issued by Govt. Authority. 9. Barrier Free Certificate submitted."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 04.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 15.11.2025.

The matter was earlier considered in the 2nd Meeting, 2026 of the Appeal Committee held on 29.01.2026, wherein the Committee, in the interest of fair adjudication, granted the appellant institution a further opportunity to submit relevant documents in support of its claim.

The Appeal Committee reconsidered the matter in the present meeting and examined the Appeal Report, records on file, documents submitted by the appellant institution, and the submissions made during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee noted the claim of the appellant institution that details of students admitted in the approved programmes have been uploaded as per NCTE norms. The institution further claimed that it is affiliated to Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University, has purchased additional land measuring 12 decimals vide Registered Sale Deed No. 011003195 dated 05.06.2025 increasing the total land area to 6063.58 sq. m., and has obtained a fresh Non-Encumbrance Certificate. It was also claimed that the institution continues only with its existing approved courses and that the approved building plan, building completion certificate and other required certificates including the barrier-free certificate have already been submitted. The institution further claimed, through an affidavit, that it offers programmes in multiple disciplines and therefore fulfills the criteria of a Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) under the NCTE Regulations, 2021, supported by a certificate issued by the Assistant Registrar (Acting), Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University.

The Appeal Committee considered the above submissions in light of the statutory framework governing recognition of teacher education institutions under the National Council for Teacher Education 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 on examination of the entire material available on record, finds that the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the said Regulations. 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) **Failure to establish Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status.** The appellant institution submitted an affidavit claiming that it offers programmes in multiple disciplines including B.A., B.Sc., B.A. B.Ed., and B.Sc. B.Ed. and therefore qualifies as a Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI). In support of this claim, the institution submitted a certificate issued by the Assistant Registrar (Acting), Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University stating that the institution has been providing degree courses in the streams of Science and Arts.
- However, upon scrutiny of the documents placed on record, the Committee observed that the institution has only submitted a renewal of affiliation letter for the B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. four-year integrated programme. The appellant institution has failed to submit documentary evidence establishing that it independently conducts undergraduate programmes in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce, or mathematics, including: details of subjects offered copies of affiliation orders for such programmes duration and continuity of such multidisciplinary programmes. Therefore, the institution has failed to establish that it operates as a multidisciplinary institution within the meaning of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended).
- (ii) **Non-compliance relating to infrastructure and built-up area** The Appeal Committee further observed that:
- (a) the building plan submitted by the institution does not clearly indicate details of classrooms, laboratories, library, common rooms or other instructional facilities, and the document is not clearly readable nor does it specify the competent authority approving the plan;
 - (b) the Building Completion Certificate indicates total built-up area of 49,380.54 sq. ft., out of which 27,222 sq. ft. is stated to be earmarked for the teacher education programme. The Committee

finds that the total built-up area shown by the institution is not sufficient to accommodate the existing programmes, namely: two units of B.Ed. one unit of D.El.Ed. two units of ITEP in accordance with the Norms and Standards prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

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 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 15.11.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, 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 15.11.2025 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, Fatika Nazrul Sukanta Educational Training College, Khata No. 739, 1881, Vill-Fatika, P.O. rol, Indas Station Road, Dist-Bankura, West Bengal - 722205.**
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 Education, Govt. of West Bengal, Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake City, (5th, 6th, 8th, 10th Floor) Kolkata, West Bengal-700 091.



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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-30/E-396321/2026 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026
APPLERC202615510 / E-89493

BAM Vivekananda Primary Teachers Training College, Khata No. 1817, Vill-Bam, P.O-Joteram, Purba Bardhaman, Bamtantipara, Burdwan, West Bengal - 713104 APPELLANT	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 RESPONDENT
--	------------------	--

Representative of Appellant	Md. Khairul Alam, Secretary
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **BAM Vivekananda Primary Teachers Training College, Khata No. 1817, Vill-Bam, P.O-Joteram, Purba Bardhaman, Bamtantipara, Burdwan, West Bengal - 713104** dated 10.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202509162615/WEST BENGAL/2025/REJC/419** dated 15.11.2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution did not submit copy of Not-for-Profit Certificate from the Competent Authority. 2. The institution did not submit the details of the authorized person on the stamp paper with admissible government rate. 3. The institution has not submitted details of students admitted. 4. The institution does not run any courses in the file do liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce or mathematics, therefore as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 amended from time to time the application of the institution does not fall in the category of multi-disciplinary institution. Moreover, in the application form also, the institution has stated that it is not a multi-disciplinary institution. Hence, the application of the institution cannot be considered for transition into ITEP as per amended Regulations 2014 Gazette on 26th October 2021. 5. The institution has submitted NCE which is very old one. 6. The institution has submitted Building Plan without earmarked area of proposed course and existing course. 7. The institution has submitted BCC but not mentioned earmarked area of proposed course and existing course. 8. The institution has not submitted Fire Safety Certificate and Building Safety Certificate issued from Govt. Authority. 9. The institution has not submitted certificate from the Competent Authority, stating that the institution's campus., building, furniture etc. is barrier free/Accessible."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Md. Khairul Alam, Secretary of BAM Vivekananda Primary Teachers Training College, Khata No. 1817, Vill-Bam, P.O-Joteram, Purba Bardhaman, Bamtantipara, Burdwan, West Bengal - 713104 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 18.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The institution Submitted a valid Not-for-Profit Certificate

from the competent authority. 2. The institution submitted the details of the authorized person on the stamp paper with admissible government rate. 3. The institution Submitted details of students admitted data. 4. The institution is affiliated to the BABA SAHEB AMBEDKAR EDUCATION University which offers programmes in Liberal Arts / Humanities / Social Sciences through its affiliated academic framework, and the institution functions within the said multi-disciplinary academic ecosystem. Also the institution has affiliation from the said above university. 5. The institution respectfully submits fresh and valid NEC that has been obtained from the Competent Authority. 6. The institution is continuing only with its existing approved courses, for which the approved Building Plan has already been submitted earlier. Since there is no proposed course and no additional construction, the requirement of separate earmarking of area for proposed or additional courses does not arise. 7. The institution is continuing only with its existing approved courses, for which the approved BCC has already been submitted earlier. Since there is no proposed course and no additional construction, the requirement of separate earmarking of area for proposed or additional courses does not arise. 8. FIRE SAFETY CERTIFICATE from Govt. Authority already submitted. 9. Barrier Free Certificate submitted.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 15.11.2025.

The matter was earlier considered in the 2nd Meeting, 2026 of the Appeal Committee held on 29.01.2026, wherein the Committee, in the interest of fair adjudication, granted the appellant institution a further opportunity to submit relevant documents in support of its claim.

The Appeal Committee reconsidered the matter in the present meeting and examined the Appeal Report, records on file, documents submitted by the appellant institution, and the submissions made during the online hearing. The Committee noted the claim of the appellant institution, as per its submission, that it has furnished a Not-for-Profit Certificate, details of the authorized representative on duly stamped paper, and data of students admitted in the approved programmes. The institution further claimed that it is affiliated to Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University and functions within a multidisciplinary academic framework, and that a fresh Non-Encumbrance Certificate has been obtained from the competent authority. It was also claimed that the institution is continuing only with its existing approved courses, for which the approved Building Plan, Building Completion Certificate, Fire Safety Certificate and Barrier-Free Certificate have already been submitted, and that no additional construction or earmarking of built-up area is required. The appellant institution also claimed through an affidavit that it offers programmes in multiple disciplines and therefore fulfils the criteria of a Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) under the NCTE Regulations, 2021, supported by a certificate issued by the Assistant Registrar (Acting), Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University stating that the institution has been offering degree programmes in Arts and Science streams. However, on perusal of the documents attached, it is observed that the institution has submitted a Renewal of Affiliation letter for the B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed. four-year Integrated Programme.

The Appeal Committee considered the above submissions in light of the statutory framework governing recognition of teacher education institutions under the National Council for Teacher Education 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 on examination of the entire material available on record, finds that the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the said Regulations. 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) **Failure to establish Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status.** The appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it offers programmes in multiple disciplines, namely B.A. (General and Honours), B.Sc. (General and Honours), B.A.B.Ed., and B.Sc. B.Ed., and claimed that it fulfils the criteria of a Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) under the NCTE Regulations, 2021. In support, the institution also furnished a certificate issued by the Assistant Registrar (Acting), Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University, stating that the institution has been offering degree programmes in Arts and Science streams for the past few years.

However, upon examination of the documents placed on record, it is observed that the institution has submitted only a Renewal of Affiliation letter for the B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed. four-year Integrated Programme. The appellant institution has failed to furnish details of undergraduate programmes, including the subjects offered, duration of such programmes (in academic years), and copies of the relevant affiliation orders, to establish that such multidisciplinary programmes have been continuously operational. In the absence of such documentary evidence, it is not established that the institution is running programmes in the fields of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce or mathematics. Accordingly, the institution does not qualify as a Multidisciplinary Institution as required under the applicable provisions of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time.

- (ii) **Non-compliance relating to infrastructure and built-up area** The Appeal Committee further observed the following deficiencies:

- (a) The Building Plan submitted by the institution is illegible and incomplete, as it does not clearly indicate the details of classrooms, laboratories, library, common rooms and other requisite facilities, nor does it clearly specify the competent authority by whom the plan has been approved.
- (b) The appellant institution has submitted two different Building Completion Certificates (BCCs) reflecting inconsistent built-up area figures, i.e., 41,100 sq. ft. in one certificate and 32,000 sq. ft. in another. Further, the BCC indicates that the land is situated across five different plots, which does not clearly establish the availability of contiguous land and built-up area earmarked for each teacher education programme. Accordingly, the documents submitted fail to conclusively establish compliance with the prescribed infrastructure and built-up area requirements under the applicable NCTE norms.

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 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 15.11.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, 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 15.11.2025 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, BAM Vivekananda Primary Teachers Training College, Khata No. 1817, Vill-Bam, P.O-Joteram, Purba Bardhaman, Bamtantipara, Burdwan, West Bengal - 713104.**
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 Education, Govt. of West Bengal, Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake City, (5th, 6th, 8th, 10th Floor) Kolkata, West Bengal-700 091.



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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-31/E-396270/2026 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026

APPLERC202615514 / E-89493

Labpur Teachers Training Institute, Plot No. 5, 7, 8, 9, 1359, Vill - Labpur, Suri-Katwa, Birbhum, West Bengal – 731303	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Labpur Teachers Training Institute, Plot No. 5, 7, 8, 9, 1359, Vill - Labpur, Suri-Katwa, Birbhum, West Bengal - 731303** dated 14.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202509263349/WEST BENGAL/2025/REJC/589** dated 15.11.2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution did not submit the details of the authorized person/representative on the stamp paper with admissible government rate. 2. The institution does not run any course in the file of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce or mathematics, therefore as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 amended from time to time the application of the institution does not fall in the category of multi-disciplinary institution. Moreover, in the application form also, the institution has stated that it is not a Multi-Disciplinary institution. Hence, the application of the institution cannot be considered for transition into ITEP as per amended Regulations 2014 Gazette on 26th October 2021. 3. Copy of Not-for-Profit Certificate and Exemption Certificate (12A) has not been submitted by the institution. 4. Details about students admitted not mentioned by the institution. 5. The institution is running B.Ed. - two units, D.El.Ed. – two units and B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. – two units. The total land area is only 4094.45 sq. mts. Which is less as per NCTE Regulations. 6. Translated English / Hindi version of Mutation Certificate has not been uploaded. 7. The institution has submitted Non-Encumbrance which is issued in the year 2015. 8. The institution has not uploaded Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Competent Authority. 9. The institution has not uploaded the Building Safety Certificate issued by the Competent Authority. 10. The institution has not submitted a certificate stating that the institution's campus, building, furniture etc. is barrier free/Accessible to all. 11. The institution has not submitted approved Building Plan by Govt. Civil Authority with earmarked area of proposed course and existing course."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from **Labpur Teachers Training Institute, Plot No. 5, 7, 8, 9, 1359, Vill - Labpur, Suri-Katwa, Birbhum, West Bengal - 731303** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the

appellant institution submitted that "1. I submitted the details of the authorized person/representative on the stamp paper with admissible government rate. 2. That I am the Secretary of the above-named institution and am well acquainted with the facts of the case and competent to swear this affidavit. That the institution had applied for transition to ITEP Programme before the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE). That in the earlier online application, due to inadvertent and unintentional error, the institution was wrongly declared as "not a Multidisciplinary Institution". That I hereby clarify and correct the said declaration and state that ----- college is a multidisciplinary institution. That the institution is running the following Four-Year Integrated Programmes: B.A. B.Ed. (Four-Year Integrated Programme) B.Sc. B.Ed. (Four-Year Integrated Programme) duly affiliated by Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University, West Bengal, and approved as per NCTE norms. That the said programmes clearly include Arts and Science disciplines, thereby fulfilling the requirement of a Multidisciplinary Institution as per NCTE Regulations. That the affiliation of the above programmes has been renewed for the academic session 2024-2025 by Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University. That in view of the above facts, the institution fully satisfies the eligibility criteria for transition to ITEP Programme, and the earlier incorrect declaration may kindly be treated as corrected. That this affidavit is submitted specifically to remove Deficiency No. 2 as pointed out by the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC), NCTE. That the statements made above are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and nothing material has been concealed. 3. I submitted the copy of Not-for-Profit Certificate and Exemption Certificate (12A). 4. No students was admitted 2024-2025 session. 5. The institution respectfully submits that earlier the total land area of the institution was 4094.45 sq. meters, which was observed to be less than the prescribed land requirement under the NCTE Regulations. In order to comply with the prescribed norms, the institution has purchased additional land measuring 67 (Sixty Seven) decimal, vide registered Sale Deed No. 031102209 dated 06/08/2021 & Deed No. 031100290 dated 28/01/2019 After inclusion of the said additional land, the total land area of the institution now stands at 6798.7253 sq. meters, which is sufficient and fully compliant with the land requirement norms of NCTE Regulations. 6. I submitted the land conversion certificate. 7. I submitted the non-encumbrance which is issued in the year 2025. 8. I submitted the fire safety certificate issued by the Competent Authority. 9. I submitted the building safety certificate issued by the competent authority. 10. I

submitted the certificate stating that the institutions campus, building, furniture etc. is barrier free/accessible to all. 11. I submitted the approved building plan by govt. Civil Authority with earmarked area of proposed course and existing course.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 04.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 15.11.2025.

The matter was earlier considered in the 2nd Meeting, 2026 of the Appeal Committee held on 29.01.2026, wherein the Committee, in the interest of fair adjudication, granted the appellant institution a further opportunity to submit relevant documents in support of its claim.

The Appeal Committee reconsidered the matter in the present meeting and examined the Appeal Report, records on file, documents submitted by the appellant institution, and the submissions made during the online hearing. The Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution claimed that it has filed an affidavit stating that the earlier declaration of the institution as “not a Multidisciplinary Institution” in the online application was inadvertent and has now been corrected. The appellant institution claimed that it is running four-year integrated programmes of B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed., duly affiliated by Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University, West Bengal, and therefore qualifies as a Multidisciplinary Institution. In support of this claim, the institution submitted a renewal of affiliation letter for the B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes along with a certificate issued by the Assistant Registrar (Acting) of the said University. The institution further submitted that it has provided the authorized representative details, Not-for-Profit and 12A certificates, additional land documents increasing the total land area to 6798.7253 sq. meters,

land conversion certificate, Non-Encumbrance Certificate (2025), fire safety certificate, building safety certificate, barrier-free certificate, and an approved building plan issued by the competent authority. The appellant institution accordingly requested reconsideration of its case.

The Appeal Committee considered the above submissions in light of the statutory framework governing recognition of teacher education institutions under the National Council for Teacher Education 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 on examination of the entire material available on record, finds that the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the said Regulations. 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) **Failure to establish Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status.** The appellant institution submitted an affidavit claiming that it offers B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes and therefore qualifies as a Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI). In support of this claim, the institution placed on record a Renewal of Affiliation letter issued by Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University for the four-year Integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programme, along with a certificate issued by the Assistant Registrar (Acting) of the said University, stating that the institution has been imparting instruction in Science and Arts streams for the past few years.

However, upon careful scrutiny of the documents placed on record, the Appeal Committee observed that the appellant institution has only submitted the renewal of affiliation for the integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programme, and has failed to furnish documentary evidence demonstrating that it independently conducts undergraduate programmes in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce, or mathematics, as required for classification as a multidisciplinary institution. The institution has also failed to submit details of undergraduate programmes, including subjects offered, copies of affiliation orders for such programmes, and documentary evidence indicating the duration and continuity (number of academic years) for which such multidisciplinary programmes have been operational. In the absence of such verifiable material, the claim of multidisciplinary status remains unsubstantiated. Accordingly, the material placed on record clearly establishes that the appellant institution does not operate independently in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce, or mathematics, and

therefore does not satisfy the criteria of a Multidisciplinary Institution under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time.

(ii) **Non-compliance relating to infrastructure and built-up area** The Appeal Committee further observed deficiencies relating to infrastructure compliance. In particular:

(a) The building plan submitted by the appellant institution does not clearly indicate the location or details of essential instructional facilities such as classrooms, laboratories, library, common rooms, and other academic spaces required under the prescribed norms. The document is also not clearly readable and does not disclose the identity of the competent authority that approved the building plan, thereby rendering it unreliable for regulatory verification.

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 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 15.11.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, 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 15.11.2025 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, Labpur Teachers Training Institute, Plot No. 5, 7, 8, 9, 1359, Vill - Labpur, Suri-Katwa, Birbhum, West Bengal - 731303.**
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 Education, Govt. of West Bengal, Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake City, (5th, 6th, 8th, 10th Floor) Kolkata, West Bengal-700 091.



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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-25/E-395684/2026 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202515460 / E- 89493

D. P. M. College, Khasra No. Old No. 1977, New-2491, Old No. 1979, New-3241/2493, Halena Board, Weir Bharatpur, Rajasthan - 321642	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **D. P. M. College, Khasra No. Old No. 1977, New-2491, Old No. 1979, New-3241/2493, Halena Board, Weir Bharatpur, Rajasthan - 321642** dated 08.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / WRC / 2627202509293445 / RAJASTHAN / 2025 / REJC / 1680** dated 14.11.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has expressed its intention to become a multidisciplinary institution through collaboration as stipulated in the NCTE Guidelines for transforming NCTE recognized stand-alone teacher education institutions into multidisciplinary higher education institutions. However, the institution has not uploaded any Memorandum of Collaboration (MoC). 2. The institution has not uploaded the certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan justifying the requirement for a teacher education programme in the area, as required under Clause 4.3(i) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. 3. The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence that both institutions proposed for collaboration are affiliated with the same university. 4. The proposal for collaboration between the institutions has not been approved by their affiliating university, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. 5. The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence confirming that 'D.P.M. College' and the institution to be collaborated with, are situated within the radius of 10 Kilometers, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from **D. P. M. College, Khasra No. Old No. 1977, New-2491, Old No. 1979, New-3241/2493, Halena Board, Weir Bharatpur, Rajasthan - 321642** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 29.01.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. At the outset, it is brought to the kind notice of the Hon'ble Appellate Authority that the Refusal Order issued by the Western Regional Committee (WRC) under Section 15(3)(b) of the NCTE Act, 1993, is arbitrary, erroneous, and unjust. It is mandatory under Sections 14, 15, and 17 of the NCTE Act, 1993, to provide a reasonable opportunity to the applicant institution prior to refusing or withdrawing its recognition. The Regional Director (RD), WRC, issued the Refusal Order

without the judicious application of mind and without quantifying the gravity of the decision: that not only is the recognition for the ITEP being refused, but the recognition of the appellants existing B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. courses shall also stand withdrawn because Appendix-13 of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, has already been omitted by the NCTE. This high-handedness, arbitrary attitude, and contravention of the laid down procedures of the NCTE Act and Regulations have been viewed very seriously by the Honble Delhi High Court in its recent judgments, which quashed the refusal orders of the WRC by directing it to provide an opportunity to the institution. However, your appellant, being a law-abiding institution, sincerely approaches the Honble Appeal Committee instead of filing a court case. The ground cited by the Western Regional Committee (WRC) in its refusal order dated -- (Appel is being filed based on the minutes) stating that the appellant institution fails to fulfill the basic criterion of being a Multi-Disciplinary Institution (MDI) is demonstrably erroneous and factually incorrect as mentioned below :

- Non-compliance with Mandate: This finding by the WRC constitutes a non-judicious application of mind and is in direct contravention of the established facts on record.
- It is pertinent to note that the Western Regional Committee (WRC) has rejected the appellants application on the erroneous ground of "not being collaborated with a Multi-Disciplinary Institution (MDI). This specific ground of refusal is misdirected and logically flawed because:
 - i. The appellant never opted for collaboration with another institution in the online transition application.
 - ii. The appellant neither mentioned collaboration anywhere in the application nor uploaded any supporting document related to collaboration.
 - iii. The reason collaboration was not sought is that the appellant is already a recognized MDI institution itself, a fact substantiated by the annexed Affiliation Orders. The WRCs decision to invoke the collaboration clause, when the appellant claimed and submitted evidence for its own MDI status, clearly indicates a non-application of mind and an arbitrary decision-making process, rendering the refusal order unsustainable in law.
- Existing MDI Status: Your appellant institution, functioning as D.P.M. College at the very same location, is already recognized and operational, offering multi-disciplinary courses in the distinct academic fields of Arts, Commerce, and Science.
- Regulatory Compliance: The appellant is, therefore, a fully compliant Multi-Disciplinary Institution as mandated under the stipulations of Appendix-15 of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, for the purpose of running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP).
- Documentary Evidence: To substantiate the appellants Multi-Disciplinary Institution (MDI) status, the following documentary evidence is annexed herewith and placed before the Honble Appeal Committee for its kind perusal:
 - i. Affiliation Order (Initial): The Affiliation Order dated 11/11/2022 (placed at Serial No.5 of the Annexures).
 - ii. Affiliation Order (Latest): The latest Affiliation Order dated 09/01/2024. Both orders, issued by the Maharaja Surajm?./Brij Vishwa Vidyalaya, Kumher, Bharatpur, Rajasthan, unequivocally confirm the appellant's existing multi-disciplinary affiliations in the

fields of Arts, Commerce, and Science. This evidence conclusively demonstrates compliance with the MDI requirement under the NCTE Regulations for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). Furthermore, as your appellant is already successfully running the B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. courses, which have been duly recognized by the NCTE since 2017, it is evidently established that the appellant institution is already in possession of all the requisite infrastructural and instructional facilities as per the Norms and Standards of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, and amendments thereof. The continued successful operation and recognition of these existing teacher education programmes strongly reveals compliance with the basic physical and academic requirements essential for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) transition.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 04.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 14.11.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 16.12.2025 and 2nd 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 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 Appeal Committee reconsidered the matter in the present meeting and examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order of the Regional Committee, the records available on file, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution. The Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it claimed

that the refusal order issued by the Western Regional Committee under Section 15(3)(b) of the NCTE Act, 1993 is erroneous and based on non-consideration of the factual position regarding its status as a Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI). The appellant institution further claimed that it is already functioning as a multidisciplinary institution under the name D.P.M. College, offering undergraduate programmes in Arts, Commerce, and Science, and therefore fulfills the eligibility requirement for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). In support of its claim, the institution placed on record affiliation orders issued by Maharaja Surajmal Brij Vishwavidyalaya, Bharatpur, Rajasthan, including the latest order dated 09.01.2024, and a certificate from the Registrar confirming that the institution is running undergraduate programmes. The appellant also submitted that it has been running B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes since 2017 with NCTE recognition and therefore possesses the requisite infrastructural and instructional facilities as prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The institution accordingly requested reconsideration of the refusal order.

The Appeal Committee examined the applicable regulatory framework governing recognition for Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended vide Gazette Notification dated 22.10.2021, which defines a multidisciplinary institution as follows:

“(ca) “multidisciplinary institution” means a duly recognized higher education institution involving several different subjects of study/combining or involving more than one discipline. Multidisciplinary universities and colleges will aim to establish education departments, which besides carrying out cutting-edge research in various aspects of education, will also run Integrated Teacher Education Programmes, in collaboration with other departments or field of liberal arts or humanities or social sciences or commerce or mathematics, as the case may be, at the time of applying for recognition of Integrated Teacher Education Programme.”

The Committee further examined the **“Guidelines for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions”** dated 15.05.2025, which prescribe, inter alia:

4.2.1 Merger of institutions under the same management

The managing trust/society must submit to NCTE the approval of such merger by: (i) the management committee (ii) affiliating university and (iii) State Government, as applicable.

The Appeal Committee, while noting the claim of the appellant institution that it is already functioning as a multidisciplinary institution under the name D.P.M. College, offering undergraduate programmes in Arts, Commerce, and Science, and therefore fulfills the eligibility requirement for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). reiterates that under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, read with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the statutory burden of establishing strict, continuous and demonstrable compliance with the prescribed norms and standards rests entirely upon the applicant institution. Recognition or continuation thereof is conditional upon fulfilment of all mandatory statutory and regulatory requirements. Mere assertions of compliance, unsupported by authenticated, contemporaneous and verifiable documentary evidence, cannot displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the competent Regional Committee in exercise of its statutory jurisdiction under the Act and the Regulations. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order and the submissions advanced by the appellant institution, and bearing in mind the principles governing appellate scrutiny under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of factual re-examination of the claims made by the appellant institution. Such interference is confined strictly to ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory consistency and shall not be construed as dilution of the binding statutory standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), nor as an expression of opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's entitlement to recognition. 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. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle recognized by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in *Rambha College of Education v. NCTE*, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016, wherein it has been observed that documents placed during appellate scrutiny may be examined for the limited purpose of verification of compliance, subject to regulatory scrutiny by the competent authority. However, such examination must remain strictly confined 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, the Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, is of the considered opinion that the matter requires factual re-examination by the competent Regional Committee. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 14.11.2025 is set aside, and the matter is remanded to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) solely for the purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed criteria relating to Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status. Prior to such re-examination, the appellant institution shall submit duly authenticated documentary evidence in support of its claim regarding multidisciplinary status, including the documentary approvals relating to the change of name of the institution and its multidisciplinary academic structure. Thereafter, the concerned Western Regional Committee shall: (a) verify the authenticity of the change of name of the institution from the Directorate of College Education, Government of Rajasthan and Maharaja Surajmal Brij Vishwavidyalaya, Bharatpur; (b) examine the claim of the appellant institution regarding Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status strictly with reference to the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended) and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025; (c) verify the authenticity and validity of the documents relied upon by the appellant institution; (d) afford reasonable opportunity of hearing, if deemed necessary; and (e) thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended) and the applicable Guidelines. The Regional Committee shall ensure strict adherence to the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Regulations framed thereunder, the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025 (where applicable), and all relevant academic and regulatory standards, and shall decide the matter strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual re-examination and regulatory scrutiny and does not create any presumption, equity or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish strict compliance with the prescribed norms and standards upon re-examination shall entail rejection in accordance with law. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of the official record, shall ensure authenticity,

completeness and proper verification of the records before passing any consequential order and shall ensure time-bound disposal of the matter. The appellant institution shall forward, within fifteen (15) days from the receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal to the concerned Regional Committee for examination and further action in accordance with law.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided to set aside the impugned order dt. 14.11.2025 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim of Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, in accordance with the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution shall forward the relevant documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed 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, D. P. M. College, Khasra No. Old No. 1977, New-2491, Old No. 1979, New-3241/2493, Halena Board, Weir Bharatpur, Rajasthan - 321642.
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 Education, Govt. of West Bengal, Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake City, (5th, 6th, 8th, 10th Floor) Kolkata, West Bengal-700 091.



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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-40/E-396852/2026 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202515440/E- 89493

Samadhan College, Khata No. 231, 232, 299/2, 618/1, 628, 629, Samriddhi Vihar Phase -2, Village - Fari, Bijabhat, Bemetara, Chhattisgarh - 491335	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Samadhan College, Khata No. 231, 232, 299/2, 618/1, 628, 629, Samriddhi Vihar Phase -2, Village - Fari, Bijabhat, Bemetara, Chhattisgarh - 491335** dated 21.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / WRC / 2526202404252368 / CHATTISGARH / 2024 / REJ / 728** dated 26.09.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "As per Appeal Report: - 1. The institution has uploaded BCC in respect of certified land documents. The institution has not uploaded certified registered land documents clearly mentioning all the Khasra Nos. 231, 232, 299/2, 618/1, 628, 629 showing that the building is situated on a single plot. 2. The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. with intake of 60, B.Sc. with intake of 60, BCA with intake of 30, B.Com. with intake of 50, BBA with intake of 30, PGDCA with intake of 50, DCA with intake of 40, PG Diploma in Yoga Education with intake of 40 combined intake of 360. The sufficiency of land and built-up area for intake of 360 multidisciplinary courses, 13 units for proposed ITEP and 100 intake for B.Ed. course cannot be ascertained. 3. The institution has not uploaded Building Plan approved by the Competent Authority of State Government mentioning the name of institution, Khasra/Plot/Survey No. and mentioning the total land area and total built-up area earmarked for each course being run in the premises and the demarcated land and built-up area for the teacher education programmes including multi-disciplinary programmes. 4. All Khasra Nos. which are mentioned in the online application are not indicated in the uploaded NEC. 5. All Khasra Nos. which are mentioned in the online application are not indicated in the uploaded CLU. 6. All Khasra Nos. which are mentioned in the online application are not indicated in the uploaded BCC. Further, total land area earmarked for teacher education programme is not mentioned in the uploaded BCC. 7. The institution has uploaded bank statement indicating the transaction of the salary / remuneration to its teaching staff. However, it cannot be ascertained from the uploaded documents whether the institution is paying salary to its staff as per Central/State Government pay scales in accordance with the norms and standards of NCTE."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from Samadhan College, Khata No. 231, 232, 299/2, 618/1, 628, 629, Samriddhi Vihar Phase -2, Village - Fari, Bijabhat, Bemetara, Chhattisgarh - 491335 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 18.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. As per the order issued by the then affiliated Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur, vide order number 4762/AKA/2011 dated 09/09/2011, the institution was required to possess land located in two separate parts. Accordingly, the institution has land at two locations: Khasra Nos. 231, 232, 299/2 measuring 1.25 acres, where the college building has been constructed. The remaining 5 acres of land located in Khasra Nos. 618/1, 628, 629 is situated approximately 4 km away from the main campus. Thus, the institution has a total of 6.25 acres of land in two parts. All the documents related to the constructed building on Khasra Nos. 231, 232, 299/2—such as Building Permission Certificate, Land Use Certificate (CLU), Mutation Certificate, Building Completion Certificate (BCC), Building Safety Certificate, Non-Encumbrance Certificate, and other required documents—are available and have been uploaded on the Council’s website as and when required. For the remaining land in Khasra Nos. 618/1, 628, 629, the Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) is available. The application is fit to be approved and accepted. 2. Apart from the B.Ed. programme, the institution also has affiliation for other undergraduate programmes. However: • Some of these programmes are only at the affiliation level, and admissions are not being made in them. • Some programmes have only nominal admissions. • The institution has already applied for closure of the BBA course. A clarification affidavit was earlier uploaded by the institution stating that: • For the first year of the four-year ITEP programme, the required building and rooms are available as per norms. • For the second, third, and fourth years, the required construction work is in progress and will be completed within the stipulated time. For the current session, the institution is submitting an application for only 4 units, as follows: • B.A. B.Ed. – 2 units • B.Sc. B.Ed. – 2 units Earlier, the application was submitted for 13 units, which has now been revised by reducing 9 units. Therefore, considering all the above facts, the revised application is fit to be approved and accepted. 3. The institution possesses a building plan approved by the competent authority (State Government Department), clearly indicating the institutions name, Khasra number, total land area, and the built-up area reserved for each course. Therefore, this point should be accepted. 4. The Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC)

issued by the competent authority includes Khasra Nos. 231, 232, 299/2 and 618/1, 628, 629. There is no mortgage, encumbrance, or dispute on the said both land. Therefore, this point is valid and may be accepted. 5. The CLU certificate submitted by the institution includes only those Khasra numbers 231, 232, 299/2—where the college building is currently constructed. The remaining land in Khasra Nos. 618/1, 628, 629 has been kept reserved for future expansion of the institution. Therefore, CLU is not applicable for these Khasra numbers. In view of these facts, this point may also be accepted. 6. The Building Completion Certificate includes the location of the institution where the constructed building exists, i.e., Khasra Nos. 231, 232, 299/2. The BCC has been uploaded. Since no building is constructed on Khasra Nos. 618/1, 628, 629, their absence in the BCC is natural and justified. This land has been reserved for future expansion. The certificate has been issued in the prescribed standard format of the Government of Chhattisgarh. Hence, it is appropriate that this point be approved and accepted. 7. The bank statements of all Assistant Professors appointed under Section-28 have been uploaded. These statements clearly show the prescribed salary being paid to them as per norms. Additionally, the institution is paying PF and ESIC contributions, which is correct and transparent. Therefore, these documents may be approved and accepted.

The Appeal Committee also noted the written submissions of the appellant institution vide letter dated 13.02.2026, along with a notarized affidavit, wherein the institution furnished its response along with supporting documents. The appellant institution submitted that it had been granted recognition by the Western Regional Committee (WRC), NCTE vide Recognition Order dated 11.07.2012 and Revised Recognition Order dated 31.05.2015, and that the institution has complied with the applicable provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014. With regard to land availability, the appellant submitted that the institution possesses land in two parts. It was stated that Khasra Nos. 231, 232 and 299/2 measuring approximately 1.25 acres constitute the land parcel on which the institutional building has been constructed and where academic activities are conducted. In addition, Khasra Nos. 618/1, 628 and 629 measuring approximately four acres are also available with the institution at a short distance from the main campus. The appellant submitted that, taken together, the total land available exceeds five acres, thereby fulfilling the applicable requirement. The appellant further submitted that apart from the B.Ed. programme, the institution is affiliated with Hemchand Yadav

Vishwavidyalaya, Durg (Chhattisgarh) and conducts undergraduate programmes. It was stated that certain courses presently have limited enrolment or are affiliated courses. The appellant clarified in the affidavit that for the proposed ITEP programme the institution initially intends to run only two units, namely one unit of B.A. B.Ed. and one unit of B.Sc. B.Ed., for which the required infrastructure and facilities are available in the first phase. The appellant further submitted that the building plan duly approved by the competent authority has been uploaded, indicating the institution's name, plot numbers, total land area and built-up area. It was also submitted that Non-Encumbrance Certificates (NEC) in respect of Khasra Nos. 231, 232, 299/2, 618/1, 628 and 629 have been uploaded. The appellant stated that the land use certificate (CLU) for the land parcels 231, 232 and 299/2, where the building is constructed, has been obtained and uploaded with the online application. It was further stated that the Building Completion Certificate (BCC) has also been uploaded in the format prescribed by NCTE and reflects the location of the institutional building on the said land parcels. With regard to faculty and salary payment, the appellant submitted that the assistant professors appointed in the institution are paid salaries through bank transfers in accordance with UGC norms and the applicable regulations of the Government of Chhattisgarh. In support of this submission, the appellant stated that bank statements evidencing salary payment have been uploaded. It was also submitted that PF and ESIC contributions are being made in respect of employees. The appellant institution further placed on record the details relating to the shortlisting criteria applicable for ITEP processing, and submitted that the institution satisfies the minimum prescribed requirements. It was stated that the institution has been accredited by NAAC with 'A' Grade, for which six (6) points are admissible under the shortlisting criteria. The appellant further submitted that NIRF ranking is not available, and therefore zero (0) points have been indicated under the said criterion. It was also submitted that the institution has been functioning as a multidisciplinary institution since the year 2012, being affiliated to Hemchand Yadav Vishwavidyalaya, Durg, and has completed approximately thirteen years of operation, thereby qualifying for two (2) points under the relevant criterion. Further, the appellant submitted that the institution has been running an NCTE-recognized teacher education programme since the year 2012, and therefore qualifies for two (2) points under the criterion relating to institutions running NCTE-recognized courses. Accordingly, the appellant submitted that the institution secures a total of ten (10) points under the prescribed shortlisting

framework, summarized as follows: NAAC Accreditation ('A' Grade) – 6 points, NIRF Ranking – 0 points, Duration of operation as a multidisciplinary institution – 2 points, Institution running NCTE-recognized programme – 2 points, Total – 10 points. The appellant submitted that, in view of the above, the institution satisfies the minimum threshold of ten points required for shortlisting and processing of its ITEP application. The appellant further affirmed through the notarized affidavit that the statements made therein are true and correct to the best of the deponent's knowledge and belief, and requested the Appeal Committee to consider the documents and submissions placed on record while deciding the appeal.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 30.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 26.09.2025.

The matter was earlier considered in the 2nd Meeting, 2026 of the Appeal Committee held on 29.01.2026, wherein the Committee, in the interest of fair adjudication, granted the appellant institution a further opportunity to submit relevant documents in support of its claim.

The Appeal Committee considered the matter in the present meeting and examined the Appeal Report, records on file, documents submitted by the appellant institution, and the submissions made during the online hearing. The Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it claimed that it has complied with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The appellant institution further claimed that it possesses land as per prescribed requirement. It was also submitted that the relevant documents relating to land and

infrastructure, including building plan, Building Completion Certificate (BCC), Land Use Certificate (CLU), Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC), and safety certificates, have been uploaded. The institution further claimed that it is affiliated with Hemchand Yadav Vishwavidyalaya, Durg (Chhattisgarh), and conducts undergraduate programmes in addition to the B.Ed. programme. It was submitted that, for the proposed ITEP programme, the institution intends to run initially one unit each of B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed., for which the required infrastructure is stated to be available in the first phase. The appellant institution also claimed that faculty members are being paid salaries through bank transfers in accordance with applicable norms, and that supporting bank statements along with PF and ESIC contributions have been uploaded. The institution further submitted that it satisfies the shortlisting criteria for processing of ITEP applications, claiming ten (10) points based on NAAC 'A' Grade accreditation, duration of functioning as a multidisciplinary institution, and operation of an NCTE-recognized programme. The appellant accordingly requested that the documents and submissions placed on record 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 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 careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, 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, Samadhan College, Khata No. 231, 232, 299/2, 618/1, 628, 629, Samriddhi Vihar Phase -2, Village - Fari, Bijabhat, Bemetara, Chhattisgarh - 491335.**
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 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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-46/E-397102/2026 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202615519 / E-89493

Late B. S. Arts, Prof. N. G. Science and A. G. Commerce College, Sakharkherda, Survey No. 254, 257, Lawhala Road, Sakharkherda, Sindkhed Raja, Buldhana, Maharashtra - 443202	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Late B. S. Arts, Prof. N. G. Science and A. G. Commerce College, Sakharkherda, Survey No. 254, 257, Lawhala Road, Sakharkherda, Sindkhed Raja, Buldhana, Maharashtra - 443202** dated 20.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202505225140/MAHARASTHRA/2025/REJC/2058** dated 05.12.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "(i) The institution mentioned its Geographic Location Latitude:20.2218421 Longitude: 76.3964545 checked and found name of the institution is "Gawande College of Pharmacy" and application for ITEP submitted in the name of "Late .B. S. Arts Prof N G SCIENCE AND A.G.COMMERCE SAKHARKHERDA", both are different. (ii) The institution has not uploaded the valid Fire Safety Certificate issued by competent Government Authority (iii) The institution has not uploaded the total building plan of 10131.72 sq. mt. (which was mentioned in the B.C.C.) approved by the Competent Authority of State Government indicating the Khasra/Plot/Survey Number and mentioning the total land area and total built-up area earmarked for each course being run in the premises and the demarcated land area and built-up area for the teacher education programme. (iv) In the land details, land area mentioned in the affidavit (in sq. mt.) is 20355.67 and built up area is 4586.084. After SCN, Institution uploaded the New BCC and institute claimed that late B.S. Arts Prof. N.G. Science & A.G. commerce college Sakharkherda Dist. Buldana have 32500 sqm Land with 10131.72 built up area. This discrimination Committee can't be ascertained. (v) In the BCC mentioned, total land and built up area mismatched with other documents submitted by Institution and from mutation and other certificate. This discrimination Committee can't be ascertained. (vi) The institution has filled information in the portal of multipurpose hall size 213 sq.m and library-cum-reading room size is 343.74 sq. m. but it is not mentioned in the building plan uploaded by the institute, so the same could not be verified from the uploaded building plan. (vii) The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. (220x3) =660, B.Com. (120x3) 360, B.Sc. (250x3)750, B.Voc.150x3=450 M.A. 180x2=360 M.Sc.160x2=320. Institution is running other courses i.e. YCMOU courses 1) Preparatory 2) B.A , M.A. English, M.A. Marathi M.Sc. -Chemistry (V-132) M.Sc. Mathematics (V-130) with following Ph.D.

Research Centres – Library and information science, Home Economics, History, Commerce, Zoology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Pali and Prakrit and Sociology, sufficiency of land and built-up area for the above courses with combined intake of multidisciplinary courses and B.Sc./B.Ed. (Secondary-2 Units) and B.A./B.Ed. (Secondary-1Unit) course cannot be ascertained. It cannot be ascertained that the built-up area of the institute is sufficient as per NCTE norms.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative of Late B. S. Arts, Prof. N. G. Science and A. G. Commerce College, Sakharkherda, Survey No. 254, 257, Lawhala Road, Sakharkherda, Sindkhed Raja, Buldhana, Maharashtra - 443202 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 discrepancy noted in query 1 stems from a cartographical overlap, not any misrepresentation. The applicant institution, Late.B. S. Arts Prof. N. G. Science and A. G. Commerce College, Sakharkherda, is a distinct legal entity with its own governing body, recognition, and physical premises. Its verified and exclusive location is at latitude 20.222306, longitude 76.396194. The coordinates cited in the query (20.2218421, 76.3964545) are factually and legally attributable to a separate, adjacent institution Gawande College of Pharmacy. Under established legal principles, two institutions can share geographic proximity without sharing identity, affiliation, or premises. Digital mapping inaccuracies do not negate the separate legal existence of each entity. The college applicant has provided conclusive evidence of its correct geo-location, fulfilling its burden of proof. There is no legal basis to conflate the two institutions. The council is respectfully urged to recognize the applicants verified coordinates and distinct institutional identity, amending its records accordingly to reflect this factual and legal separation. Request to council to do the needful at earliest for the same for approval of Integrated Teachers Education Program (ITEP). 2. The query regarding the absence of a valid fire safety certificate is factually addressed. The institution has submitted a fire safety certificate issued by the Chief Officer, Municipal Council, Urban Development Department, Government of Maharashtra, which is a competent statutory authority under the Government of Maharashtra Fire Prevention and Life Safety Measures Act and relevant Municipal Laws. Furthermore, in support of ongoing compliance, the institution has also submitted a valid Fire Safety Audit Report conducted by an

agency expressly approved and authorized by the Directorate of Maharashtra fire services, Urban Development Department, Government of Maharashtra. This audit fulfills the procedural mandate for periodic safety verification. Therefore, the documents presented constitute valid, legally recognized fire safety certification. The combined submission of the statutory certificate and the authorized audit report demonstrates full compliance with regulatory requirements. The council's records should be updated to reflect this compliance, and the query is respectfully resolved on these substantive legal grounds. Request to council to do the needful at earliest for the same for approval of Integrated Teachers Education Program (ITEP). 3. Based on the provided file, the legal justification for the institutions response lies in its substantive compliance with regulatory directives. The national council for teacher education (NCTE) is the competent authority for setting norms and standards for teacher education programs. While the initial query noted the absence of a specific building plan, the institution's justification demonstrates that it has acted in accordance with NCTE's directions. The submission of the building completion certificate (BCC) from the Municipal Council, Chikhali serves as a legally valid document issued by a competent local government authority. This certificate formally attests to the total land area (8.05 acres/32500 sq.m) and the total approved built-up area (10131.72 sq. m). Furthermore, the detailed breakdown of the built-up area earmarks specific spaces for various institutional functions, implicitly covering all courses including the teacher education programme. By providing the BCC and the detailed area statement as directed by NCTE, the institution has furnished authoritative proof of land ownership, approved construction, and spatial allocation, thereby fulfilling the substantive legal requirement behind the query. The response shifts the evidentiary basis from a mere plan to a certified document of completion, which holds greater legal weight. Request to council to do the needful at earliest for the same for approval of Integrated Teachers Education Program (ITEP). 4. The legal justification for the discrepancy in land details lies in the principle of progressive disclosure and compliance with specific regulatory queries. Initially, the institution submitted details (20,355.67 sq.m land 4,586.084 sq.m built-up) strictly as per the specific guidelines for the Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP). This constituted a complete and truthful disclosure for that specific purpose. Above mentioned land area and built up area are much more than that of area required as per the guidelines of NCTE for ITEP. Subsequently, the Show Cause Notice (SCN)

from NCTE explicitly required details of the total land and built-up area for all existing courses, including the ITEP, across the entire premises. This was a new and distinct legal query, mandating a broader disclosure. In response, the institution furnished the Building Completion Certificate (BCC) from the Municipal Council, Chikhali a legally superior document from the competent local authority-certifying the total institutional land as 8.05 acres (32,500 sq.m) and total built-up area as 10,131.72 sq.m. Therefore, there is no "discrimination" or misrepresentation. The institution has lawfully provided different data sets in response to two different legal mandates. First, for a specific program application, and second, for the institutions total footprint as required by the SCN. The later, more comprehensive figures from the bcc legally supersede the initial, limited-scope submission. Request to council to do the needful at earliest for the same for approval of Integrated Teachers Education Program (ITEP). 5. The legal justification for the apparent discrepancy lies in the hierarchy of evidentiary documents and the principle of progressive compliance. The Building Completion Certificate (BCC) issued by the Municipal Council is the Supreme Legal Document certifying the final, approved, and constructed reality of the institutions premises. As a document from the competent local planning authority, it overrides preliminary submissions or certificates detailing partial holdings. The initial figures in other documents may have represented a specific parcel or a phase of development. The BCC, however, consolidates the institutions total lawful and contiguous landholding (8.05 acres/32,500 sq.m) and its total approved built-up area (10,131.72 sq.m) as per the final sanctioned plan. This comprehensive certification is what NCTE requires for evaluating infrastructure adequacy. Therefore, there is no "discrimination" but a lawful submission of the most authoritative and current document in response to regulatory scrutiny. The institution has consistently provided documents that were accurate at the time of their issuance, with the bcc now serving as the definitive proof that all norms for land, built-up area, ownership, and approved plans are fully and legally met. Request to council to do the needful at earliest for the same for approval of Integrated Teachers Education Program (ITEP). 6. The legal justification lies in the principle of functional aggregation and architectural planning flexibility. The portal entries for specific rooms (multipurpose hall: 213 Sq.m, library-cum-reading room: 343.74 sq.m) represent functional designations for regulatory reporting, not separate, isolated structures. The submitted, legally approved building plan is the authoritative document that physically demarcates the space. It shows a

central library of 623.21 Sq.m, which is a composite area housing all library functions, inherently including the reading room space. The plan also clearly earmarks a multipurpose hall of 198.4 sq. m within the same building complex. Therefore, the portal information and the building plan are not contradictory but complementary: the plan provides the physical layout and total sanctioned area, while the portal details the intended use of subspaces within that total. The institution has lawfully demonstrated that the required functional areas exist within the larger, approved built-up footprint. The discrepancy is one of descriptive granularity versus architectural documentation, and the approved plan takes precedence as the legal proof of infrastructure. Request to council to do the needful at earliest for the same for approval of Integrated Teachers Education Program (ITEP). 7. The legal justification is based on the principle of infrastructure sufficiency as per approved capacity, not fluctuating enrolment. The institution holds a valid building completion certificate for 8.05 acres of land and 10,131.72 Sq. m of built-up area, which is the legally sanctioned capacity. Out of that as per NCTE guidelines for ITEP, required only 4400 Sq. m. built up area and 8000 Sq. m land area which is very lesser than the available built-up area and land area. NCTE norms prescribe minimum area requirements per sanctioned seat. The institutions justification demonstrates that: 1. Actual enrolment is significantly below sanctioned intake across its multidisciplinary courses, creating a substantial surplus of available space. 2. Certain programs (B.Com., M.A., and M.Sc.) have zero current enrolment and are slated for discontinuation, further freeing up infrastructure. 3. The proposed Integrated Teachers Education Programs will be accommodated within this existing surplus, without exceeding the total approved built-up area. Therefore, the query's concern about insufficiency is legally addressed. The institution is not required to possess infrastructure for hypothetical maximum simultaneous enrolment of all sanctioned courses, but to have adequate, legally approved infrastructure for its operational and proposed intake. The approved bcc certifies this, and the enrolment data confirms the available capacity. The institution complies with NCTE norms by meeting the per-student area requirement for its actual and planned student body within the sanctioned campus. Request to council to do the needful at earliest for the same for approval of Integrated Teachers Education Program (ITEP)."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 26.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 05.12.2025.

The matter was earlier considered in the 2nd Meeting, 2026 of the Appeal Committee held on 29.01.2026, wherein the Committee, in the interest of fair adjudication, granted the appellant institution a further opportunity to submit relevant documents in support of its claim.

The Appeal Committee after consideration of the matter in the present meeting. The Appeal Committee examined the Appeal Report, relevant records, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution. The appellant institution, in its written submissions, contended that the geo-location discrepancy noted in the query arose due to mapping overlap with a neighboring institution and asserted that it is a distinct legal entity with separate premises, furnishing its verified coordinates in support of its claim. The institution further submitted that a valid Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Municipal Council, along with a Fire Safety Audit Report conducted by an agency authorized by the Directorate of Maharashtra Fire Services, has been placed on record to demonstrate compliance with statutory safety requirements. With regard to infrastructure, the appellant institution submitted that the Building Completion Certificate issued by the Municipal Council, Chikhali, certifies the total land area as 8.05 acres (32,500 sq. meters) and the total approved built-up area as 10,131.72 sq. meters, and contended that this document constitutes authoritative proof of land ownership, approved construction, and availability of infrastructure for the proposed ITEP programme. The institution also stated that the variation in land and built-up area

figures arose due to different disclosures made in response to separate regulatory queries, and asserted that the Building Completion Certificate reflects the final and consolidated landholding and built-up area of the institution. The appellant further contended that the functional areas such as the library, reading room, and multipurpose hall are duly provided within the approved building plan and that the infrastructure available is adequate for the proposed ITEP programme in accordance with NCTE norms. The institution also submitted that the available land and built-up area exceed the minimum requirements prescribed for the ITEP programme and therefore requested that its application be considered for approval.

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 WRC at the time of passing the impugned order dated 05.12.2025 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 05.12.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee. The Western 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 careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided to set aside the impugned order dated 05.12.2025 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme with the directions specified hereinabove. The WRC 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 WRC 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, Late B. S. Arts, Prof. N. G. Science and A. G. Commerce College, Sakharkherda, Survey No. 254, 257, Lawhala Road, Sakharkherda, Sindkhed Raja, Buldhana, Maharashtra - 443202.
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 Education, Directorate of Higher Education, Elphiston Technical School premises, 3, Mahapalika Marg, Dhobi Talao, Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus Area, Fort, Mumbai, Maharashtra 400001.



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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-69/E-398723/2026 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202615538 /E-89493

Leela Devi Parasmal Sancheti Kanya Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 573, Khimel, Vidyawadi, Rani Station Road, Bali, Pali, Rajasthan - 306115	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Prof. Punita Soni, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Leela Devi Parasmal Sancheti Kanya Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 573, Khimel, Vidyawadi, Rani Station Road, Bali, Pali, Rajasthan - 306115** dated 12.02.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2526202404232224/RAJASTHAN/2024/REJC/642** dated 06.02.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution has uploaded Consolidated staff profile and said that "the institution has uploaded Consolidated staff profile (Teaching Staff Including HoD) filled by every faculty member for Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) countersigned by the Society and Registrar (Affiliating Body) as per NCTE norms." It is also found from the staff profile uploaded by the institution, only 5 faculty members are appointed and 2 part time teaching staff are appointed as on date. So, as per the staff profile the required teaching staff is not appointed as per NCTE norms."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Prof. Punita Soni, Principal of Leela Devi Parasmal Sancheti Kanya Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 573, Khimel, Vidyawadi, Rani Station Road, Bali, Pali, Rajasthan - 306115 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 19.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "We have carefully reviewed the grounds mentioned in the refusal order and wish to submit that the deficiency pointed out – "required teaching staff is not appointed as per NCTE norms", has now been rectified. Faculty appointments have now been completed strictly in accordance with NCTE norms. All relevant documents are enclosed for your kind perusal"

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 18.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 06.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee after reconsideration of the matter in the present meeting. The Appeal Committee examined the Appeal Report, relevant records, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution. The Committee noted the submission of the appellant institution that the deficiency relating to non-appointment of required teaching staff as per NCTE norms has now been rectified and that faculty appointments have been made in accordance with the prescribed NCTE norms, with supporting documents submitted for consideration. The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted a notarized affidavit stating that the required teaching and supporting staff have been appointed and are serving exclusively in the institution in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. The institution further claimed that salaries are being paid as per the prescribed UGC/University/affiliating body pay scales through bank transfer, that statutory obligations relating to employee welfare are being complied with, and that the details of the staff have been displayed on the institution's website. The deponent affirmed that the information furnished in the affidavit is true and correct and submitted the same in compliance with the Letter of Intent issued by the Regional Committee, undertaking that any incorrect information would render the management liable for action under the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

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 WRC at the time of passing the impugned order dated 06.02.2026 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 06.02.2026 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee. The Western 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 the present remand is confined strictly to factual and regulatory re-examination and shall not be construed as creating any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. The appellant institution shall be required to establish full and demonstrable compliance with the provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the Rules framed thereunder, and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). Failure to establish such compliance upon reconsideration shall entail appropriate action in accordance with the statutory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. It is further directed that the concerned Regional Committee, while reconsidering the matter, shall ensure strict adherence to the provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021, which stipulate that the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is to be implemented in a phased manner, commencing with pilot implementation in eligible Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) / Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) and thereafter expanding progressively in alignment with the implementation framework envisaged under the National Education Policy (NEP), 2020. The appellant institution shall forward to the concerned Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal for the purpose of regulatory scrutiny. Upon receipt of the same, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter and proceed strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, and the directions contained herein, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided to set aside the impugned order dated 06.02.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme with the directions specified hereinabove. The WRC 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 WRC 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, Leela Devi Parasmal Sancheti Kanya Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 573, Khimel, Vidyawadi, Rani Station Road, Bali, Pali, Rajasthan - 306115.**
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.**



एनसीटीई अपीलीय 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 - 18.03.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-85/E-399030/2026 Appeal/3rd Meeting, 2026
APPLERC202615512 | E- 89493

Prabhat Jyotirmoyee Educational Research Institute, Plot No. 530, 533, 534, 539, 541, Vill-Abdarpur, P.O. Suri (Barabagan), Asansole Road, Suri - I, Birbhum, West Bengal - 731103	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	--
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	18.02.2026
Date of Pronouncement	18.03.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Prabhat Jyotirmoyee Educational Research Institute, Plot No. 530, 533, 534, 539, 541, Vill-Abdarpur, P.O. Suri (Barabagan), Asansole Road, Suri - I, Birbhum, West Bengal - 731103** dated 14.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202509223054/WEST BENGAL/2025/REJC/1646** dated 15.11.2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP. Course on the grounds that "1. The address of the institution is not matching with recognition order issued by the NCTE for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programme. 2. The institution did not submit a copy of Not-for-Profit Certificate from the competent authority. 3. The institution did not submit authorization letter on the stamp paper with admissible government rate. 4. The institution has not submitted details of student admitted. 5. The institution does not run any course in the field of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce or mathematics, therefore as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 amended from time to time the application of the institution does not fall in the category of multi-disciplinary institution. Moreover, in the application form also, the institution has stated that it is NOT a Multi-Disciplinary institution. Hence, the application of the institution cannot be considered for transition into ITEP as per amended Regulations 2014 Gazette on 26th October 2021. 6. The institution has submitted mutation certificate which is very old one. A copy of Latest of mutation certificate is required. 7. The institution is running two units of B.Ed. programme. The institution submitted the application for transition for two units of ITEP programme. The institution has only 4078.73 sq.mtrs land with is less as per NCTE regulation for running two unit of B.Ed programme two units of ITEP programme as per para 6.1 (b) notified dated 26.10.2021. 8. The institution has submitted to NEC which is very old one. 9. The institution has submitted Building plan but it is not readable. 10. The institution has submitted BCC but not mentioned earmarked area of proposed course and existing course. 11. The institution has not submitted fire safety Certificate and Building safety certificate issued from Govt. Authority. 12. The institution has not submitted certificate stating that the institution's campus,"

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

-- of **Prabhat Jyotirmoyee Educational Research Institute, Plot No. 530, 533, 534, 539, 541, Vill-Abdarpur, P.O. Suri (Barabagan), Asansole Road, Suri - I, Birbhum, West Bengal - 731103** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 19.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The address mentioned in application form at the time of submission of online is the same address mentioned in recognition order issued by NCTE (copy of application form in and recognition order). 2. The trust namely Prabhat Jyotirmoyee Education Foundation is established on not-for-profit basis. (Attached the Affidavit for NON-PROFIT Organization). 3. Submitting the authorization letter by the Secretary on 100/- stamp paper. 4. Submitting the List of students from 2019-2025 year wise. 5. That in the earlier online application, due to some software problem, It was written as No though we wrote yes on the time of filling up the portal form. Even the uploaded copy of the certificate from the Registrar of the University of Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University dealing with the Multidisciplinary Institution, is not shown. In five (5) times of hearing we were asked the question whether we were the Multidisciplinary Institution or not therefore it is quiet unnatural for us to write No in the application form. However other than Teacher Education programme B.A. & B.Sc. stream wise is offering by the Institution Affiliation letter session 24-25, from B.S.A.E. University is enclosed. In response to the NCTE letter no Appl011/7th Mtg./2025-Appeal Section-HQ dated 10/07/2025 Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University doing the full verification and the Registrar of this University has given us the certificate again that our college is already a Multidisciplinary Institution. (Certificate enclosed). 6. Latest Mutation certificate from B.L & L.R.O. is submitted. 7. 3000 sq mt. land area for B.Ed. Course and 3000 sq mt. land area for B.A.- B.Ed./B.Sc. -. per 2021 norms. We have total land Area is 8323.61 sq mt. copy of Building plan B.C.C, N.E and Registered Sale Deed regarding area is enclosed. We are submitting the new registered deed deals with another 4244.88 sq mt. land area which resulting our total land area is (40 sq mt. + 4244.88 sq mt.) 8323.61 sq mt. 8. Latest NEC is submitted. 9. Readable copy of Building plan is submitted. 10. Clearly maintaining the area of the existing course of B.Ed. and the exiting course of four-year integrated course of (B.A./B.SC-B.Ed.) in B.C.C. Certificate enclosed herewith. 11. Fire Safety Certificate from fire officer is enclosed.

Building Safety certificate from Govt. Engineer is enclosed. 12. The barrier free certificate from the Govt. Assistant Engineer is enclosed.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 held online on 18th & 19th February, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

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 05.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 15.11.2025.

The Appeal Committee considered the matter in the present meeting and examined the Appeal Report, records on file, documents submitted by the appellant institution, and the submissions made during the online hearing. The Committee noted the claim of the appellant institution that the address mentioned in the online application is the same as that reflected in the recognition order issued by NCTE. The institution further submitted that it is run by a not-for-profit trust, and furnished an authorization letter, student enrolment details (2019–2025), and relevant statutory documents. The appellant institution contended that the entry showing “No” against Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status in the online application occurred due to a software error, and asserted that it is a multidisciplinary institution offering B.A. and B.Sc. programmes, duly affiliated to Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University, which has also issued a certificate affirming its MDI status. The institution further claimed that it possesses adequate land and infrastructure, submitting documents relating to land ownership, mutation, building plan, Building Completion Certificate, Non-Encumbrance Certificate, fire and building safety certificates, and barrier-free access, and stated that the built-up area and land earmarked for the existing B.Ed. and integrated B.A./B.Sc.-B.Ed. programmes comply with the applicable norms.

The Appeal Committee considered the above submissions in light of the statutory framework governing recognition of teacher education institutions under the

National Council for Teacher Education 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 on examination of the entire material available on record, finds that the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the said Regulations. 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) **Failure to establish Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status.** The appellant institution submitted an affidavit claiming that it offers honours/general/pedagogy subjects in the fields of science, arts, and humanities. However, the institution has failed to place on record any verifiable documentary evidence substantiating such claim, including details of undergraduate programmes, subjects offered, duration of operation, and copies of affiliation orders issued by the competent affiliating authority demonstrating the continuity and stability of such multidisciplinary programmes. In the absence of such material evidence, the appellant institution has not established that it conducts undergraduate programmes in the fields of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, commerce, or mathematics. Accordingly, the institution does not satisfy the definition and eligibility requirements of a Multidisciplinary Institution under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and therefore its application cannot be considered under the category of a Multidisciplinary Institution.

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 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 15.11.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, 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 15.11.2025 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, Prabhat Jyotirmoyee Educational Research Institute, Plot No. 530, 533, 534, 539, 541, Vill-Abdarpur, P.O. Suri (Barabagan), Asansole Road, Suri - I, Birbhum, West Bengal - 731103.**
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, Govt. of West Bengal, Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake City, (5th, 6th, 8th, 10th Floor) Kolkata, West Bengal-700 091.**