



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-101/E-401203/2026 /5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLWRC202615558/ E- 89760

M. D. College, Khasra No. 911/370, Pallu, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan – 335524	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Devendar Kumar, Secretary</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **M. D. College, Khasra No. 911/370, Pallu, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan – 335524** dated 05.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2526202402261760/RAJASTHAN /2024/REJC/1710** dated 05.02.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “1. The institution uploaded affidavit on Rs.100 stamp paper regarding appointment of faculty/staff; the members of Committee are not as per NCTE norms. 2. The institution has not recruited teaching and non-teaching staff as per NCTE norms. And the institution has not uploaded the staff profile of each faculty/staff member as per NCTE norms. 3. The uploaded copies of Affidavit on Rs.10/- stamp paper regarding staff are not in specific format of NCTE. 4. The uploaded copy of Staff profile of each faculty/staff is not as per NCTE norms. 5. The uploaded copy Screenshots of name of faculty and staff mentioned in school certificate along with their qualifications, scale of pay and photograph uploaded on the website is not as per NCTE norms. 6. The institution has not uploaded the Screenshot of names of students admitted during the current session along with qualification, percentage of marks in the qualifying examination and in the entrance test on website as per NCTE norms.”

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

**Sh. Devendar Kumar, Secretary of M. D. College, Khasra No. 911/370, Pallu, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan – 335524** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The institution uploaded affidavit on Rs.100 stamp paper regarding appointment of faculty/staff the members of Committee are as per NCTE norms at Annexuare-1. 2. The institution has now recruited teaching and non-teaching staff as per NCTE norms. Annexuare-2 The institution has now uploaded the staff profile of each faculty/staff member as per NCTE norms Annexuare-2-A. 3. The uploaded copies of Affidavit on Rs.10/- stamp paper regarding staff are in specific format of NCTE. Annexuare-3. 4. The institution has uploaded copy of Staff profile of each faculty/staff is as per NCTE norms. Annexuare-4. 5. The institution has uploaded copy Screenshots of name of faculty and staff mentioned in school certificate along with

their qualifications, scale of pay and photograph uploaded on the website is as per NCTE norms. Annextuare-5. 6. The institution has uploaded the Screenshot of names of students admitted during the current session along with qualification, percentage of marks in the qualifying examination and in the entrance test on website as per NCTE norms Annextuare-6”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 02.03.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 05.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that requisite compliances regarding faculty and staff have been carried out in accordance with NCTE norms. The appellant institution submitted that it has furnished a duly sworn affidavit on stamp paper confirming that the appointment of faculty and staff has been made as per NCTE norms. It was further submitted that the institution has recruited teaching and non-teaching staff in conformity with the prescribed requirements and has uploaded detailed staff profiles of each faculty/staff member in the prescribed format. The institution also submitted that affidavits and staff-related documents have been provided in the specific format prescribed by NCTE. Further, it has uploaded relevant details of faculty and staff, including qualifications, pay scale, and photographs, on its official website in compliance with NCTE norms. Additionally, the institution submitted that details of students admitted during the current academic session, including their qualifications and marks in qualifying and entrance examinations, have also been uploaded on the official website as per the prescribed requirements. The appellant institution, accordingly, submitted that it has complied with the relevant norms relating to faculty, staff, and disclosure requirements.

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 05.02.2026 or requires authentication and factual verification by the Western 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 05.02.2026 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 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 05.02.2026 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, M. D. College, Khasra No. 911/370, Pallu, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan – 335524.**

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

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-104/E-402555/2026 /5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202615564/E-89760

Vallabh Government College, Khasra No. 464, 465, 466 467, Paddal, Mandi, Himachal Pradesh – 175001  <b>APPELLANT</b>	<b>Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075  <b>RESPONDENT</b>
---	-----------	---

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. Harish Chauhan, Associate Professor</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Vallabh Government College, Khasra No. 464, 465, 466 467, Paddal, Mandi, Himachal Pradesh - 175001** dated 27.02.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. NRC/NCTE/HP-116/B.Ed./453rd Meeting (Vol-III) (Sl. No. 8)/2025/ (235198-207)** dated 02.02.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has not submitted the certified copy of the registered land documents in the name of institution/ society. 2. The institution has submitted the building plan approved by Executive Engineer, Mandi, Division-2, HPPWD, however, as per the building plan, the institution shares the old Arts Block of the Vallabh Government College Mandi for offering B.Ed. Course and has, therefore, submitted the building plan of the Arts Block, which is not acceptable as per NCTE Regulations 2014. 3. The institution has not submitted the demarcated site plan duly approved by Competent Authority showing the demarcated land and built-up area for all the courses being offered in the institution. 4. The institution has submitted the Fire Safety Certificate dated 04.09.2024 issued by Chief Fire Officer renewing the NOC for Fire Safety for the period 04.09.2024 to 03.09.2026 for the B.Ed. Block of Vallabh Govt College. Total land area and built-up area are not mentioned in the Fire Safety Certificate. 5. As per the BCC issued by Assistant Engineer, Subdivision No. II, HPPWD, Mandi, the total land area earmarked for the teacher training programme is 1850.61 sq. mtr and built-up area earmarked for teacher training programme is 1649.98 which is less than the required as per the norms & standards for offering 2 units of B.Ed. course. 6. In the Building Completion Certificate, the institution has submitted that being a Govt institution, the infrastructural facilities shared by the B.Ed. programme like library, Multipurpose Hall, seminar hall, laboratories, common rooms, offices etc. are present in various buildings of the campus, which is not acceptable as the B.Ed. course is managed by Higher Education Institute Society which is a private Society. 7. In response, the institution has submitted 1+16 teaching staff, out of which the appointment of two faculties namely Dr. Pooja Kapoor and Dr Rajender Chauhan are not approved by the affiliating body. Moreover, the date of approval of the University is not mentioned on the list. 8. Approval letter

from the Sardar Patel University regarding selection of the faculty is not submitted. 9. As per the report of the Enquiry Committee of the University dated 28.06.2025 attached by the complainant, the University has stated the following: - 1. Most of the candidates recommended are not working in the college present. 2. Three teachers viz. Mr Vipin Kumar and Rajat Chandel and Mr Lucky Thakur are presently not working in the College. 3. Four faculty namely Dr. Suman Bhardwaj, Dr. Sunil Sen, Dr. Mujeeb Hussain and Mrs. Anupama are the employees of State Government and are rendering services in B.Ed. College on sharing basis, which is not acceptable as per norms and standards for B.Ed. course. 4. The institution has not submitted the details of salary disbursed to the faculty along with six months Bank statement and account number of each faculty member.”

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

**Dr. Harish Chauhan, Associate Professor of Vallabh Government College, Khasra No. 464, 465, 466 467, Paddal, Mandi, Himachal Pradesh - 175001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The NOC and recognition of the B.Ed. programme has been granted to Vallabh Government College Mandi in 2005 on the condition of using/sharing the Land and Building of the college. hence, the land which in the title of the Government of Himachal Pradesh in possession of Department of Education is exclusively meant for running all the courses of the Vallabh Government College Mandi including the B.Ed. programme. The facilities of the Vallabh Government College are being used/shared for running the B.Ed. programme, being a composite institution aligning with the mandate of NEP, the affidavit counter signed by the Secretary, Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh and Director, Higher Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh has been uploaded. 2. Theory classes of B.Ed. Programme is running in the old arts block of Vallabh Government Mandi. That is why the Building Plan of this block was uploaded and the same has been uploaded again. Rest is same as in the reply of point no.1. 3. Revised demarcated site plan duly approved by Competent Authority showing the demarcated Land and Built-up area for all the courses being offered in the institution showing all Buildings and courses of Vallabh Government College Mandi has been uploaded. 4. A certificate issued by the Competent Authority containing total area and built-up area has been uploaded. 5. In this regard, we have uploaded herewith 02 numbers of

Building Completion Certificates showing total land area of 6379.43 sq. mts. and built-up area of 2812.65 sq. mts. Although this college has many other buildings which are being shared by the students of B.Ed. Programme for their extra-curricular activities.

6. Higher Education Institution Society-Vallabh Government College (HEIS-VGC), Mandi is a society of Vallabh Government College Mandi and framed under the direction of Himachal Pradesh Government to run all Self-finance courses including B.Ed. programme. The members of the society are Senior Faculty members of Vallabh Government College, Mandi appointed by the Department of Higher Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh. This society is working on the norms of Department of Higher Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh. The funds of all Self-finance courses including B.Ed. programme are under the control of Department of Higher Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh. As B.Ed. programme is running in Vallabh Government College Mandi hence all the Infrastructural Facilities such as Buildings, Library, Multi-purpose Hall, Seminar Hall, Laboratories, Common Rooms, Hostels, Offices etc. are being shared for B.Ed. programme. Supporting documents are uploaded.

7. Dr. Pooja Kapoor and Dr. Rajender Singh had applied for interviews of B.Ed. Teachers conducted by HEIS-VGC Mandi in the month of August, 2024 but due to over age their application were rejected by the Selection Committee constituted by Sardar Patel University, Mandi, H. P. both of them have given stay by the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh (CWP No.-6807 of 2025) to continue their services in B.Ed. Department of Vallabh Government College Mandi. The copy of stay orders has been uploaded.

8. Approval letter from the Sardar Patel University regarding Selection of the Faculty has been uploaded.

9. List of Teaching Faculty of B.Ed. programme presently working has been uploaded. Advertisements (dated-01-03-2026) for Vacant Faculty positions has also been uploaded for which the interviews will be conducted at the earliest.

10. Mr. Lucky Thakur is working in B.Ed. Department of VGC Mandi and his name is included in the Enclosed Staff list where as Mr. Vipin Kumar and Mr. Rajat Chandel are not working in VGC Mandi.

11. Dr. Suman Bharwdwaj, Dr. Sunil Sen, Dr. Mujeeb Hussain and Mrs. Anupama are regular Employees of Department of Higher Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh. Being a composite college their services are being utilized on part-time basis to teach the students of B.Ed. programme. This is in accordance with the clause 5.3 of NCTE Regulations 2014. The SPU Authorities has also enquired the complaint filed by Mr. Ramesh Kumar and specified that Higher Education Institute Society is an integral part

of Vallabh Government College. Therefore clause 5.3 of NCTE norms is applicable to VGC Mandi making it a composite institution where faculty members from other streams can impart education to the students of B.Ed. Further, SPU Enquiry Committee has also observed that Dr. Suman Bhardwaj fulfill. The required criterion of Teaching Experience in a Teacher Training Institution. As per NCTE norms to be appointed as HOD. The report of Enquiry Committee of SPU Mandi has also been uploaded. 12. The detail of salary disbursed to all the Faculty Members of B.Ed. programme has been uploaded.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students vide order dated 25.05.2005. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 the institution has submitted affidavit dt. 15.12.2014 for its willingness for adherence of provisions of new Regulations. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 each student (two units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 22.07.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 02.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Vallabh Government College, Mandi (Himachal Pradesh), affiliated to Sardar Patel University, Mandi, in respect of its appeal concerning recognition/compliance of the B.Ed. programme. The Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that recognition for the B.Ed. programme was granted in 2005 with the condition of utilizing the land and building of Vallabh Government College, which is owned by the Government of Himachal Pradesh and is under the Department of Education. It was submitted that the institution is functioning as a composite institution and that infrastructural facilities of the college are being

shared for running the B.Ed. programme. In support, an affidavit countersigned by the Secretary, Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh and Director, Higher Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh has been submitted. The appellant institution further submitted that the theory classes of the B.Ed. programme are being conducted in the old Arts Block of the college, and the building plan of the said block has been uploaded. It was also submitted that a revised demarcated site plan, duly approved by the competent authority, showing land and built-up area for all courses, has been furnished, along with a certificate indicating total land area and built-up area. The institution submitted that two Building Completion Certificates indicating total land area of 6379.43 sq. mtrs. and built-up area of 2812.65 sq. mtrs. have been uploaded, and that additional buildings and facilities of the college are being shared for co-curricular and academic purposes of the B.Ed. programme. It was further submitted that the Higher Education Institution Society – Vallabh Government College (HEIS-VGC), constituted under the directions of the Government of Himachal Pradesh, manages self-financing courses including the B.Ed. programme. The society comprises senior faculty members of the college and functions under the Department of Higher Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh. The institution stated that all infrastructural facilities including library, laboratories, seminar halls, hostels and other common facilities are shared for the B.Ed. programme. With regard to faculty, the appellant institution submitted that certain faculty members (Dr. Pooja Kapoor and Dr. Rajender Singh) were not selected due to age criteria; however, they have been allowed to continue pursuant to interim orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh in CWP No. 6807 of 2025, copies of which have been submitted. It was further submitted that approval letter from Sardar Patel University regarding selection of faculty has been uploaded, along with the current list of teaching faculty. The institution also submitted that advertisements dated 01.03.2026 have been issued for filling vacant faculty positions and that interviews shall be conducted shortly. It was clarified that Mr. Lucky Thakur is presently working in the B.Ed. department and is included in the staff list, whereas Mr. Vipin Kumar and Mr. Rajat Chandel are not working in the institution. The appellant institution submitted that all relevant supporting documents in respect of the above submissions have been uploaded. Dr. Suman Bharwdwaj, Dr. Sunil Sen, Dr. Mujeeb Hussain and Mrs. Anupama are regular Employees of Department of Higher Education, Government of Himachal Pradesh. Being a composite college their services are being utilized on part-time basis to teach

the students of B.Ed. programme. This is in accordance with the clause 5.3 of NCTE Regulations 2014. The SPU Authorities has also enquired the complaint filed by Mr. Ramesh Kumar and specified that Higher Education Institute Society is an integral part of Vallabh Government College. Therefore clause 5.3 of NCTE norms is applicable to VGC Mandi making it a composite institution where faculty members from other streams can impart education to the students of B.Ed. Further, SPU Enquiry Committee has also observed that Dr. Suman Bhardwaj fulfill.

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

- (i) **Faculty Deficiency and Non-Approval** -The institution has failed to establish the existence of duly qualified, full-time, and affiliating University–approved faculty as mandated. The submitted faculty list is inadequate (10 members against requirement for two units), not in the prescribed format, and unsupported by approval orders, dates, and verifiable qualification documents (including NET/Ph.D.). Engagement of Government faculty on a “sharing basis” is impermissible and contrary to Appendix–IV, which mandates exclusive full-time faculty. The absence of approved and qualified faculty constitutes a fundamental and continuing breach of statutory requirements, rendering the programme non-compliant.
- (ii) **Non-Establishment of Salary Compliance** - The institution has failed to furnish authenticated bank records evidencing salary disbursement to faculty through banking channels. In absence of verifiable proof, compliance with

mandatory service conditions remains unsubstantiated, indicating non-adherence to regulatory safeguards governing faculty employment.

- (iii) **Infrastructure Non-Compliance** - The institution has admitted that the B.Ed. programme is being conducted in a shared Arts Block, without furnishing any approved demarcated site plan or building plan evidencing exclusive earmarking of land and built-up area for the programme. This constitutes a clear violation of infrastructure norms, which require programme-specific demarcation and adequacy of facilities.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act,

1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Northern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 02.02.2026 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 NRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 02.02.2026 issued by NRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.**

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



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

**Copy to :-**

- 1. The Principal, Vallabh Government College, Khasra No. 464, 465, 466 467, Paddal, Mandi, Himachal Pradesh - 175001.**
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, Directorate of Higher Education, Shimla-171001, Himachal Pradesh.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-112/E-403230/2026 /5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202615568 / E- 89760

Ashutosh PG Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 339, 1541/339, Mandha Bhim Singh, Via-Jon ber, Teh-Kishangarh Renwa, Jaipur, Rajasthan – 303604	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. Damodar Prasad Nagar, Principal</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **Ashutosh PG Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 339, 1541/339, Mandha Bhim Singh, Via-Jon ber, Teh-Kishangarh Renwa, Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303604** dated 20.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2526202402191463/RAJASTHAN/2024/REJC/463** dated 05.02.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. In the uploaded affidavit of the institution, the representative of the University and other representatives are not reflected. 2. The staff appointed at /Sr. No. 06 and 07 do not possess B.Ed. or M.Ed., hence, not qualified. The subject of PG is not mentioned of all the staff; the institution has appointed only one lecturer for English as against requirement of two i.e. one for B.A.B.ED. and one for B.SC. B.ED. The Staff for Teaching of Educational Studies is not appointed. Staff is not as per NCTE norms. 3. The institution has not uploaded the Screenshot of name of faculty and staff in full as mentioned in school certificate along with their qualifications, scale of pay and photograph as per NCTE norms."

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

**Dr. Damodar Prasad Nagar, Principal of Ashutosh PG Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 339, 1541/339, Mandha Bhim Singh, Via-Jon ber, Teh-Kishangarh Renwa, Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303604** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The university representative and other representatives have been mentioned in the affidavit uploaded by the institution. 2. The employees appointed at serial numbers 06 and 07 in the previous list did not possess B.Ed. or M.Ed. degrees, rendering them ineligible however, the employees appointed at serial numbers 20 and 21 in the new list do hold B.Ed./M.Ed. degrees. The Post-Graduate (PG) subjects of all employees have been duly specified. The institution has completed the appointment of two lecturers for the subject of English—specifically, one for the B.A. B.Ed. program and one for the B.Sc. B.Ed. program. An employee has also been appointed to teach Educational Studies (as listed at serial numbers 3, 6, 10, and 23 in the new list), and the total number of employees aligns with the norms prescribed by the NCTE. 3. In accordance with NCTE norms, the Institute has fully uploaded screenshots of the

names of the faculty and staff—including their qualifications, pay scales, and photographs—as listed in the school certificate.”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 04.03.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 05.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that, in response to the deficiencies pointed out regarding authorization and faculty compliance, the institution has submitted that the details of the authorized University representative and other representatives have been duly furnished through an affidavit uploaded on record. The appellant further submitted that certain employees reflected in the earlier faculty list (at serial nos. 06 and 07) were ineligible due to non-possession of B.Ed./M.Ed. qualifications; however, the same have since been replaced with duly qualified faculty (at serial nos. 20 and 21) possessing requisite B.Ed./M.Ed. degrees. It has been stated that Post-Graduate subject specializations of all faculty members have been clearly indicated, and requisite appointments have been made, including two lecturers in English (for B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes respectively) and faculty for Educational Studies. The institution has asserted that the total faculty strength is now in conformity with the norms prescribed by NCTE. The appellant institution also submitted that, in compliance with regulatory requirements, details of faculty and staff, including their names, qualifications, pay scales, and photographs, have been uploaded on the institutional website, supported by relevant screenshots.

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 05.02.2026 or requires authentication and factual verification by the Western 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 05.02.2026 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 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 05.02.2026 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, Ashutosh PG Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 339, 1541/339, Mandha Bhim Singh, Via-Jon ber, Teh-Kishangarh Renwa, Jaipur, Rajasthan - 303604.**

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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-114/E-403623/2026/ Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLNRC202615573 / E-89760

Invertis University, Gata no. 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, NH-24, Bareilly, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh – 243123	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>The Representative</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of Invertis University, Gata no. 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, NH-24, Bareilly, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh - 243123 dated 18.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the refusal order No. F. No. NCTE/NRC/2627202505164638/UTTAR PRADESH/2025/REJC1917 dated 24.01.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that " As per online application, the institution has failed up the Gata No.(s). as 5 & 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 & 13, 31/1(old), 22, 24, 25, 26 (new), whereas the non-encumbrance certificate was uploaded for Gata No. 27 only. The institution has not submitted the Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Competent Government Authority. The connectivity of first and second floor is not friendly for persons abled differently due to unavailability of ramp and lift. The reply of the institutions in this regard is at all not satisfactory. The institution does not have adequate faculty rooms and departmental library, as per Norms & Standards of ITEP. The reply of the institution in this regard is also not satisfactory."

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

The Representative of Invertis University, Gata no. 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, NH-24, Bareilly, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh - 243123 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, it is submitted that "1. The institution confirms that the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by the Competent Revenue Authority is duly available with us. The said certificate clearly establishes that the land in possession of the institution is free from all encumbrances, claims, liabilities, or legal disputes. A copy of the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate is hereby enclosed again for your kind perusal and verification. We sincerely request the Hon'ble Council to kindly consider this submission and take a favourable view in the matter. 2. We wish to inform you that the institution does possess a Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent government authority. Earlier at the time of VT, the institution did possess fire safety certificate which was issued by Gram Pradhan. The institution maintains full compliance with all safety norms and gives utmost priority to the safety and well-being of students, staff, and infrastructure. We are now enclosing herewith a copy of the Fire Safety Certificate issued by competent government authority ( ) for

your kind perusal and verification. We request the authority to kindly consider this submission.

3. The built-up area reflected in the approved building plan/architectural drawing represents the total constructed area of the institution, which includes facilities earmarked for all teacher education programmes being conducted, including the B.El.Ed. programme. However, the built-up area mentioned at Sl. No. 17 of page 2 of the Building Completion Certificate pertains specifically and exclusively to the B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. Integrated programmes, and does not include the area allocated for the B.El.Ed. programme. Therefore, the apparent mismatch arises due to the difference in scope:

1. Architectural drawing: Total built-up area (including B.El.Ed.)

2. Sl. No. 17 entry: Built-up area limited to B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. Integrated programmes only.

We assure you that there is no discrepancy in actual construction, and the variation is purely due to the categorization of area based on programme-wise allocation. We request you to kindly consider this clarification and take a favourable view in the matter.

4. We wish to inform that the institution has already made provisions to support accessibility for differently-abled persons. A ramp facility is available connecting the First and Second Floor, ensuring ease of movement and accessibility at these levels. We request the authority to kindly take this clarification on record while reviewing our appeal.

5. We would like to affirm that the institution fully complies with the prescribed Norms & Standards of ITEP in regard to faculty rooms and departmental library facilities.

1. Faculty Rooms: The institution has adequate number of faculty rooms, properly constructed and allocated to teaching staff. These rooms are well-furnished with necessary infrastructure such as seating arrangements, storage facilities, ventilation, lighting, and ICT support, ensuring a conducive academic and professional environment for faculty members.

2. Departmental Library: The institution also maintains a well-established departmental library dedicated to teacher education programs. The library is equipped with:

a. Sufficient number of relevant books, reference materials, and journals as per NCTE norms

b. Access to educational resources and digital materials

c. Proper seating and reading facilities for students and faculty.

The departmental library is regularly updated and is fully functional to support teaching-learning and research activities. In view of the above, we respectfully submit that the observation mentioned in the report may kindly be reconsidered. The institution is in full compliance with the required infrastructure norms. We request your good office to kindly review the submitted clarification and supporting documents (if required) and oblige.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 ITEP Course on 27.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 24.01.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that, in response to the deficiencies relating to land, infrastructure, and statutory compliance, the institution has submitted that it possesses a latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by the competent Revenue Authority, certifying that the land is free from all encumbrances, and a copy thereof has been furnished for verification. The appellant further submitted that it now holds a Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent Government authority. It has been stated that earlier a certificate issued by the Gram Pradhan had been submitted; however, the requisite certificate from the competent authority has since been obtained and placed on record. With regard to the discrepancy in built-up area, the institution submitted that the total built-up area reflected in the approved building plan includes all programmes, including B.El.Ed., whereas the area indicated in the Building Completion Certificate pertains only to the B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes, and the variation arises due to programme-wise categorization rather than any actual deficiency in construction. The appellant institution also submitted that provisions for accessibility for differently-abled persons are available, including ramp facilities connecting upper floors. Further, the institution submitted that it is compliant with NCTE norms in respect of faculty rooms and departmental library facilities, stating that adequate and well-equipped faculty rooms are available, and that a functional departmental library with requisite books, journals, digital resources, and seating facilities is maintained for teacher education programmes. The institution has

requested that the above submissions and supporting documents be taken on record and the deficiencies be treated as complied with.

The Appeal Committee reiterates that under the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the statutory burden to establish strict, continuous, and demonstrable compliance with the prescribed norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution.

– Recognition or continuation thereof is conditional upon fulfillment of mandatory requirements relating to land, building, instructional and infrastructural facilities, and other regulatory parameters. Mere assertions of compliance, unsupported by authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence, cannot displace or invalidate the factual findings recorded by the concerned Regional Committee in exercise of its statutory jurisdiction. The Appeal Committee, having regard to the nature of the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order, the appellant institution's categorical assertion of rectification, and the principles governing appellate scrutiny under Section 18 of the Act, is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted strictly for the purpose of factual re-verification. Such interference is confined to ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory consistency and shall not be construed as dilution of the binding statutory standards or as an expression of opinion on the merits of the appellant's claims. The Appeal Committee further notes that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification within the statutory framework. The documents placed on record during appellate proceedings are relevant to the grounds of refusal and warrant examination in the interest of procedural fairness, consistent with the principle recognized by the **Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in Rambha College of Education v. NCTE [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016]**. However, such examination shall be confined strictly to verification of compliance with the mandatory provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

Noting the submission made in the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 decides to set aside the impugned order dated 24.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional

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

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

**After 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 24.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee for limited factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee and strict compliance with the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall forward the relevant documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within the stipulated timeframe.**

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

- 1. The Principal, Invertis University, Gata no. 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, NH-24, Bareilly, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh - 243123.**

2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, Room No. 03, Naveen Bhawan, U.P. Secretariat, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226001.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-115/E-403619/2026/ Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLERC202615574/ E-89760

Abhayapuri College, Khasra No. 101, 102, 262, 270, 271, 272, Abhayapuri Main Road, Bongaigaon, Assam – 783384	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>The Representative</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, ERC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **Abhayapuri College, Khasra No. 101, 102, 262, 270, 271, 272, Abhayapuri Main Road, Bongaigaon, Assam - 783384** dated 24.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the refusal order No. F. No. **NCTE/ERC/2526202405203155/ASSAM/2024/REJC/1400** dated 14.11.2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “ The Show Cause Notice post inspection was issued to the institution on 24.04.2025. However, the institution did not submit reply of Show Cause Notice.”

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

The Representative of **Abhayapuri College, Khasra No. 101, 102, 262, 270, 271, 272, Abhayapuri Main Road, Bongaigaon, Assam - 783384** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, it is submitted that “On the day of virtual inspection we encountered significant technical difficulties specifically our institution faced sever connectivity issue which prevented the interface from functioning correctly. we promptly submitted the response letter to NCTE vide letter no. ac/principal/01/2025/2543 dated 10/05/2025 via email.”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 21.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 14.11.2025.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that, in response to the deficiencies arising during the process of virtual inspection, the institution has submitted that on the date of inspection it faced significant technical and connectivity issues, which prevented proper functioning of the inspection interface. The appellant institution further submitted that, in order to place the relevant facts on record, it promptly communicated the said difficulty to NCTE vide its letter No. ac/principal/01/2025/2543 dated 10.05.2025 through email.

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

examination shall be confined strictly to verification of compliance with the mandatory provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

Noting the submission made in the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 decides to set aside the impugned order dated 14.11.2025 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee solely for factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, as per the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Prior to such re-verification, the appellant institution shall submit a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon, along with certified copies of approvals issued by the competent authorities. The Online Visiting Team shall verify the specific infrastructural and instructional deficiencies noted in the impugned order and assess overall compliance with the norms and standards prescribed for implementation of the ITEP programme. The Regional Committee shall ensure strict adherence to the applicable provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Regulations framed thereunder, the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025 (where applicable), and all relevant academic, legal, and regulatory standards. Thereafter, the Eastern Regional Committee shall examine the Visiting Team report, the affidavit, and all supporting documents, and pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations herein, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny; it does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish strict compliance upon re-verification shall entail rejection in accordance with law, without further opportunity. The concerned Regional Committee, being custodian of its records, shall also ensure authenticity and completeness of the record before passing any consequential order and shall ensure time-bound disposal of the matter. The appellant institution shall forward, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal to the Regional Committee for further action in accordance with law.

#### IV. DECISION:

After 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 14.11.2025 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee for limited factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to strict compliance with the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall forward the relevant documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within the stipulated timeframe.

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Abhayapuri College, Khasra No. 101, 102, 262, 270, 271, 272, Abhayapuri Main Road, Bongaigaon, Assam - 783384.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Assam, Assam Secretariat, Block 'C', 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Secretariat Road, Dispur, Guwahati, Assam-781006.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-36/E-396031/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLWRC202615504/E- 89760

Shri Guru Govind Singh Khalsa Shikshan Sanstha, Plot No. MU. No. 15, Kila No. 11, 12, Chak - 44 F, MU. No. 15, Kila No. 11, 12, 43 F Badinga, Near Warehouse Padampur Road Shri Karanpur, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan - 335073	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL**

The appeal of **Shri Guru Govind Singh Khalsa Shikshan Sanstha, Plot No. MU. No. 15, Kila No. 11, 12, Chak - 44 F, MU. No. 15, Kila No. 11, 12, 43 F Badinga, Near Ware House Padampur Road Shri Karanpur, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan - 335073** dated 09.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. WRC/NCTE/CF-82015/NRCAPP-2016-15218-B.Ed./434th/2025/7948-54** dated 14.11.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “1. Building plan for Khasra/Plot/Survey No. Kila No. 11/1/0.2050 & 12/2/0.2500 Murba No. 15 Chak -1-IFF is not approved by the Competent Authority of State Government, wherein not reflected lola/ land area and 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 programs. 2. List of teaching staff is not countersigned by the Registrar of affiliating body. 3. Self-issued letter against Fire Safety Certificate dated 24.05.2025 submitted instead of Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL [https://sgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track\\_application.aspx](https://sgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx). 4. Self-issued letter for Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by Principal dated 24.05.2025 submitted instead of latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 5. Self-issued letter for Building Safety Certificate issued by Principal dated 24.05.2025 submitted instead of Building Safety Certificate in adherence of safety guidelines as prescribed by National/State Disaster Management Authority issued by Competent Government Authority. 6. BCC is not approved by the by Competent Authority of State Government. Total built-up area floor wise, information regarding approval of CLU by Competent Authority of State Government is also not reflected in BCC. 7. The website of institution has NOT been found operational for cross-checking information in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(-1)(i), 8(6), 8(-1) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 201-1 as amended from time to time.” Further, the Committee noted that the State Government of Rajasthan has lodged FIR against the institution dated 24.08.2022 and after enquiry by the Competent Authority of State Government of Rajasthan. It was found that the institution had made forgery related to land document

shown for B.A. course which was submitted for B.Ed. Accordingly, deficiencies communicated vide order dated 22.07.2024 cancelling the NOC by the State Government in respect of institution together with notice issued on 22.07.2024 to the institution with deficiencies for B.Ed. course”

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

**No one from Shri Guru Govind Singh Khalsa Shikshan Sanstha, Plot No. MU. No. 15, Kila No. 11, 12, Chak - 44 F, MU. No. 15, Kila No. 11, 12, 43 F Badinga, Near Ware House Padampur Road Shri Karanpur, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan - 335073** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. In the show cause notice dated 24.07.2025, WRC only sought ‘information’ regarding documents in respect of land & building. No deficiency in respect of non-approval of building plan by competent authority of State Government reflecting total land and built-up area was pointed out. The present ground of withdrawal of recognition is not only at variance with ground of show cause notice but the present ground of withdrawal of recognition is also ‘in excess’ of ground of show cause notice. However, the approved building plan by competent government authority clearly mentioning the plot no. of land is annexed as ANNEXURE 1. Thus, there is no deficiency in this regard and the aforesaid document may kindly be considered and taken into account. It is clarified that institute is running only one course i.e. B.Ed. and therefore, there is no question of earmarking land and built-up area for different courses. 2. In the show cause notice dated 24.07.2025, WRC only sought ‘information’ regarding latest list of teaching staff countersigned by Registrar of Affiliating Body. No deficiency in respect of approved teaching staff was pointed out. The present ground of withdrawal of recognition is not only at variance with ground of show cause notice but the present ground of withdrawal of recognition is also ‘in excess’ of ground of show cause notice. The latest list of qualified teaching staff duly signed by the Registrar of University along with letter dated 29.10.2025 issued by University is enclosed as ANNEXURE 2. Thus, there is no deficiency in this regard and the aforesaid document may kindly be considered and taken into account. 3. In the show cause notice dated 24.07.2025, WRC only sought ‘information’ regarding Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department. No deficiency in respect of Fire Safety Certificate was pointed out. The present ground of withdrawal of recognition is not only at variance with ground of show cause notice but

the present ground of withdrawal of recognition is also 'in excess' of ground of show cause notice. The Fire Safety Certificate dated 17.12.2025 issued by competent authority is submitted as ANNEXURE 3. Thus, there is no deficiency in this regard and the aforesaid document may kindly be considered and taken into account. 4. In the show cause notice dated 24.07.2025, WRC only sought 'information' regarding latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate. No deficiency in respect of Non-Encumbrance Certificate was pointed out. The present ground of withdrawal of recognition is not only at variance with ground of show cause notice but the present ground of withdrawal of recognition is also 'in excess' of ground of show cause notice. The latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by competent revenue authority is submitted as ANNEXURE 4. Thus, there is no deficiency in this regard and the aforesaid document may kindly be considered and taken into account. 5. In the show cause notice dated 24.07.2025, WRC only sought 'information' regarding Building Safety Certificate. No deficiency in respect of Building Safety Certificate was pointed out. The present ground of withdrawal of recognition is not only at variance with ground of show cause notice but the present ground of withdrawal of recognition is also 'in excess' of ground of show cause notice. The latest Building Safety Certificate dated 29.12.2025 issued by competent government authority is submitted as ANNEXURE 5. Thus, there is no deficiency in this regard and the aforesaid document may kindly be considered and taken into account. 6. In the show cause notice dated 24.07.2025, WRC only sought 'information' regarding Building Completion Certificate (BCC). No deficiency in respect of Building Completion Certificate (BCC) was pointed out. The present ground of withdrawal of recognition is not only at variance with ground of show cause notice but the present ground of withdrawal of recognition is also 'in excess' of ground of show cause notice. The Building Completion Certificate (BCC) issued by competent authority is submitted as ANNEXURE 6. Thus, there is no deficiency in this regard and the aforesaid document may kindly be considered and taken into account. 7. In the show cause notice dated 24.07.2025, WRC only pointed out that website of institute is not updated and maintained as per NCTE Regulation, 2014. No specific deficiency was pointed out in respect of violation/non-compliance in respect of any specific provision of NCTE Regulation-2014 in relation to functionality and maintenance of official website of institute. The present ground of withdrawal of recognition is not only at variance with ground of show cause notice but the present ground of withdrawal of recognition is also 'in excess' of ground of show cause notice. The web page print out

of institute website is submitted as ANNEXURE 7. Thus, there is no deficiency in this regard and the aforesaid document may kindly be considered and taken into account. It is respectfully submitted that WRC has taken drastic action of withdrawal of recognition under Section 17 on the grounds which are not only at variance with ground mentioned in the show cause notice but the ground of withdrawal is completely arbitrary and in excess of ground mentioned in the show cause notice. A bare reading of ground mentioned in the show cause notice dated 24.07.2025 shows that they are in the nature of seeking only certain 'information' from the institution and they are not in the nature of 'deficiency' as required under Section 17 of NCTE Act, 1993. Thus, merely on the basis of SCN dated 24.07.2025 which is, in effect, only in the nature of seeking information from the institution, WRC is not justified withdrawing recognition of our institute under Section 17. It is further submitted that before taking drastic action of withdrawal of recognition, WRC has neither issued proper show cause notice pointing out specific deficiencies nor granted opportunity of hearing. Not only that, though Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) issued by NCTE itself, at least two show cause notices are required to be issued to institute before taking drastic action of withdrawal of recognition. However, WRC did not issue even the 2nd show cause notice. Therefore, it is prayed that withdrawal order may be set aside with following directions to WRC:- a. Order of restoration of recognition for B.Ed. course be issued b. The request of institute for shifting of institution may be considered urgently so that existing students do not suffer."

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

**The Appeal Committee in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of two-years duration with an annual intake of 100 for two basic units of 50 students each from the academic session 2015-2016 vide order dated 03.11.2017. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the WRC vide order dated 14.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present Meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution that the Show Cause Notice dated 24.07.2025 sought only "information" in respect of land and building documents, and did not specifically record any deficiencies. The institution contended that the grounds cited in the withdrawal order are at variance with, and allegedly in excess of, the grounds mentioned in the Show Cause Notice. The appellant submitted that it has furnished the approved building plan, latest list of teaching staff countersigned by the Registrar of the affiliating University, Fire Safety Certificate, Non-Encumbrance Certificate, Building Safety Certificate, Building Completion Certificate, and website printouts in support of its compliance. It further clarified that it is running only one course (B.Ed.) and, therefore, earmarking of land and built-up area for multiple courses does not arise. The institution alleged that the withdrawal of recognition under Section 17 of the NCTE Act, 1993 was effected without issuance of a proper show cause notice specifying deficiencies, without affording adequate opportunity of hearing, and without issuance of a second show cause notice as per the Standard Operating Procedure. The appellant accordingly prayed for setting aside of the withdrawal order, restoration of recognition for the B.Ed. course, and consideration of its request for shifting of premises.

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

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

- (i) **Building Plan** : The Regional Committee recorded that the building plan was not approved by the competent authority and lacked essential particulars including programme-wise earmarked land and built-up area. The appellant has merely asserted submission of an approved building plan; however, no verifiable approval document or compliant plan containing mandatory details (FSI/FAR, area statement, demarcation) has been produced on record. The deficiency remains unsubstantiated and non-compliant with Regulation 8 read with Appendix-IV.
- (ii) **Faculty Approval**: The appellant claims submission of a faculty list countersigned by the University. However, the record reveals that only a faculty list without supporting documents and without valid approval letters of the affiliating University has been submitted. In absence of formal approval orders and supporting qualifications, the institution has failed to establish compliance with faculty norms under Regulation 5 and 7.
- (iii) **Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC)** : The appellant claims submission of a latest NEC; however, no certified NEC issued by the competent Revenue Authority is available on record for verification. The institution has failed to discharge its burden of proving clear and marketable title as required under Regulation 8.
- (iv) **Building Safety Certificate**: Against the deficiency of submission of a self-issued certificate, the appellant claims to have submitted a certificate dated 29.12.2025. However, no authenticated Building Safety Certificate issued by the competent Government authority in compliance with Disaster Management norms has been produced. The deficiency remains uncomplied under Regulation 8.
- (v) **Building Completion Certificate (BCC) & CLU**: The Regional Committee recorded that the BCC was not approved and lacked floor-wise built-up area and CLU approval details. The appellant's submission of BCC is not supported by verifiable approval from competent authority, nor does it demonstrate compliance with CLU requirements. The requirement under Regulation 8 and statutory land use compliance remains unfulfilled.
- (vi) **Website Compliance (Clauses 7(14), 8(6), 8(14), 10(3))**: The appellant has submitted webpage printouts; however, no evidence of a fully functional and compliant website containing mandatory disclosures as per Regulations has been established. The deficiency persists in violation of Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3).
- (vii) At the outset, it is noted that the appellant institution did not respond to the Appeal Division letter dated 19.03.2026 and no representative appeared before the Appeal Committee, thereby failing to avail the opportunity of hearing and to

substantiate its claims with verifiable records. Upon correlation of deficiencies with submissions, the following findings are recorded:

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Northern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 14.11.2025 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 WRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 14.11.2025 issued by WRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.

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

उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Shri Guru Govind Singh Khalsa Shikshan Sanstha, Plot No. MU. No. 15, Kila No. 11, 12, Chak - 44 F, MU. No. 15, Kila No. 11, 12, 43 F Badinga, Near Ware House Padampur Road Shri Karanpur, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan - 335073.
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**

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-57/E-398080/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLWRC202615520/E-89760**

Mata Kitab Kaur Mahavidhalaya, Khasra No. Pathar No. 133/244 (72), Kila No. 11,12, Mata Kitab Kaur Memorial Welfare Society, Kohla Rawatsar Road, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan - 335513	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Bhupender Lamba, Chairman</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

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

The appeal of **Mata Kitab Kaur Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. Pathar No. 133/244 (72), Kila No. 11,12, Mata Kitab Kaur Memorial Welfare Society, Kohla Rawatsar Road, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan - 335513** dated 17.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202610043662/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/1961** dated 14.11.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution has not filled any particulars of online transition application, not uploaded any document and submitted blank application."

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

**Sh. Bhupender Lamba, Chairman of Mata Kitab Kaur Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. Pathar No. 133/244 (72), Kila No. 11,12, Mata Kitab Kaur Memorial Welfare Society, Kohla Rawatsar Road, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan - 335513** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "Since the space in this box is short to give reasoned explanation hence a separate sheet is uploaded with this online appeal giving the reasoned explanations against the ground on which the grant of recognition has been rejected." The appellant institution vide letter dated 23.01.2026 also submitted a detailed representation."

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

**The Appeal Committee in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the 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 14.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present Meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Mata Kitab Kaur Mahavidyalaya, Hanumangarh (Rajasthan), managed by Mata Kitab Kaur Memorial Welfare Society, which stated that it had been granted recognition for conducting the 4-year B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programme vide order dated 06.02.2021 under Appendix-13 of the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The appellant submitted that, pursuant to the amendments to the NCTE Regulations and omission of Appendix-13, it applied within the stipulated time for transition to ITEP through the online portal and was allotted an application number. It was further submitted that the application was rejected by the Western Regional Committee in its 439<sup>th</sup> Meeting (29<sup>th</sup>-31<sup>st</sup> October, 2025) on the ground that no particulars were filled and no documents were uploaded. The institution contended that it had duly filled all required particulars and uploaded all necessary documents at the time of submission, and that the observation of a blank application was attributable to a technical issue in the online portal beyond its control. It was submitted that the portal became unresponsive during submission and did not permit re-submission, leading the institution to believe that the application had been successfully submitted. The appellant further submitted that it had reported the issue through emails to the Regional Committee and NCTE helpline and had also approached the office of the Regional Director, WRC, and the IT Section of NCTE, where it was observed that the application details and documents were visible in the system. It was also contended that the rejection was

made without issuance of any show cause notice or opportunity of hearing, and therefore in violation of principles of natural justice. The institution asserted that it possesses the requisite infrastructure and fulfils the norms prescribed under the NCTE Regulations for transition to ITEP, and requested that the refusal order be set aside and its application be considered on merits.

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 14.11.2025 or requires authentication and factual verification by the competent Regional Committee.

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

Noting the submissions placed on record and the documents submitted, the Appeal Committee observes that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification on the basis of the submissions and documents placed before the Appeal Committee. In the interests of justice, the Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants limited interference, strictly within the statutory framework. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims and without diluting or negating the findings recorded in the impugned order, the Appeal Committee sets aside the order dated 14.11.2025 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 14.11.2025 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, Mata Kitab Kaur Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. Pathar No. 133/244 (72), Kila No. 11,12, Mata Kitab Kaur Memorial Welfare Society, Kohla Rawatsar Road, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan - 335513.**
- 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

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-50/E-397509/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202615523/E-89760

Cosmic College of Education, Survey No. 04, Ward No. 4, Lakhanpur Road, Kathua, Jammu & Kashmir - 184152	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh./Capt. R. K. Sharma, Administrator</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUND OF MINUTES**

The appeal of **Cosmic College of Education, Survey No. 04, Ward No. 4, Lakhanpur Road, Kathua, Jammu & Kashmir - 184152** dated 24.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per **refusal order no. F. No. NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-nrc-631099103/JAMMU AND KASHIR/2020/REJC/84 dated 25.11.2025** of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition of conducting B.Ed. course on the ground of "The institution was required to submit steam-wise list of faculty in the format prescribed by NCTE, duly approved by the affiliating university. The number of faculty and qualifications shall be as per the Regulation 5 of the NCTE (Recognition of Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations 2021 notified in the Gazette of India on 26.10.2021."

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

**Sh./Capt. R. K. Sharma, Administrator of Cosmic College of Education, Survey No. 04, Ward No. 4, Lakhanpur Road, Kathua, Jammu & Kashmir - 184152** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. That this institution is running B.Ed. course from 2004. That NRC, NCTE, has rejected the application due to staff selection of this institution for B.Ed. course vide order no. 450th Meeting of NRC held on 08th November 2025 at S. No. 70. Copy of refusal order is attached. 2. That approved list of Teaching Staff list duly approved by the Director, College Development Council, Jammu having seal and stamp of Director is attached. Non-Approved list of Teaching Staff list duly approved by the College Management having seal and stamp of Chairman is attached. 3. You are requested to consider the facts and documents submitted by this institution and directions be issued to NRC, NCTE for further processing the recognition for B.Ed. course of this institution from 2026-27."

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

The Appeal Committee in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the 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 25.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee, in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submission of the appellant institution that it has been running the B.Ed. course since 2004 and that its application was rejected by the Northern Regional Committee in its 450th Meeting held on 08.11.2025 on the ground relating to staff selection. A copy of the refusal order has been placed on record. The appellant submitted that it has furnished a teaching staff list duly approved by the Director, College Development Council, Jammu, bearing official seal and signature, along with another list approved by the College Management. The institution requested that the documents be considered and that directions be issued to the NRC for further processing of recognition of the B.Ed. course from the academic session 2026–27.

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

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

- (i) The institution has failed to furnish a complete, duly authenticated, and verifiable stream-wise and stage-wise faculty list in the prescribed format, as mandated under NCTE Regulations, duly approved by the affiliating university/competent authority. The lists submitted are neither in the prescribed format nor supported by requisite statutory approvals or accompanying documents such as appointment orders and qualification credentials. Mere submission of unapproved/incomplete lists does not meet the regulatory requirement. The deficiency, therefore, persists.
- (ii) In the absence of a duly approved faculty list in the prescribed format, the institution has failed to establish compliance with the prescribed norms relating to number, qualifications, and deployment of faculty for the B.Ed. programme, as required under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). This constitutes a substantive non-compliance with mandatory staffing norms. The onus to demonstrate compliance lies upon the institution through clear, credible, and verifiable documentary evidence. The documents placed on record being incomplete, unauthenticated, and non-conforming to statutory requirements, fail to cure the deficiency recorded by the NRC.

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

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Northern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is

neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 25.11.2025 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 NRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 25.11.2025 issued by NRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.**

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

- 1. The Principal, Cosmic College of Education, Survey No. 04, Ward No. 4, Lakhapur Road, Kathua, Jammu & Kashmir - 184152.**
- 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.**



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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-72/E-396579/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLERC202615513 & APPLERC202514884/E-89760

Kadambini Womens College of Education, Plot No. 8952, 8945, 8947, Vill - Garhbari, PS- Bhupatinagar, S. N. Bera Sarani, Nazir Bazar, Kismat Bajkul, Midnapur, West Bengal - 721655	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector - 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Prof. Tusharkanti Bera, Founder &amp; Secretary</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, ERC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

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

The appeal of **Kadambini Womens College of Education, Plot No. 8952, 8945, 8947, Vill - Garhbari, PS- Bhupatinagar, S. N. Bera Sarani, Nazir Bazar, Kismat Bajkul, Midnapur, West Bengal - 721655** 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/2627202509213027/WEST BENGAL/2025/REJC/2024** 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 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 multidisciplinary 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 runs two units of B.Ed. programme and two units of D.El.Ed. programme. The institution submitted the application for transition into ITEP programme for two units. The institution has only 3945.51. Sq mtrs land which is less as per NCTE regulation for running two units of B.Ed. programme, two units of D.El.Ed. and two units of ITEP programme as per para 6.1 (b) notified dated 26.10.2021. 5. The institution has submitted NEC 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 Govt. Competent Authority stating that Institute's campus is barrier free/Accessible."

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

**Prof. Tusharkanti Bera, Founder & Secretary of Kadambini Womens College of Education, Plot No. 8952, 8945, 8947, Vill - Garhbari, PS-**

**Bhupatinagar, S. N. Bera Sarani, Nazir Bazar, Kismat Bajkul, Midnapur, West Bengal - 721655** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "Already Given."

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

**The Appeal Committee in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Eastern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 30.09.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 15.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present meeting reconsidered the case and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, namely Kadambini Women's College of Education, Hanumangarh, managed by Vidyasagar Technological Institute of Physical Education & Sports, which has been granted recognition by NCTE for conducting B.Ed. (since 2008), D.El.Ed. (since 2012), and 4-year integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes (since 2016). The appellant submitted that, pursuant to the NCTE Public Notice dated 05.02.2024, it applied on 03.05.2024 before the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) for transition of its existing integrated programmes to ITEP under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The application was refused by the ERC in its 353<sup>rd</sup> Meeting (13–14 November 2024) on the ground that the institution is not a multidisciplinary institution. Aggrieved, the institution preferred an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and

submitted supporting documents including certification from the affiliating University declaring it as a multidisciplinary institution. It was further submitted that the Appeal Committee, in its 9th Meeting held on 28.08.2025, set aside the earlier refusal order dated 21.11.2024 and remanded the matter to ERC for fresh consideration. In compliance, the institution submitted requisite documents in hard copy to the office of the Regional Director, ERC on 15.09.2025. The appellant submitted that the ERC, in its 381st Meeting (03–04 November 2025), again refused the application for the academic session 2026–27 on multiple grounds. In response, the institution submitted as under: (i) Authorized Representative: Details were earlier provided on letterhead and have now been submitted through an affidavit on ₹100/- stamp paper. (ii) Details of Students: The details of admitted students had already been submitted and are being re-submitted. (iii) Multidisciplinary Status: The appellant contended that institutions running 4-year integrated programmes under Appendix–13 are eligible for transition to ITEP without fulfilling the multidisciplinary requirement as per amended Regulations dated 26.10.2021; that the Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 does not impose such condition; that the Higher Education Department, Government of West Bengal has approved integrated liberal arts and science curricula; and that the affiliating University has declared and verified the institution as multidisciplinary. (iv) Land Area: The institution stated that, against the earlier recorded land area of 3945.51 sq. mtrs., it presently possesses 6936.12 sq. mtrs. supported by land documents, fulfilling prescribed norms. (v) Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC): An updated NEC has been submitted. (vi) Building Plan: An updated building plan indicating earmarked areas for existing and proposed courses has been submitted. (vii) Building Completion Certificate (BCC): An updated BCC reflecting earmarked areas has been furnished. (viii) Fire Safety and Building Safety Certificates: Certificates issued by competent Government authorities have been submitted/re-submitted. (ix) Barrier-free/Accessibility Certificate: Certificate from the competent authority confirming accessibility provisions has been submitted. The appellant further submitted that, in terms of NCTE Notifications dated 22.10.2021 and 25.01.2024, institutions recognized under Appendix–13 are required to transition to ITEP before the academic session 2026–27, and that it had applied within time along with requisite fee and documents. It was contended that all directions of the Appeal Committee upon remand were complied with and that the institution fulfils all prescribed norms relating to infrastructure, land, and academic facilities. Accordingly,

the appellant requested that the refusal order of the ERC be set aside and permission be granted for transition of its existing 4-year integrated programmes to ITEP.

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) The institution has failed to establish its status as a multidisciplinary institution, as required under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). Reliance on interpretation of amended provisions and a declaration by the affiliating University, in the absence of conclusive statutory recognition and verifiable documentary evidence, is insufficient. Accordingly, eligibility for transition to ITEP remains unsubstantiated.
- (ii) The claim of enhanced land is not supported by consolidated, duly certified land documents establishing ownership, contiguity, and compliance with prescribed norms. In the absence of verifiable documentary evidence, the requirement relating to land remains unproven.
- (iii) The purported submission of an updated NEC is unsupported by any duly issued, authenticated, and verifiable Non-Encumbrance Certificate from the competent Revenue Authority. Submission of unauthenticated copies does not satisfy statutory requirements. The deficiency persists.
- (iv) The institution has failed to produce duly approved building plan and Building Completion Certificate (BCC), issued by the competent authority, clearly indicating programme-wise earmarked built-up area. Submission of unauthenticated photocopies is not legally tenable. The deficiency remains unrectified.
- (v) The certificates claimed to have been submitted are unauthenticated and not issued by competent Government authorities and hence are not verifiable or compliant with statutory norms. The requirement, therefore, remains unfulfilled.

- (vi) No valid certificate issued by a competent Government authority certifying compliance with accessibility norms has been produced. In the absence of such statutory certification, the deficiency remains unresolved.

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations,

2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 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, Kadambini Womens College of Education, Plot No. 8952, 8945, 8947, Vill - Garhbari, PS- Bhupatinagar, S. N. Bera Sarani, Nazir Bazar, Kismat Bajkul, Midnapur, West Bengal - 721655.**
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, (5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor) Kolkata, West Bengal-700 091.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-73/E-397051/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLERC202414771/E 89760

Maa Bachchan Devi Teachers Training College, Khata No. 311, 439, Arawan, Ben, Parwalpur, Nalanda, Bihar - 803114	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Prafulla Kumar Azad, Chairman</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, ERC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

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

The appeal of **Maa Bachchan Devi Teachers Training College, Khata No. 311, 439, Arawan, Ben, Parwalpur, Nalanda, Bihar - 803114** dated 11.04.2024 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. NCTE/ERC/2526202403042046/BIHAR/2024/REJC/1996** dated 01.04.2024 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "As per Public Notice dated 05.05.2004 issued by NCTE, the application were invited for transition from institutions which have been granted recognition by NCTE to run the 4-year Integrated Programme (B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed.), under omitted Appendix 13 as per NCTE Regulation, 2014. In the Public Notice, it was clearly mentioned that if any institution which is not recognized by NCTE, applies for transition, the application shall be out rightly rejected and any fee paid by such institution shall be forfeited. The institution is not recognized by ERC, NCTE for 4 year B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. programme, therefore, the institution is not eligible to apply for transition into ITEP."

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

**Sh. Prafulla Kumar Azad, Chairman of Maa Bachchan Devi Teachers Training College, Khata No. 311, 439, Arawan, Ben, Parwalpur, Nalanda, Bihar - 803114** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The institution has been already running B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. course and the all fulfillment of ITEP course. Infrastructure and land area fulfill by the management. 2. The institution has been already running B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. course and the all fulfillment of M.Ed. course. Infrastructure and land area fulfill by the management. Affiliating Body also issued the NOC for the M.Ed. course. 3. The institution has been already running B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. course and the all fulfillment of B.P.Ed. Course. Infrastructure and land area fulfill by the management. Affiliating Body also issued the NOC for the B.P.Ed. course."

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

**The Appeal Committee in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2026 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Eastern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 05.03.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 01.04.2024.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 19.02.2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee, in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution that is already conducting B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. programmes and that the existing infrastructure and land area available with the institution are adequate to meet the requirements of proposed ITEP, M.Ed., and B.P.Ed. programmes. The appellant further submitted that the management has ensured fulfillment of the infrastructural and land norms for the said courses. It was also stated that the affiliating body has issued No Objection Certificates (NOCs) in respect of the proposed M.Ed. and B.P.Ed. programmes. The institution requested that its compliance with the requisite norms be taken on record and that recognition for the proposed programmes be granted accordingly.

The Appeal Committee, after careful consideration of the record and submissions, noted that as per the Public Notice dated 05.05.2004 issued by NCTE, applications for transition to the 4-year Integrated Programme (B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed.) under erstwhile Appendix-13 of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 were invited only from institutions already recognized by NCTE for such programmes. The said Public Notice categorically provides that applications from unrecognized institutions shall be outrightly rejected with forfeiture of fee. Admittedly, the appellant institution does not hold recognition from ERC, NCTE for the 4-year B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed.

programme. Consequently, the institution lacks basic eligibility to apply for transition into ITEP. The application is thus non-est in law and not maintainable. The appeal has also been preferred after an inordinate and unexplained delay, without any cogent or legally sustainable justification. The same is liable to be rejected on the ground of laches alone, contrary to settled principles governing exercise of appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993.

The Committee further observed that the impugned order passed by the ERC does not suffer from any apparent procedural infirmity, violation of principles of natural justice, or non-consideration of material on record warranting interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993. The appellant has failed to demonstrate any statutory compliance or legal right entitling it to seek transition into ITEP under the framework of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended from time to time). In the absence of prior recognition for the integrated programme, the claim for transition is legally untenable.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After careful consideration of the Appeal Report 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, hereby holds that the present appeal is non-maintainable. The appellant institution being ineligible for transition into ITEP, the appeal fails on both maintainability and merits. Accordingly, the appeal is rejected, and the impugned order dated 01.04.2024 passed by the Eastern Regional Committee is hereby 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, Maa Bachchan Devi Teachers Training College, Khata No. 311, 439, Arawan, Ben, Parwalpur, Nalanda, Bihar - 803114.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.

3. Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Bihar Vikash Bhawan, Ground Floor, Near New Sachibalay, Bailey Road, Secretariat (Near New Sachibalay), Bihar 800 015.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-491/E- 391762/2025 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202515451 / E-89760

Universal College of Education, Plot No. 680, Ballopur, Jastana Road, Lalru, Derabassi, Mohali, Punjab - 140501	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **Universal College of Education, Plot No. 680, Ballopur, Jastana Road, Lalru, Derabassi, Mohali, Punjab - 140501** dated 27.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2626202402231669 / PUNJAB / 2024 / REJC / 1619** dated 28.10.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution has stated that the approved and selected faculty by the university conacred was mentioned in the format for which interview held on 09.07.2025. Approval process of selected faculty will be started after 2 months of the interview. As such, the list of faculty selected by the institution is not duly approved by the affiliating University. The institution was required to submit stream-wise & stage-wise list of faculty in the format duly approved by the affiliating university. The number of faculty and qualifications shall be as per the Regulation 5 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations 2021 notified in the Gazette of India on 26.10.2021."

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

**No one from Universal College of Education, Plot No. 680, Ballopur, Jastana Road, Lalru, Derabassi, Mohali, Punjab - 140501** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "With reference to the observation communicated by the Hon'ble NCTE regarding the submission of the stream-wise and stage-wise list of faculty duly approved by the affiliating University, the institution respectfully submits the following detailed explanation for your kind consideration. 1. Background of the Faculty Selection Process Conducted by the Institution The institution would like to reiterate that a transparent, merit-based, and duly advertised faculty recruitment process was conducted in accordance with the norms laid down by NCTE and the affiliating University. Applications were invited strictly as per eligibility criteria prescribed under NCTE Regulations, 2014 and further amended on 26.10.2021 vide NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. A duly constituted Selection Committee was formed, consisting of subject experts, senior academicians, and administrative representatives, in

accordance with the affiliating University's norms. Interviews for all positions were conducted on 09.07.2025, and the Selection Committee finalized the list of provisionally selected candidates for all streams and stages required for the running of the programme. The faculty details submitted earlier in the NCTE-prescribed format were based on the recommendations of the Selection Committee and reflect all shortlisted and recommended candidates.

2. Explanation Regarding University Approval Process and Timelines It is respectfully submitted that the affiliating University follows a two-stage post-selection approval process, applicable to all affiliated colleges.

Stage 1: Submission of Selected Candidate List After the interview held on 09.07.2025, the institution immediately submitted the list of selected candidates to the affiliating University for approval as per standard procedure.

Stage 2: University-Level Scrutiny and Statutory Approval The University undertakes the following actions, generally requiring 6–8 weeks: Verification of qualifications and experience of selected candidates. Scrutiny by University's Faculty Approval Committee. Vetting by the Academic Council/Board of Studies (where applicable). Issuance of formal approval order for each faculty member. The University has already communicated to us that the approval process will commence two months after the interview, which is the standard time frame applicable for all affiliated institutions. Therefore, at the present stage, the institution possesses the "selected list" of faculty but is awaiting the University's formal approval order, which is an administrative process outside the institution's control.

3. Clarification on Why the University-Approved List Could Not Be Submitted Earlier The institution acknowledges that NCTE requires the stream-wise and stage-wise list of faculty duly approved by the affiliating University. However, the following circumstances explain the unavoidable delay: The University's approval cycle begins only after its internal committee convenes, and the earliest scheduled date is two months post-interview. The University follows a centralized approval workflow, which involves sequential verification by multiple statutory bodies. This process is uniform for all affiliated colleges. There is no deliberate delay or non-compliance on part of the institution. The absence of an approved list at this moment is solely due to the University's statutory scheduling. "The selected faculty list, duly approved by the affiliating University, has already been submitted to NCTE in the prescribed format on 15.07.2024 & 09.07.2025." Despite this, the institution has fully complied with the requirement of furnishing: Stream-wise details Stage-wise details Qualifications

Experience Selection Committee recommendations

4. Assurance That the Institution Fully Complies With Regulation 5 of the NCTE Amendment Regulations, 2021

Regulation 5 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021 mandates: The number of faculty must correspond to student intake and programme structure. Faculty qualifications must be strictly as per NCTE norms. Appointments must be made through a duly constituted Selection Committee. The institution must maintain adequate pupil–teacher ratio. Faculty must be full-time, regular appointees. The institution reaffirms full compliance with all these criteria as detailed below:

4.1 Adequacy of Faculty Strength The number of selected faculty members strictly satisfies: Pupil–Teacher Ratio requirements Stream-wise distribution Stage-wise requirements (Foundation Courses, Pedagogy Courses, EPC, Internship Supervision)

4.2 Qualifications of Faculty Members All selected candidates possess: Required degrees (e.g., B.Ed./M.Ed./M.A.(Education), Ph.D. wherever applicable) Mandatory pedagogical qualifications Required percentage of marks and recognized university degrees Qualification verification reports have already been submitted to the University.

4.3 Selection Process as per Norms The selection was conducted: Through public notification with verification of documents Through a valid composition Selection Committee With recorded proceedings and merit lists

4.4 Full-Time Appointments All recommended candidates are to be appointed on: Regular, full-time basis With UGC/NCTE-compliant service conditions.

5. Institution’s Transparent and Proactive Approach We wish to highlight that the institution has: Not concealed any information Submitted all available verified documents Disclosed the status of faculty approval truthfully and transparently Responded to all NCTE queries in a timely manner Maintained complete compliance with NCTE norms voluntarily the institution values regulatory discipline and have always upheld academic integrity and administrative transparency.

7. Prayer for Consideration In light of the above detailed explanation, we humbly request the Hon’ble NCTE to: Kindly consider the institution’s compliance efforts. Acknowledge that the delay in obtaining University approval is procedural and beyond our direct control. “The selected faculty list, duly approved by the affiliating University, has already been submitted to NCTE in the prescribed format on 15.07.2024 & 09.07.2025.” The institution assures full cooperation and complete compliance with all regulatory requirements. The delay pertains solely to the procedural approval at the University level and not on the part of the institution. In view of this, we kindly

request the Hon'ble NCTE to accept our submission." 8. Conclusion The institution respectfully submits that it is fully committed to maintaining academic quality and regulatory compliance under the NCTE framework. All steps regarding faculty recruitment, qualification verification, and submission of information have been followed scrupulously. And already submitted to office on the date of 09.09.2025 copy attached We remain at your disposal for any further clarification or documents required. Submitted with utmost respect."

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 ITEP Course on 05.03.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 28.10.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2025 held on 16.12.2025, 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present Meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution submitted that a transparent, merit-based faculty recruitment process was conducted strictly in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021, through a duly constituted Selection Committee comprising subject experts and University representatives. Interviews were held on 09.07.2025 and stream-wise and

stage-wise faculty were provisionally selected as per prescribed norms. It was contended that the affiliating University follows a statutory, multi-stage approval process for faculty appointments, involving verification and approval by its internal bodies, which ordinarily takes 6–8 weeks. The institution submitted that the delay in submission of the University-approved faculty list is purely procedural and beyond its control, and not attributable to any lapse or non-compliance on its part. The institution asserted that the selected faculty fully meet the prescribed qualifications, pupil–teacher-ratio, and stage-wise and stream-wise requirements under Regulation 5 of the 2021 Amendment Regulations, and that appointments are proposed on a regular, full-time basis. The institution further stated that all available faculty details, Selection Committee recommendations, and supporting documents were duly submitted to NCTE, and that the University-approved faculty list has since been forwarded as soon as received. The appellant emphasized its continued adherence to regulatory discipline, transparency, and academic standards, and requested that the procedural delay at the University level be viewed sympathetically.

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

- (i) The institution has failed to submit a stream-wise and stage-wise faculty list duly approved by the affiliating University, as mandated under Regulation of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The appellant has admitted that only a provisionally selected faculty list based on Selection Committee recommendations was available at the relevant time. Such recommendations do not constitute “duly approved” faculty within the meaning of the Regulations, thereby rendering the institution non-compliant with an essential eligibility condition.
- (ii) The documents relied upon, including the Staff Selection Proforma signed by the Dean, CDC, and Selection Committee proceedings, do not amount to formal approval by the affiliating University. No University-issued approval orders/appointment approvals for individual faculty members have been produced. The material on record remains confined to the stage of recommendation/selection and does not satisfy the statutory requirement of approved faculty.
- (iii) The explanation attributing non-submission to administrative timelines and procedural delays at the University level is untenable. NCTE Regulation mandates demonstrable compliance at the time of consideration and pending or anticipated approvals cannot substitute the requirement of duly approved faculty. It is evident that, as on the relevant date, the institution did not possess the requisite approved faculty. Further, despite sufficient opportunity granted by the Appeal Committee, the deficiency remains unrectified.
- (iv) The appellant has taken mutually inconsistent stands, claiming prior submission of approved faculty lists while simultaneously asserting that University approval is still awaited. This contradiction undermines the credibility of the claim and confirms the absence of verifiable approved faculty records. The request for additional time to obtain approval is not tenable. Recognition under the statutory framework is contingent upon established compliance at the time of consideration, and any extension at the appellate stage would amount to diluting the mandatory provisions and prescribed timelines under the NCTE Regulations.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply and supporting documents; and the deficiencies were specifically identified and communicated. The grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility, infrastructural adequacy, and regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The deficiencies identified are substantive and foundational in nature and relate to threshold conditions for grant of recognition. They cannot be treated as technical irregularities capable of post facto rectification by explanation. It is settled that grant of recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is not automatic upon submission of an application. Recognition is conditional upon strict and demonstrable compliance with

the statutory framework at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by applying for recognition. In the present case, despite adequate opportunity granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the 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 28.10.2025 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 NRC 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 order dated 28.10.2025 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, Universal College of Education, Plot No. 680, Ballopur, Jastana Road, Lalru, Derabassi, Mohali, Punjab - 140501.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**
3. **Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**
4. **The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Block E, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali)-Punjab-160062.**



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-501/E- 393781/2025 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202515455/E-89760

Baba Farid College of Education, Khasra No. 161/, 11/2, 161//12min, Muktsar Road, Deon, Bathinda, Punjab - 151001	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>The Representative</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF ORDER**

The appeal of **Baba Farid College of Education, Khasra No. 161/, 11/2, 161//12min, Muktsar Road, Deon, Bathinda, Punjab - 151001** dated 26.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2526202402281864/PUNJAB/2024/Recognition Order** dated 29.10.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, granting recognition for conducting ITEP Course, and as per appeal report the Appellant Institution submitted that “No ground has been given for recognition to 50 seats instead of 100 (applied).”

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

**The Representative** from **Baba Farid College of Education, Khasra No. 161/, 11/2, 161//12min, Muktsar Road, Deon, Bathinda, Punjab - 151001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Application Submitted for Transition Only The institution had applied solely for the transition of its existing B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes to ITEP. As per the applicable NCTE Regulations, institutions transitioning from these integrated programmes are eligible for an intake of 100 seats, and therefore the intake should not have been restricted to 50 seats. 2. Existing Approved Intake of 100 Seats since 2018–19 The institution has been successfully running B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes with an intake of 100 seats since the academic session 2018–19. The demand of 100 seats is therefore in alignment with the approved and established capacity of the institution. 3. Availability of Required Infrastructure and Resources The institution possesses all requisite infrastructural facilities, instructional resources, qualified faculty, ICT-enabled classrooms, laboratories, library resources and physical infrastructure, fully compliant with the NCTE norms and standards for an intake of 100 seats under the ITEP programme. The college continues to maintain these facilities as per the latest amendments to the NCTE Regulations. 4. Entire Regulatory Process Was Conducted for 100 Seats Throughout the entire recognition process—including the First Show Cause Notice dated 08.01.2025, the First Show Cause Notice dated 05.03.2025, the LOI Document Requirement Notice dated 17.05.2025 and the Post-LOI First Show Cause Notice dated 13.09.2025—there has been no reference

whatsoever to restricting the intake to 50 seats. All observations, compliance requirements, faculty details and infrastructural norms sought by the NRC were clearly aligned with the intake of 100 seats, as per the NCTE Regulations for transition from B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. to ITEP. Hence, the entire process was conducted with the explicit understanding that the institution is eligible and being evaluated for 100 seats, not 50.

5. Faculty Appointed for 100-Seat Capacity & Regional Educational Needs The institution has appointed qualified faculty on a regular basis fully in compliance with the requirements for an intake of 100 seats. Reducing the intake to 50 seats may compel the institution to relieve several long-serving faculty members, which would not only be an administrative hardship but also an injustice to faculty who have been contributing to teacher education for years. Additionally, the institution is located in the educationally backward Malwa region of Punjab, where access to quality teacher education is limited. Reducing the intake to 50 seats would deprive a large number of rural and aspiring students from availing quality teacher education near their doorstep, thereby adversely impacting the region's educational upliftment and lowering down the GER.

6. Recognition Order Confirms Full Compliance In the recognition order issued, the Northern Regional Committee has explicitly recorded that the institution fulfils all requirements under the NCTE Act, Rules, and Regulations—including norms and standards for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme — such as infrastructural facilities, instructional facilities, financial resources, academic environment, etc., as indicated in Paragraph 2 of the said order. Since NRC has already acknowledged full compliance, the reduction in intake to 50 seats does not appear to be aligned with the institution's approved capacity or applicable regulatory provisions. In light of the above facts, the institution most humbly requests the Honorable Appellate Authority of the NCTE to kindly review the order and grant approval for an intake of 100 seats for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), as applied and fully justified. The institution assures its continued commitment to quality teacher education and adherence to all norms of the NCTE."

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 ITEP Course on 05.03.2024. The recognition was granted to the institution for ITEP programme by the NRC vide order dated 29.10.2025 for 1 unit (50 students) of B.A. B.Ed. programme.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that the present appeal pertains to restriction of intake to 50 seats in respect of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), whereas the institution had applied solely for transition of its existing B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes. The appellant submitted that, as per the applicable provisions of the NCTE Regulations, institutions transitioning from B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes are eligible for an intake of 100 seats, and therefore restriction of intake to 50 seats is not in consonance with the regulatory framework. It was further submitted that the institution has been running the said programmes with an approved intake of 100 seats since the academic session 2018–19, and the present request for 100 seats is consistent with its established capacity. The appellant contended that it possesses the requisite infrastructure, instructional and physical facilities, qualified faculty, ICT-enabled classrooms, laboratories, and library resources in full compliance with the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Regulations for an intake of 100 seats, and that such facilities continue to be maintained as per the amended Regulations. It was further submitted that throughout the regulatory process, including issuance of Show Cause Notices dated 08.01.2025 and 05.03.2025, LOI Document Requirement Notice dated 17.05.2025, and Post-

LOI Show Cause Notice dated 13.09.2025, there was no indication of any proposed restriction of intake to 50 seats, and all requirements sought by the NRC were aligned with an intake of 100 seats. The appellant also submitted that faculty have been appointed in accordance with the requirement for 100-seat capacity, and reduction of intake would adversely affect the existing faculty strength and institutional functioning. It was further stated that the institution is located in the Malwa region of Punjab and caters to educational needs of a rural and educationally backward area, and reduction in intake would impact access to teacher education and Gross Enrolment Ratio in the region. The appellant additionally submitted that in the recognition order, the NRC has recorded that the institution fulfils the requirements under the NCTE Act, Rules and Regulations, including norms and standards for ITEP with respect to infrastructure, instructional facilities, financial resources, and academic environment, and therefore restriction of intake to 50 seats is not aligned with the recorded compliance. On the above grounds, the appellant has sought grant of recognition for ITEP with an intake of 100 seats as applied for.

The Appeal Committee, after considering the records available on file, the submissions made during the hearing, and the additional submissions furnished by the appellant institution vide letter dated 31.03.2026, along with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the NCTE (Amendment) Regulations, 2021, and the Public Notice dated 05.02.2024, observed as under: The Committee noted that, vide letter dated 31.03.2026, the appellant institution submitted that it has furnished the affidavit and affiliation letters issued by Punjabi University, Patiala in compliance with the directions of the Appeal Committee for consideration of transition of its existing 4-year integrated B.A.B.Ed. programme (2 Units – 100 seats) to ITEP. The institution further submitted that it had earlier communicated with the affiliating University regarding continuation of the said programme and requested that the submitted documents may be taken on record for grant of approval for transition. The Committee further noted that the Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 provides that only those institutions which are duly recognized by NCTE for conducting the 4-year integrated programme under the erstwhile Appendix-13 and satisfy all prescribed conditions, including continuity of recognition, approved units/intake, and valid affiliation, are eligible for transition to ITEP. The recognized units and intake are

required to remain unchanged, and compliance is to be established strictly through verifiable documentary evidence. Upon examination, the Committee observed that although the appellant institution has submitted additional documents, including affidavit and affiliation-related documents, the same require verification of authenticity, validity, and regulatory conformity, particularly with regard to: continuity and validity of affiliation of the concerned programme for the claimed units; consistency between NCTE recognition and University affiliation in respect of intake and units; and compliance with the conditions stipulated under the Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 and the applicable NCTE Regulations. In the absence of conclusive and verified evidence on the above aspects at the appellate stage, the claim of the appellant institution cannot be finally determined.

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 29.10.2025 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 are capable of objective verification on the basis of material placed before it. In the interest of justice and within the statutory framework of the NCTE Act, 1993 and Regulations framed thereunder, the Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants limited interference, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the claims of the appellant and without disturbing the findings recorded in the impugned order. Accordingly, the matter requires factual and

regulatory re-examination by the Northern Regional Committee (NRC), limited to the following: (a) Examination of submissions made by the appellant, including those furnished vide letter dated 31.03.2026; (b) Verification of authenticity and validity of affiliation and supporting documents (c) Confirmation of approved units and intake in conformity with NCTE recognition; (d) Assessment of eligibility strictly in terms of Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 and applicable NCTE Regulations; and (e) Passing of a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law, after affording opportunity of hearing, if deemed necessary. It is clarified that this remand is strictly confined to factual and regulatory examination and does not confer any right, presumption, or equity in favour of the appellant institution. The Regional Committee shall decide the matter strictly on merits, based on verified records and in adherence to the statutory and regulatory framework. The NRC, being the statutory custodian of records, shall ensure the authenticity, completeness, and genuineness of all relevant records, including those forming part of the original application and documents submitted during appellate proceedings, before passing any consequential order. 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 submit all documents filed in appeal to the NRC within 15 days from 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 remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for reconsideration strictly in terms of the directions contained herein. The NRC shall take a reasoned and speaking decision after considering all documents and subsequent submissions of the appellant, including compliance as required 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, Baba Farid College of Education, Khasra No. 161/, 11/2, 161//12min, Muktsar Road, Deon, Bathinda, Punjab - 151001.**
- 2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**

3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Block E, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali)-Punjab-160062.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-39/E-396767/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202515396/ E-89760

Shri Jain Adarsh Kanya Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. Old 207/59/1/ New 181, Ramdevra Road, Nokha, Bikaner, Rajasthan - 334803	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Shri Jain Adarsh Kanya Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. Old 207/59/1/ New 181, Ramdevra Road, Nokha, Bikaner, Rajasthan - 334803** dated 03.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202505124248/ RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/1861** dated 11.09.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “1. The institution has not uploaded document in respect of Category I. 2. The institution has not obtained letter of recommendation of the State Government. 3. The institution has not uploaded the letter of NOC of affiliating university. 4. The institution has not uploaded Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 5. The institution has not uploaded the details of all Society/ Trust/ Company Members. 6. The name of the institution “SHRI Jain Adarsh Kanya Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya” mentioned in the application whereas “SHRI JAIN ADARSH COLLEGE” 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 Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time, the application of the institution does not fall in the category of multi-disciplinary institution. Further, the institution has not uploaded affiliation order for M.A. course issued by the Affiliating University. 7. The institution has not uploaded Revised Recognition Order for B.Ed. course in the name of applicant institution issued by NCTE. 8. The institution has not uploaded the details of admitted students with supporting documents for all running programmes. 9. Land and Built-up area are mentioned in the online ITEP application without affidavit and the institution has not uploaded certified registered land documents in respect of the Khasra Nos. 207/59/1 mentioned in the online ITEP portal issued by Competent Authority of State Government showing that the building is situated on a single plot. 10. Khasra No. 181 mentioned in the uploaded Mutation Certificate whereas Khasra No. 207/59/1 mentioned in the address and land details columns of online ITEP application portal. The institution has not uploaded Mutation Certificate in respect of the Khasra Nos. 207/59/1 mentioned in the online ITEP portal issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 11. The institution has not uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) in

respect of the Khasra Nos. 207/59/1 mentioned in the online ITEP portal issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 12. The institution has not uploaded latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) in respect of the Khasra Nos. 207/59/1 mentioned in the online ITEP portal issued by Competent Authority of State Government indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances issued by Competent Government Authority. 13. 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. 14. The institution has not uploaded Building Safety Certificate in adherence of safety guidelines as prescribed by National/State Disaster Management Authority issued by Competent Government Authority. 15. The institution has not uploaded latest Building Completion Certificate (BCC) in the prescribed format of NCTE (17 points) issued by the Competent Government Authority for all the courses being conducted in the premises. 16. The institution is required to upload Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL [https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track\\_application.aspx](https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx) 17. The website of institution has NOT been updated and maintained in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time. 18. The institution has not uploaded geotag photos with different angles of Lift, Ramp, Electricity Connection, Safe Drinking Water and Accessible Toilet indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph. 19. The institution has not uploaded geotag photos with different angles of front view, rear view, multipurpose hall, library. lab 1 and playground clearly indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph.”

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

**No one from Shri Jain Adarsh Kanya Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. Old 207/59/1/ New 181, Ramdevra Road, Nokha, Bikaner, Rajasthan - 334803** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The institution has uploaded MOM for Category I. 2. The institution has reminder

letter send to the State Government for NOC. 3. The institution has uploaded the letter of NOC of affiliating university MGSU BIKANER. 4. The institution has uploaded FORM NO. 10 AC for not-for-Profit Certificate issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 5. The institution has uploaded the details of all Society/ Trust/ Company Members. 6. Our academic college is named "Shri Jain Adarsh PG College" and our B.Ed. college is named "Shri Jain Adarsh Kanya Teacher Training College". Both colleges are under the management of Shri Jain Adarsh Seva Sansthan, Nokha, Bikaner. The process of merging these two colleges is currently underway, and the necessary documentation name "MOM" is being prepared. 7. The institution has uploaded Revised Recognition Order for B.Ed. course in the name of applicant institution issued by NCTE. 8. The institution has uploaded the details of admitted students with supporting documents for all running programmes. 9. our old khasara nos. is 207/59/1 and new khasara nos is 181. Land and Built-up area are mentioned in affidavit. and it has uploaded. certified registered in respect of the Old Khasra Nos. 207/59/1 new Khasra Nos. 181 mentioned issued by Competent Authority of State Government (Patwari, Nokha tehsil Dist. Bikaner). 10. our old khasara nos. is 207/59/1 and new khasara nos is 181. Land and Built-up area are mentioned in affidavit. and it has uploaded. certified registered in respect of the Old Khasra Nos. 207/59/1 new Khasra Nos. 181 mentioned issued by Competent Authority of State Government (Patwari, Nokha tehsil Dist. Bikaner). 11. The institution has uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) in respect of the old Khasra Nos. 207/59/1 new Khasra Nos. 181 issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 12. The institution has uploaded latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) in respect of the old Khasra Nos. 207/59/1 new Khasra Nos. 181 issued by Competent Authority of State Government indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances issued by Competent Government Authority. 13. The institution has 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. 14. The institution has uploaded Building Safety Certificate in adherence of safety guidelines as prescribed by National/State Disaster Management Authority issued by Competent Government Authority. 15. The institution has uploaded latest Building Completion Certificate (BCC) in the

prescribed format of NCTE (17 points) issued by the Competent Government Authority for all the courses being conducted in the premises. 16. The institution has applied new Fire Safety Certificate with application number LSG/NOKHA/FIRENOC/2025-26/591 06 dated 19-09-2025 on Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL [https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track\\_application.aspx](https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx). 17. The website of institution has been updated and maintained in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 11.09.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present Meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. 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, wherein it claimed that it has uploaded the Memorandum of Merger (MoM) for Category-I, submitted a reminder to the State Government for issuance of NOC, and placed on record the NOC issued by the affiliating university, Maharaja Ganga Singh University (MGSU), Bikaner. The institution further claimed that both Shri Jain Adarsh PG College and Shri Jain Adarsh Kanya Teacher Training College, functioning under the same management of Shri Jain Adarsh Seva Sansthan, Nokha (Bikaner), are in the process of merger and that necessary documentation relating to the merger is being prepared. The appellant also stated that it has uploaded the revised recognition order for the B.Ed. programme issued by NCTE, details of admitted students for existing programmes, and relevant documents relating to land ownership and Khasra numbers, including land use certificate (CLU) and Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by the competent authority. The institution further submitted that it has uploaded the approved building plan, building safety certificate, and building completion certificate (BCC) issued by the competent authority, and has applied for issuance of a fresh Fire Safety Certificate from the competent authority. The appellant also claimed that the institutional website has been updated and maintained in compliance with the provisions of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The appellant institution requested that the above submissions and documents be considered while examining 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) **Category–I Documents, Society Details & Not-for-Profit Status** The appellant has claimed uploading of MOM, Society details, and Form 10AC; however, no authenticated and verifiable documents issued by competent authorities establishing compliance have been placed on record. Mere assertion of uploading is insufficient. Deficiency remains unsubstantiated.
- (ii) **State Government Recommendation / NOC** The appellant has only stated that a reminder has been sent to the State Government. No recommendation/NOC from the State Government has been produced. Mandatory requirement under Regulation remains unfulfilled.
- (iii) **NOC from Affiliating University & Multidisciplinary Status:** Though the appellant claims to have uploaded NOC, the record reflects inconsistency in institutional identity, i.e., “Shri Jain Adarsh Kanya Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya” vis-à-vis “Shri Jain Adarsh College”. Further, the appellant admits that merger of institutions is “under process”, which indicates that the entity seeking recognition is not yet established as a single multidisciplinary institution in law. The requirement of a clearly identifiable, duly affiliated multidisciplinary institution remains not established.
- (iv) **Land Documents & Khasra Discrepancy :** The appellant has attempted to explain that old Khasra No. 207/59/1 corresponds to new Khasra No. 181; however: No consolidated, certified land records establishing continuity, ownership, and single plot status have been produced; Documents are stated to be issued by Patwari, which does not substitute certified registered land documents from competent authority as required; The inconsistency between application details and mutation records remains unresolved. The institution has failed to establish clear title, contiguity, and legality of land as required under Regulation 8.
- (v) **CLU, NEC, Building Plan & BCC** - Though the appellant claims submission of CLU, NEC, Building Plan, and BCC: No verifiable documents demonstrating approval by competent Government authority with complete details (name of institution, khasra no., earmarked area, course-wise demarcation) are available on record; The requirement of programme-wise earmarked land and built-up area is not demonstrably satisfied. These deficiencies remain unresolved and non-compliant.
- (vi) **Fire Safety Certificate (Regulation 8):** The appellant has merely stated that it has applied for Fire Safety Certificate with an application number. Application for certificate does not amount to compliance; absence of a valid certificate issued by competent authority renders the requirement unfulfilled.
- (vii) **Building Safety Certificate:** Though claimed to be uploaded, no authenticated certificate issued by competent authority conforming to Disaster Management norms is on record. Deficiency persists.
- (viii) **Website Compliance** - The appellant has made a general assertion of compliance; however, no evidence of a fully functional and compliant website with mandatory disclosures has been placed on record for verification. Requirement remains unverified.
- (ix) **Geo-tagged Photographs & Infrastructure Evidence:** No documentary evidence of geo-tagged photographs with latitude/longitude and date as required has been produced. Deficiency remains uncured.

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of

recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Western Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 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 WRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned refusal order dated 11.09.2025 issued by WRC is confirmed.

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

उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Shri Jain Adarsh Kanya Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. Old 207/59/1/ New 181, Ramdevra Road, Nokha, Bikaner, Rajasthan - 334803.
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

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-42/E-396589/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202414828/E-89760

Indian M.Ed. College, Survey No. 41/P1, 112/1-C, 18-1-220/1-56, Chidri Road, Bidar, Karnataka - 58540 <b>APPELLANT</b>	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075 <b>RESPONDENT</b>
---	------------------	--

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. S. R. Joshi, Principal</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, SRC</b>
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<b>30.03.2026</b>
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	<b>22.04.2026</b>

## आदेश/ ORDER

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

The appeal of **Indian M.Ed. College, Survey No. 41/P1, 112/1-C, 18-1-220/1-56, Chidri Road, Bidar, Karnataka - 585401** dated 04.11.2024 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. SRO/NCTE/APSO2435/B.Ed./KA/2020/18700-8706** dated 24.09.2020 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course. The Appellant Institution in its appeal report mentioned the grounds that "1. The institution has not shifted its institution to own permanent building, which is a violation, the NCTE Regulation 200, 3(c). 2. The institution has also not responded to the Final Show Cause Notice issued on 19.07.2019."

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

**Dr. S. R. Joshi, Principal of Indian M.Ed. College, Survey No. 41/P1, 112/1-C, 18-1-220/1-56, Chidri Road, Bidar, Karnataka - 585401** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "We have building in the name of Indian M.Ed. College run by Indian Education Society's Chidri Road Bidar. The institution vide letter dated 24.03.2026 also made additional submission.

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 was granted recognition for B.Ed. Course of one-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 02.12.2004. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 the institution submitted affidavit dt. 28.01.2015 for its willingness for adherence of provisions of new Regulations. A revised provisional recognition order was issued to the institution on dt. 18.05.2015 for conducting B.Ed. course of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 (two basic unit) from the academic

session 2015-16. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 24.09.2020.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant another opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee, in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee after reconsideration of the matter in the present meeting. The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that the building stands in the name of Indian M.Ed. College and is being operated under the aegis of the Indian Education Society, Chidri Road, Bidar.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution preferred the present appeal only on 04.11.2024 and hard copy of appeal submitted on 19.01.2026, i.e., after an inordinate delay of **more than 4 years (from filing online application)** from the date of the impugned withdrawal order. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any satisfactory explanation or sufficient cause justifying such an extraordinary delay. The Appeal Committee also noted order dated 10.01.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Suo Motu Writ Petition (Civil) No. 3 of 2020, wherein it was held as under:

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

Applying the aforesaid binding judicial pronouncement, the period from 15.03.2020 to 28.02.2022 stands excluded; however, even thereafter, the appellant was required to file the appeal within 90 days from 01.03.2022, i.e., on or before

30.05.2022. The appeal having been filed only on 04.11.2024 remains clearly and substantially barred by limitation. The Committee reiterates that under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, condonation of delay is not automatic and can be granted only upon demonstration of reasonable and sufficient cause. In the present case, no such cause has been shown. The doctrine of delay and laches squarely applies, rendering the appeal not maintainable. The Appeal Committee also finds that the withdrawal of recognition was effected by the SRC in exercise of its statutory powers under Section 17(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993, due to non-compliance with mandatory regulatory requirements.

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

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that recognition of the institution stood withdrawn in September 2020 and has not been restored at any point thereafter. The record further reflects that the concerned University has not extended or renewed affiliation subsequent to such withdrawal. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any order evidencing subsisting recognition, continuation of affiliation, or any judicial direction authorizing continued academic operation. In the absence of lawful recognition and valid affiliation, the institution cannot, in the eyes of law, be regarded as an existing or functional teacher education institution and is, for regulatory purposes, non-existent.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating

continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including proof of appointment approval by the affiliating University or payment of salary. The faculty list placed on record is not approved by the competent affiliating authority, as mandatorily required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of duly approved faculty would amount to sanctioning a grave, substantive, and continuing breach of the statutory framework, striking at the very foundation of quality assurance in teacher education.

- (iii) The Appeal Committee observes that the appellant institution failed to submit any reply to the Final Show Cause Notice, issued by the Southern Regional Committee within the stipulated period, and has furnished no cogent or satisfactory explanation for such persistent default. Even during the appellate proceedings, despite being afforded adequate opportunity to produce specific and material documents, the institution has failed to place on record complete, authentic, and legally sustainable evidence of compliance. The purported submissions remain fragmented, deficient, and incapable of establishing adherence to the mandatory requirements of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The deficiencies recorded are substantive and foundational in character, striking at the very root of eligibility for grant or restoration of recognition. They cannot be trivialized as technical irregularities nor cured by post facto explanations unsupported by contemporaneous, verifiable compliance. The Appeal Committee further holds that restoration of recognition, once lawfully withdrawn, can be contemplated only upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the statutory framework as existing at the time of

consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by submitting a representation bereft of credible and legally sustainable proof of compliance or demonstrable readiness to lawfully conduct the programme. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon continuous adherence to statutory norms, and cannot be claimed as a matter of entitlement in the absence of proven compliance. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 24.09.2020 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, holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Any further opportunity would be contrary to the NCTE Act, 1993 and destructive of regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 24.09.2020 passed by the Southern Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Indian M.Ed. College, Survey No. 41/P1, 112/1-C, 18-1-220/1-56, Chidri Road, Bidar, Karnataka - 585401.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-49/E-397506 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202515470/E-89760

Shri Pragya Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 339 (1/2), 340, 342, 343 (1/2), 349, Pragya Road, Bijainagar, Dist - Beawar Road, Ajmer, Rajasthan – 305624	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

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

The appeal of **Shri Pragya Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 339 (1/2), 340, 342, 343 (1/2), 349, Pragya Road, Bijainagar, Dist - Beawar Road, Ajmer, Rajasthan - 305624** dated 16.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / WRC / 2627202505124239 / RAJASTHAN / 2025 / REJC / 702** dated 27.10.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The uploaded building plan approved by Assistant Engineer, Masuda Sub-Division (without date) is not signed by the management of institution. The address of application mentioned in the online application does not exactly match with the address mentioned in the building plan uploaded. The district mentioned therein as Beawar which differs from Ajmer as mentioned in the online application. The uploaded plan does not reflect 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 programmes including multi-disciplinary programmes. The multipurpose hall is not reflected in the building plan. (ii) The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. with intake of 160, B.Sc. with intake of 140, BCA & PGDCA with intake of 20, B.Com. with intake of 160, BBA with intake of 40, M.A. with intake of 40, M.Com. with intake of 40, M.Sc. (Physics) with intake of 20, M.Sc. with intake of 25 combined intake of 645 which comes to 1810 students in accordance with the duration of the courses. Further, the total built-up area is 4719.82 sq. mtr. and earmarked built-up area for teacher education programmes is 2360.11 sq. mtr. The sufficiency of remaining built-up area (4719.82sq.mtr.-2360.11sq.mtr. = 2359.71 sq. mtr.) for multidisciplinary courses (645 intake) cannot be ascertained."

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

**No one** from **Shri Pragya Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 339 (1/2), 340, 342, 343 (1/2), 349, Pragya Road, Bijainagar, Dist - Beawar Road, Ajmer, Rajasthan - 305624** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 18.02.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. That the building plan of the institution has been duly approved by the Assistant Engineer, Masuda Sub-Division. The omission of the date on the earlier uploaded copy was

purely inadvertent. A revised building plan bearing the date and duly approved by the competent authority is now being uploaded for kind consideration. 2. It is further submitted that the revised building plan is duly signed by the Management of the Institution, and the signed copy is being submitted herewith in compliance with the NCTE norms. 3. Regarding address variation, it is respectfully submitted that the address mentioned in the online application and the building plan pertains to the same premises. The difference in the district name has occurred due to administrative reorganization of districts. As per the newly constituted districts, Bijainagar now falls under Beawar District. However, on the NCTE online portal, the district field is still reflecting Ajmer District, and therefore Ajmer District was selected in the online application. It is respectfully clarified that there is no change in the location, land, or premises of the institution. Supporting documentary evidence in this regard is enclosed for kind perusal. 4. The revised building plan clearly reflects all requisite details as per NCTE norms, including: o Total land area of the institution: 21326.33 Sq. M. o Total built-up area: 4719.82 Sq. M. o Demarcated land area and built-up area earmarked separately for each course, including teacher education programmes and proposed multi-disciplinary programmes, within the same premises. 5. The Multipurpose Hall has now been clearly shown and properly labeled in the revised building plan in full compliance with the NCTE requirements. In view of the above clarifications and submission of the revised, dated, duly signed and complete building plan, the deficiency pointed out at Observation (i) stands fully complied with. The same may kindly be accepted and the institution may be considered for further necessary action. 2. Subject: Revised Reply to Observation (ii) regarding sufficiency of built-up area and proposal for separate ITEP building – Reg. Respected Sir, with reference to the observation at point (ii) communicated by the Hon'ble Western Regional Committee, NCTE, it is respectfully submitted as under: That the institution is conducting various undergraduate and postgraduate programmes as mentioned in the observation. Although the approved annual intake of all non-teacher education (multidisciplinary) programmes is 645 students, it is respectfully submitted that the actual enrolled student strength of the institution has remained much lower and stable during the last three academic years, as detailed below: • Academic Year 2021–22: 750 students • Academic Year 2022–23: 700 students • Academic Year 2023–24: 760 students Thus, the average actual student enrollment is approximately 750 students, which is significantly lower than the

maximum permissible student strength calculated on the basis of approved intake and duration of the courses. It is further submitted that the total built-up area of the institution is 4719.82 Sq. M., out of which 2360.11 Sq. M. is exclusively earmarked and demarcated for teacher education programmes, strictly in accordance with the NCTE norms. The remaining 2359.71 Sq. M. of built-up area is exclusively earmarked and utilized for multidisciplinary (non-teacher education) programmes being conducted within the same campus. The adequacy of the remaining built-up area may kindly be appreciated in view of the following facts: 1. The multidisciplinary programmes are conducted in different time slots / shifts, ensuring optimum utilization of classrooms, laboratories and common facilities, without any overlap with the teacher education programmes. 2. The available built-up area of 2359.71 Sq. M., together with existing infrastructure such as classrooms, laboratories, computer labs, seminar halls, library and other common facilities, is adequate to cater to the actual student strength of approximately 750 students. 3. The institution maintains clear physical demarcation and separate scheduling for teacher education programmes and multidisciplinary programmes, thereby ensuring strict compliance with NCTE norms and avoiding congestion or infrastructural overlap. Further, it is most respectfully submitted that after receipt of the Refusal Order, the Management Committee of the institution has taken a conscious and well-considered decision and has passed a formal resolution to construct a separate, independent building exclusively for the ITEP programme. The proposed ITEP building shall be entirely independent, with separate classrooms, laboratories, multipurpose hall, library, staff rooms and other infrastructural facilities, strictly as per NCTE norms. The Management has already initiated the planning process, including preparation of architectural drawings, area calculations and financial arrangements for the proposed ITEP building. The institution is fully committed to ensuring complete infrastructural segregation of the ITEP programme and enhanced long-term compliance with NCTE requirements. A copy of the Management Resolution approving the construction of a new ITEP building, along with a conceptual plan / proposal note, is being enclosed herewith for kind reference. A revised area statement and floor-wise utilization plan, clearly indicating the present allocation of built-up area for multidisciplinary programmes, is also enclosed for ready verification. In view of the above clarifications, actual student enrollment data, adequacy of existing built-up area, and the firm and documented commitment of the Management

to construct a separate ITEP building, it is respectfully submitted that the observation at point (ii) stands satisfactorily complied with, and the same may kindly be accepted and the institution considered for further necessary action.”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on March, 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 27.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 27.10.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee, in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution submitted written submissions wherein it claimed that the building plan of the institution has been duly approved by the competent authority and that the earlier omission of the date on the uploaded building plan was inadvertent. The institution stated that a revised building plan bearing the date and duly signed by the competent authority and the management has now been submitted. It was further claimed that the variation in the address mentioned in the building plan and the online application arose due to administrative reorganization of districts and that both addresses pertain to the same premises. The institution also submitted that the revised building plan reflects the total land area, total built-up area,

demarcated area for each programme, and the multipurpose hall in compliance with NCTE norms. With regard to sufficiency of built-up area, the appellant institution claimed that the total built-up area of the institution is 4719.82 sq. meters, out of which 2360.11 sq. meters has been earmarked for teacher education programmes and the remaining 2359.71 sq. meters for multidisciplinary programmes. The institution further claimed that the actual student enrolment during recent academic years has remained around 750 students, and that the existing infrastructure is adequate in view of staggered scheduling and separate utilization of facilities. The appellant institution further submitted that the Management Committee has passed a resolution to construct a separate and independent building exclusively for the ITEP programme, and that planning for the proposed building has been initiated. The institution accordingly requested that the above submissions and documents be considered while deciding the appeal.

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

- (i) The appellant has failed to demonstrate adequacy of land and built-up area vis-à-vis total cumulative intake of all existing and proposed programmes, including ITEP. The claim of infrastructure is unsupported by approved documentary evidence as the record establishes that the institution is conducting multiple programmes (including non-teacher education

courses), each requiring separate and norms-prescribed infrastructural allocation. The institution has not disclosed programme-wise infrastructural allocation for multiple running courses, thereby suppressing the actual requirement and inflating claims of sufficiency. The submissions lack programme-wise demarcation and integrated assessment, and reliance on fragmented/functional utilisation is impermissible. Hence, compliance with NCTE Regulations remains unestablished.

- (ii) The institution has submitted multiple layout drawings/building plans; however, the same do not constitute a comprehensive, duly approved and regulation-compliant building plan as required under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The plans placed on record: do not form a single consolidated approved building plan reflecting the complete institutional infrastructure; lack clear certification/approval by the competent local authority evidencing statutory sanction of the entire building; do not provide integrated details of total land area, total built-up area, FSI/FAR, and programme-wise earmarking of facilities; are presented as segregated floor/layout drawings, thereby precluding holistic assessment of compliance with prescribed norms. Accordingly, the appellant has failed to establish submission of a duly approved and complete building plan in terms of the Regulations.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply and supporting documents; and the deficiencies were specifically identified and communicated. The grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility, infrastructural adequacy, and regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The deficiencies identified are substantive and foundational in nature and relate to threshold conditions for grant of recognition. They cannot be treated as technical irregularities capable of post facto rectification by explanation. It is settled that grant of recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is not automatic upon submission of an application. Recognition is conditional upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the statutory framework at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by applying for recognition. In the present case, despite adequate opportunity granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish

fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

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

#### IV. DECISION: -

After 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 WRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 27.10.2025 issued by WRC is confirmed.

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Shri Pragya Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 339 (1/2), 340, 342, 343 (1/2), 349, Pragya Road, Bijainagar, Dist - Beawar Road, Ajmer, Rajasthan - 305624.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.

3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Block-4, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan Shiksha Sankul, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302015.



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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-48/E-397513/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202515479 / E- 89760

Shaildevi Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 763/2, Janjiri Road, Anda, Durg, Chhattisgarh - 491221 <b>APPELLANT</b>	<b>Vs</b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector - 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 <b>RESPONDENT</b>
--	-----------	--

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. K. N. Mishra, Principal</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **Shaildevi Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 763/2, Janjiri Road, Anda, Durg, Chhattisgarh - 491221** dated 26.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202505245325/CHATTISGARH/2025/REJC/762** dated 27.10.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has not uploaded Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 2. The institution has not uploaded Exemption Certificate (12A) issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 3. The institution has not uploaded Building Plan approved by the Competent Authority of State Government mentioning the name of applicant institution, Society, 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 area and built-up area for the teacher education programmes including multi-disciplinary programmes. 4. The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. with intake of 60, B.Sc. with intake of 120, BCA with intake of 30, B.Com. with intake of 60, MSW with intake of 40, M.Com. with intake of 20, M.Sc. with intake of 40 so cumulative intake (complete duration) of 1010. Further, the sanctioned intake of existing teacher education programme i.e. B.Ed. with intake of 100, D.El.Ed. with intake of 100, B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. with intake of 100 cumulative intake (complete duration) of 800. The institution has applied for 24 units of ITEP programme so cumulative intake (complete duration) of 4800. The sufficiency of land area and built-up area for 6610 intake of multidisciplinary courses and teacher education programmes that includes proposed ITEP cannot be ascertained. 5. The website of institution has not been updated and maintained in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time."

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

**Dr. K. N. Mishra, Principal of Shaildevi Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 763/2, Janjiri Road, Anda, Durg, Chhattisgarh - 491221** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant

institution submitted that "Due to lack of knowledge, unfortunately we have submitted wrong entry in the unit for the multiple courses! Requesting you kindly consider our case for further consideration, so that we can overcome our mistake. Thank you for your understanding."

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 31.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 27.10.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee after consideration of the matter in the present meeting. The Appeal Committee considered the matter in the present meeting and examined the Appeal Report, records on file, documents submitted by the appellant institution, the institution submitted written submissions stating that an incorrect entry regarding the units of multiple courses had been made in the application due to lack of knowledge, and requested that the same may be considered as an inadvertent error and the case

be reconsidered accordingly. The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution, Shaildevi Mahavidyalaya, Anda, Durg (Chhattisgarh), vide its submission dated 24.02.2026 (affidavit) placed on record, has furnished its reply along with supporting documents in response to the observations communicated by the Council. The Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that it is situated in a rural area of District Durg and that the competent authorities for authentication and approval of building-related documents are the Sarpanch and Sachiv of Gram Panchayat, Anda, along with the Sub-Engineer of the Rural Engineering Services Sub-Division, Durg, functioning under the PWD. It was stated that the building permissions and Building Completion Certificate (BCC) related to built-up area are being processed/authorized by the said competent authorities. The appellant institution further submitted that it possesses sufficient land measuring 8300 sq. m. (Khasra No. 763/2) along with additional land, and a total built-up area of 9181.92 sq. m., for smooth conduct of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). It was submitted that the institution has earmarked and furnished details of land and built-up area across different blocks within the campus, as under:

- (i) Block A: Built-up area of 4325.47 sq. m. for B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. programmes;
- (ii) Block B: Built-up area of 3109.98 sq. m. for B.Sc.B.Ed. and proposed ITEP programme;
- (iii) Block C: Built-up area of 228.91 sq. m. for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) activities;
- (iv) Block D: Built-up area of 1517.56 sq. m. (on separate land measuring 2500 sq. m., Khasra No. 763/3) for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) activities.

The appellant institution submitted that Blocks A and B are fully dedicated for Teacher Education Programmes, while Blocks C and D are earmarked for multidisciplinary (MDI) programmes, with a combined built-up area of 1746.47 sq. m. for MDI purposes. The institution further submitted that it is running multiple undergraduate and postgraduate programmes as part of its multidisciplinary status, including: Undergraduate programmes: B.A., B.Sc., B.Com., B.C.A., B.Sc. (Computer Science), B.Lib.; Postgraduate programmes: M.Sc. (Chemistry), M.Com., M.Sc. (Computer Science), PGDCA, PG Diploma in Yoga, and Master of Social

Welfare (MSW). It was submitted that all such multidisciplinary programmes are being conducted successfully within the campus in accordance with applicable norms. The appellant institution, through the affidavit, declared that it fulfills all requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and that all mandatory documents have been submitted with due approval from the competent authorities. The institution affirmed that the infrastructure, land, and built-up area are adequate and compliant for conducting the ITEP programme and that all submissions are supported by verified documents.

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

- (i) The appellant has failed to demonstrate adequacy of land and built-up area vis-à-vis total cumulative intake of all existing and proposed programmes, including ITEP. The claim of infrastructure (9181.92 sq. m. built-up area/8300 sq. m. land) is unsupported by approved documentary evidence as the record establishes that the institution is conducting multiple programmes (including non-teacher education courses), each requiring separate and norms-prescribed infrastructural allocation. The institution has not disclosed programme-wise infrastructural allocation for multiple

running courses, thereby suppressing the actual requirement and inflating claims of sufficiency. The submissions lack programme-wise demarcation and integrated assessment, and reliance on fragmented/functional utilisation is impermissible. Hence, compliance with NCTE Regulations remains unestablished.

- (ii) The appellant has failed to establish that the authorities issuing building approvals (Gram Panchayat/Sarpanch/Sachiv/Sub-Engineer) are legally recognized as “competent authority” under applicable State laws, as no statutory notification has been produced. The documents submitted are fragmented layout drawings, lacking integrated land and built-up details, FSI/FAR, and programme-wise earmarking, rendering them non-compliant with NCTE Regulations. Accordingly, submission of a valid, approved building plan is not established.
- (iii) The institution has failed to submit a valid and authenticated 12A Exemption Certificate issued by the competent authority. No documentary evidence has been furnished to establish compliance with statutory financial requirements.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply and supporting documents; and the deficiencies were specifically identified and communicated. The grounds of refusal pertain to essential statutory requirements governing eligibility, infrastructural adequacy, and regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The deficiencies identified are substantive and foundational in nature and relate to threshold conditions for grant of recognition. They cannot be treated as technical irregularities capable of post facto rectification by explanation. It is settled that grant of recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is not automatic upon submission of an application. Recognition is conditional upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the statutory framework at the time of consideration. An applicant institution does not acquire any vested, accrued, or equitable right merely by applying for recognition. In the present case, despite adequate opportunity granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the

Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

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

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

**After 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 WRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 27.10.2025 issued by WRC is confirmed.**

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

उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

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

- 1. The Principal, Shaildevi Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 763/2, Janjiri Road, Anda, Durg, Chhattisgarh - 491221.**
- 2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**

3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Government of Chhattisgarh, First floor, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh, 492002.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-51/E-397525/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLNRC202615515 / E-89760

Franklin College of Education, Khasra No. 1632, 1639, 1631, 1632, Gousabad Chinkipora, Sopore, Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir – 193201	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>The Representative</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF ORDER**

The appeal of **Franklin College of Education, Khasra No. 1632, 1639, 1631, 1632, Gousabad Chinkipora, Sopore, Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir – 193201** dated 18.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-NRC-299074118/JAMMU AND KASHMIR/2021/Recognition Order** dated 25.11.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that the appellant has been granted only one unit instead of two units.

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

The Representative from of **Franklin College of Education, Khasra No. 1632, 1639, 1631, 1632, Gousabad Chinkipora, Sopore, Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir – 193201** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “Appeal for Enhancement of Intake Capacity from 50 to 100 Seats in B.Ed. Programme” Respected Sir/Madam, With due respects, I have the submission that Franklin College of Education, recognized by the National Council for Teacher Education and affiliated to the University of Kashmir, was granted recognition for the B.Ed. Programme vide Recognition Order No. F. No. NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-NRC-299074118/JAMMU AND KASHMIR/2021 dated 25/11/2025, whereby the approved intake has been restricted to 50 seats against the institution’s infrastructurally supported capacity of 100 seats. It is respectfully submitted that the institution is fully compliant with the norms and standards prescribed under the applicable NCTE Regulations for an intake of 100 seats with respect to land, building, instructional facilities, library, laboratories, ICT resources, financial provisions, and other mandatory requirements. The causes of restriction to 50 seats were illuminated to college representative by Regional Director, NRC, NCTE, New Delhi herself on Friday 28/11/2025 at 10:30 A.M. in her office in a meeting with her. The director was very much sympathetic in identifying the shortcomings and deficiencies as under:-

1. Non-approval of some Assistant Professors for want of NET/Ph.D. qualification in addition to prescribed academic qualifications of M.A., M.Ed., and M.Sc. M.Ed.
2. Non-approval of a few Assistant Professors engaged on contractual basis, as they

were not regular and on full time basis. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the institution has already complied fully with all the observations raised by NRC, NCTE. The compliance measures undertaken are as under: The posts of Assistant Professors were re-advertised strictly in accordance with the prescribed eligibility conditions under the NCTE Regulations and University norms in daily newspaper and social media. All Assistant Professors have now been appointed on regular basis, possessing the requisite academic qualifications along with NET/Ph.D., as applicable All Assistant Professors who were earlier engaged on-contractual basis have been confirmed and regularized against duly sanctioned posts by way of a formal resolution passed in a duly convened meeting of the Board of Trust. (Copy of the resolution enclosed). The updated teaching faculty list has been duly prepared in the prescribed format and has been counter-signed and authenticated by the affiliating body, i.e., the Dean, College Development Council (DCDC), University of Kashmir. The Assistant Professor at S. No. 2 in faculty Performa, namely Ms. Ausmat Gul Appointed in 2010 not having NET/Ph.D. but having degree of M.A. and M.Ed. full fills the norms of appointment and eligibility criteria made by NCTE in 2014. An Affidavit duly notarized acknowledging all necessary details on oath regarding the compliance of all related details is attached here with. Thus, at present, the institution has a fully compliant and approved faculty strength, commensurate with the norms prescribed for an intake capacity of 100 seats in the B.Ed. Programme. In view of the above facts and full compliance of the matters, it is most humbly submitted and requested that the competent authority may kindly reconsider the case of the institution and grant enhancement of intake capacity from 50 seats to 100 seats at the earliest, preferably on or before 1st March 2026, as the class work and admission process for the current academic session 2025–26 are scheduled to be completed by that date. Any delay in conveying the decision is likely to result in an irreparable loss of 50 seats to the institution, for the current session. The request is, therefore, made in accordance with the NCTE Regulations and in the larger interest of teacher education and the institution. The institution undertakes to maintain continued compliance with all provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules, and Regulations, as amended from time to time. An early and favorable consideration of this representation is very much expected on humanitarian grounds and decision will be granted by going through the validity of the facts and realities in the above representation. Waiting anxiously for the decision at your end.”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 28.01.2021. The NRC granted recognition to the appellant institution for B.Ed. programme for 50 students (one unit).

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunity to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, which has filed the present appeal seeking enhancement of intake capacity in the B.Ed. programme from 50 to 100 seats. The appellant institution submitted that it was granted recognition for the B.Ed. programme vide order dated 25.11.2025 with an intake of 50 seats, though it claims to possess infrastructure adequate for 100 seats. It was further submitted that the restriction of intake was on account of deficiencies relating to (i) non-approval of certain Assistant Professors lacking NET/Ph.D. qualifications, and (ii) engagement of some faculty on contractual basis. The institution stated that it has since rectified the said deficiencies by re-advertising faculty positions in accordance with NCTE Regulations and affiliating University norms, appointing qualified faculty on regular basis, and regularizing earlier contractual faculty through a resolution of the management. It was submitted that the updated faculty list has been prepared in the prescribed format and duly authenticated by the affiliating body, i.e., the Dean, College Development Council, University of Kashmir. The institution also stated that one faculty member appointed prior to 2014

without NET/Ph.D. fulfills eligibility as per applicable NCTE norms. A notarized affidavit affirming compliance has also been submitted. Further, in response to the communication dated 19.03.2026, the appellant institution submitted that it has furnished the Teaching Staff Proforma duly attested by the Registrar of the University of Kashmir, uploaded the faculty details on its official website, and submitted the proceedings of the duly constituted Selection Committee along with relevant documents relating to academic qualifications and appointments of faculty members. It was also submitted that the experience certificate of the Principal has been enclosed. The institution further submitted that additional appointments of faculty were made and subsequently approved by the University, and that all supporting documents have been placed on record. It was also stated that an authorized representative has been nominated by the management to represent the institution before NCTE, and a duly sworn affidavit covering all submissions has been filed. The appellant institution reiterated that it is fully compliant with the applicable NCTE norms and standards for an intake of 100 seats and requested consideration of its case for enhancement of intake accordingly.

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

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

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, having regard to the above judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the case, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 25.11.2025 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 remand back the case 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 remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Franklin College of Education, Khasra No. 1632, 1639, 1631, 1632, Gousabad Chinkipora, Sopore, Baramulla, Jammu & Kashmir – 193201.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Mini Block Civil Secretariat, Jammu, J&K.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-54/E-397589/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202615518/E-89760

Raghuveer Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. 124, Vill Thaloj, Bhikharipurkala, Jaunpur, Sujanganj to Machalishahar Road, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh - 222143 <b>APPELLANT</b>	<b>Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 <b>RESPONDENT</b>
--	-----------	---

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>The Representative</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

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

The appeal of **Raghuveer Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. 124, Vill Thaloi, Bhikharipurkala, Jaunpur, Sujanganj to Machalishahar Road, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh - 222143** dated 18.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2627202505083880/UTTAR PRADESH/2025/REJC/1829** dated 27.11.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has uploaded the Building Safety Certificate dated 26.08.2025 issued by Aadishashi Abhiyanta, PWD, Jaunpur. In the said Certificate the Khasra Number on which the building of the institution is constructed, is not mentioned. 2. The institution has uploaded the Building Completion Certificate signed by Gram Pradhan in place of Competent Authority. 3. The institution has not uploaded the No Objection Certificate for offering ITEP issued by Veer Bahadur Singh Purvanchal University, Jaunpur. 4. The institution has uploaded the Building Plan signed by Gram Pradhan, Abhiyanta Jila Panchayat. As per the Building Plan and Building Completion Certificate uploaded by the institution, the built-up area earmarked for ITEP does not match."

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

The Representative from **Raghuveer Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. 124, Vill Thaloi, Bhikharipurkala, Jaunpur, Sujanganj to Machalishahar Road, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh - 222143** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The revised Building Safety Certificate dated 09/01/2026 issued by Sahayak Abhiyanta, PWD, Jaunpur, U.P. is attached. In this Certificate, the Khasra number on which the building of the institution is constructed is mentioned. 2. The revised Building Completion Certificate of the institution signed by the Consulting Architect, Gram Pradhan, Abhiyanta Jila Panchayat (Competent Government Authority), Principal and Manager are attached. 3. The institution has been granted Autonomous Status from UGC, New Delhi. The Governing body of Institution has granted permission to submit application for offering the course of ITEP from the session 2026-27. Hence NOC for offering ITEP issued by Veer Bahadur Singh Purvanchal

University, Jaunpur is not required. 4. Required corrections have been done in the Building Plan signed by the Gram Pradhan, Abhiyanta Jila Panchayat. Now the Building Plan and Building Completion Certificate attached have same built-up area earmarked for ITEP.”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 ITEP Course on 30.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 27.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution in respect of its appeal concerning refusal of recognition for the ITEP programme. The Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that, in response to the deficiencies pointed out by the Regional Committee, it has furnished a revised Building Safety Certificate dated 09.01.2026 issued by the Sahayak Abhiyanta, PWD, Jaunpur (Uttar Pradesh), wherein the Khasra number of the land on which the institution is situated has been duly mentioned. The appellant institution further submitted that a revised Building Completion Certificate has been furnished, duly signed by the Consulting Architect, Gram Pradhan, Abhiyanta, Zila Panchayat, along with the Principal and Manager,

indicating compliance with the requirements. It was also submitted that the institution has been granted autonomous status by UGC, New Delhi, and that the Governing Body has permitted submission of the application for the ITEP programme from the academic session 2026–27. On this basis, the institution stated that a No Objection Certificate from Veer Bahadur Singh Purvanchal University, Jaunpur is not required. The institution further submitted that necessary corrections have been carried out in the Building Plan, which has been signed by the Gram Pradhan and Abhiyanta, Zila Panchayat, and that the built-up area indicated in the Building Plan now corresponds with that mentioned in the Building Completion Certificate for the ITEP programme. The appellant institution submitted that the above documents have been uploaded in support of its compliance with the deficiencies pointed out earlier.

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) The revised Building Safety Certificate dated 09.01.2026, issued by Sahayak Abhiyanta, PWD, Jaunpur, does not establish a clear, verifiable relation between the certified structure, land records and approved building plan. No corroborative, authenticated documents have been furnished to ensure consistency across records. Accordingly, compliance with Regulation 8 remains unsubstantiated and incomplete
- (ii) The revised BCC continues to bear signatures of Gram Pradhan and other local functionaries without any statutory proof establishing them as competent authority under applicable State laws. The certificate is not shown to be issued by a recognized Government authority authorized to certify building completion, thereby failing to meet the mandatory requirement under NCTE Regulations. The deficiency remains unrectified.

- (iii) The appellant's contention that NOC is not required due to autonomous status is unsupported by any statutory exemption under the NCTE Regulations. The requirement of NOC/consent from the affiliating body/University is mandatory, and internal approval by the Governing Body cannot substitute statutory compliance. The deficiency under Regulation 7 remains unfulfilled.
- (iv) Although the appellant claims consistency between Building Plan and BCC, it has failed to disclose programme-wise allocation of land and built-up area for all running courses. The submissions rely on aggregate and fragmented data, without approved, integrated, programme-wise demarcation, thereby suppressing actual infrastructural requirements and inflating claims of adequacy. Such reliance on functional/segmented utilisation is impermissible under Appendix-IV. Compliance with infrastructural norms remains unestablished.

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the 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 27.11.2025 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 NRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned refusal order dated 27.11.2025 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, Raghuveer Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. 124, Vill Thaloj, Bhikharipurkala, Jaunpur, Sujanganj to Machalishahar Road, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh - 222143.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**
3. **Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**

4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, Room No. 03, Naveen Bhawan, U.P. Secretariat, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226001.



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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-53/E-397727/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLERC202615527/ E-89760

Mata Manjharo Ajab Dayal Singh Teachers Training College, Plot No. 1321, 1322, Uttarwari Jungle, (Baradparwa), Dulour-Bihiya Path, Jagdishpur, Bhojpur, Bihar - 802158	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, ERC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF APPEAL

The appeal of **Mata Manjharo Ajab Dayal Singh Teachers Training College, Plot No. 1321, 1322, Uttarwari Jungle, (Baradparwa), Dulour-Bihiya Path, Jagdishpur, Bhojpur, Bihar – 802158** dated 26.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202505134600/BIHAR/2025/Recognition Order** dated 01.12.2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “As per Appeal Report:- The ERC has granted recognition to our institution for four units of ITEP Course.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**No one** from **Mata Manjharo Ajab Dayal Singh Teachers Training College, Plot No. 1321, 1322, Uttarwari Jungle, (Baradparwa), Dulour-Bihiya Path, Jagdishpur, Bhojpur, Bihar – 802158** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Our institution had submitted an application to ERC for ITEP course with Sixteen Units, however, keeping in view the infrastructure and other requirements as required in NCTE Regulations, our institution requested ERC to permit us eight units of ITEP course i.e. B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) (Two Units), B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) (Two Units), B.A. B.Ed. (Middle) (Two Units), B.Sc. B.Ed. (Middle) (Two Units). 2. The Letter of Intent (Lol) was issued by ERC to our institution for ITEP course wherein the number of Units decided by ERC were not mentioned, however, keeping in view the infrastructure and other requirements as required in NCTE Regulations, our institution requested ERC to permit us eight units of ITEP course i.e. B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) (Two Units), B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) (Two Units), B.A. B.Ed. (Middle) (Two Units), B.Sc. B.Ed. (Middle) (Two Units) and accordingly, the required staff for eight Units of ITEP course were appointed and submitted to ERC. 3. Thereafter the ERC issued us Show Cause Notice directing us to opt for four units of ITEP course. Left with no option we requested ERC to kindly permit us ITEP course with B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) (Two Units), B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) (Two Units) and accordingly, the ERC granted permission to our institution for ITEP course vide order F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202505134300/BIHAR/2025/Recognition Order,

dated 01.12.2025. 4. It is submitted that our institution had adequate infrastructure and instructional facilities for eight Units of ITEP course and moreover, the staff appointed in our institution for eight units of ITEP course are continuing, hence, it is requested that the Appeals Committee may kindly consider our request and permit us for eight units of ITEP course instead of four units, as decided by ERC.”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 29.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme or B.A. B.Ed. (2 units) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (2 Units) was granted by the ERC vide order dated 01.12.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee, in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee after consideration of the matter in the present meeting. The Appeal Committee examined the Appeal Report, records on file, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution. The appellant institution, in its written submissions, claimed that it had initially applied for sixteen units of the ITEP programme, but subsequently requested the Eastern Regional Committee to permit eight units in view of the available infrastructure and instructional facilities. The

institution further submitted that although the Letter of Intent did not specify the number of units, it had appointed faculty for eight units and submitted the details to the Regional Committee. It was further stated that the Regional Committee later issued a Show Cause Notice directing the institution to opt for four units, pursuant to which recognition was granted for B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) – two units and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) – two units vide order dated 01.12.2025. The institution contended that it possesses adequate infrastructure and faculty for eight units and therefore requested the Appeal Committee to permit eight units of the ITEP programme instead of the four units granted by the Regional Committee.

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, documents placed on record, and submissions of the appellant institution. The Appeal Committee upon independent, objective, and comprehensive examination of the entire material, and in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Committee finds that the appellant has failed to discharge the statutory burden of establishing entitlement for grant of additional units of the ITEP programme through cogent, credible, and verifiable documentary evidence, as required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended by the Amendment Regulations, 2021). The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The Appeal Committee noted that the institution has already been granted recognition for B.A. B.Ed. (2 units) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary – 2 units). It is further noted that Clause 1.8 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021 provides as under: **“ITEP shall be implemented in a phase wise manner starting from piloting in multidisciplinary HEIs/TEIs and thereby country wide expansion as per NEP 2020 timeframe.”** Accordingly, implementation and expansion of ITEP, including determination of number of units, is phased, conditional, and contingent upon demonstrable compliance with prescribed norms. Any enhancement of intake or additional units can be considered only upon verified operationalization and compliance, as assessed by the Regional Committee concerned.
- (ii) The appellant has failed to establish adequacy of land and built-up area vis-à-vis cumulative intake of all existing and proposed programmes, including ITEP. The record indicates that the institution is conducting multiple programmes, each requiring separate, norm-prescribed infrastructural allocation. However, the

appellant has not furnished programme-wise demarcation of land and built-up area, nor any approved and integrated infrastructural plan. The claim of adequacy is unsupported by verifiable documentary evidence and is based on aggregate and fragmented assertions, which are impermissible under the Regulations. Compliance with Appendix norms thus remains unestablished.

- (iii) The appellant has stated that faculty for eight units had been appointed. However: No faculty list duly approved by the affiliating University/body for eight units has been produced; No documentary proof of qualifications, appointments, or compliance with prescribed pupil–teacher ratio for enhanced intake is on record; The institution has not demonstrated compliance with NCTE Regulations, which mandates duly approved faculty commensurate with the number of units. The requirement of faculty adequacy for eight units remains unfulfilled. Effect of Show Cause Notice and Final Decision of ERC:

The Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the Appeal Report and material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, arbitrariness, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record establishes that adequate and reasonable opportunity was afforded to the appellant. The Committee further notes that determination of intake and number of units by the Regional Committee is based on verified adequacy of resources and compliance with statutory norms, and such determination is substantive and foundational, going to the root of eligibility. These cannot be treated as technical or curable irregularities. It is well settled that recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the prescribed norms under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). No institution acquires any vested or accrued right to recognition or intake in the absence of such compliance.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the mandatory provisions of the Act and Regulations through credible and verifiable documentary evidence. The decision of the Eastern Regional Committee is thus lawful, justified, and within its statutory jurisdiction, warranting no interference. Accordingly, in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no ground to

interfere with the impugned order dated 01.12.2025, which 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 issuance of impugned order for 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 order dated 01.12.2025 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, Mata Manjharo Ajab Dayal Singh Teachers Training College, Plot No. 1321, 1322, Uttarwari Jungle, (Baradparwa), Dulour-Bihiya Path, Jagdishpur, Bhojpur, Bihar – 802158.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Bihar Vikash Bhawan, Ground Floor, Near New Sachibalay, Bailey Road, Secretariat (Near New Sachibalay), Bihar 800 015.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-65/E-398527/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202615509/E-89760

Aakash Deep Teacher Training College, Khasra No. 1194/943, Harsh Road Sanwali, Dujod, Bajaj Gram Sanwali, Sikar, Rajasthan - 332021  <b>APPELLANT</b>	<b>Vs</b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075  <b>RESPONDENT</b>
---	-----------	--

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **Aakash Deep Teacher Training College, Khasra No. 1194/943, Harsh Road Sanwali, Dujod, Bajaj Gram Sanwali, Sikar, Rajasthan - 332021** dated 13.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / WRC / 26272028509162587 / RAJASTHAN / 2025 / REJC / 1615** 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 standalone 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 'Aakash Deep Teacher Training 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 Aakash Deep Teacher Training College, Khasra No. 1194/943, Harsh Road Sanwali, Dujod, Bajaj Gram Sanwali, Sikar, Rajasthan - 332021** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “Under instructions from and on behalf of Aakash Deep Teacher Training College, we hereby submit this legal reply to the notice issued by your good office pointing out certain deficiencies in our proposal for transformation into a Multidisciplinary Institution. At

the outset, it is respectfully submitted that the institution has always acted in a bona fide manner and with complete intention to comply with all provisions of the NCTE Guidelines. However, certain observations in the notice require factual and legal clarification, as detailed below: Specific Legal Clarification regarding State Government Certificate It is most respectfully submitted that the institution could not upload the certificate required under Clause 4.3(i) of the NCTE Guidelines, not due to any negligence or default on part of the institution, but solely because the State Government of Rajasthan has not yet opened the application process / portal for submission of applications for issuance of the said certificate. In absence of an operational application mechanism by the competent State authority, it is legally and practically impossible for the institution to obtain and upload the said certificate at this stage. It is a settled principle of law that: "No person can be penalized for non-compliance of a condition which is beyond his control." (Lex non cogit ad impossibilia – the law does not compel a man to do what he cannot possibly perform.) Therefore, attributing deficiency to the institution for non-submission of a document, when the State Government itself has not enabled the application process, would be unjust, arbitrary, and contrary to principles of natural justice. Bonafide Conduct of the Institution The institution assures this Hon'ble Authority that the moment the State Government opens the application process, the institution shall immediately apply for the required certificate and the same shall be uploaded without any delay whatsoever. Thus, there is no willful default, but only a procedural impossibility caused due to non-initiation of the process by the competent State authority. Prayer In view of the above facts and legal position, it is most humbly prayed that: 1. The observation regarding non-submission of the State Government certificate may kindly be kept in abeyance till such time the application process is opened by the State Government, and 2. The institution may not be subjected to any adverse action for a circumstance beyond its control. The institution remains fully committed to regulatory compliance and shall submit all required documents at the earliest legally possible opportunity."

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 14.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 29.01.2026 & 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held on 18.02.2026 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present Meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. 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 the required State Government certificate under Clause 4.3(i) of the NCTE Guidelines could not be uploaded as the State Government of Rajasthan has not yet opened the application process/portal for issuance of the said certificate. The institution contended that the non-submission of the certificate is due to circumstances beyond its control and not due to any negligence on its part. The institution further stated that it will apply for and submit the required certificate immediately upon the State Government initiating the application process, and requested that the deficiency regarding the State Government certificate be kept in abeyance until such time the application mechanism is made operational.

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) The appellant has failed to submit a duly executed Memorandum of Collaboration (MoC). Further, the mandatory State Government Recommendation Certificate has not been furnished. The plea of policy constraints is legally untenable in absence of any notified exemption. The deficiency remains unrectified.
- (ii) The appellant has not established that the collaborating institutions are affiliated to the same University, nor has it produced approval of the affiliating University for the proposed collaboration, as required. The deficiency remains unfulfilled. No authenticated documentary evidence has been submitted to demonstrate compliance with the prescribed distance criteria. The deficiency remains uncured.

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

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Western Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 14.11.2025 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 WRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned refusal order dated 14.11.2025 issued by WRC is confirmed.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Aakash Deep Teacher Training College, Khasra No. 1194/943, Harsh Road Sanwali, Dujod, Bajaj Gram Sanwali, Sikar, Rajasthan - 332021.
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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-66/E-397243/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLNRC202615528/E-89760

Amity Institute of Education, Amity University, Khasra No. 39/4, Amity Road, Patuadi, Gwalior, Punchgaon, Haryana, Gurgaon – 122413 <b>APPELLANT</b>	<b>Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 <b>RESPONDENT</b>
---	-----------	---

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Ashish Kumar Singh, Joint Registrar</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **Amity Institute of Education, Amity University, Khasra No. 39/4, Amity Road, Patuadi, Gwalior, Punchgaon, haryana, Gurgaon - 122413** dated 27.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2627202505215014/HARYANA/2025/REJC/2009** dated 27.11.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution has uploaded the Building Plan approved by the DTO, STP, CTP and the Superintendent, HUDA, Panchkula mentioning the total area for ITEP as 137566.69 Sqm. and built-up area as 3620.58 Sqm. However, the Khasra No./ Plot No. is not mentioned thereon. The approval letter issued by the Competent Government authority is also not uploaded. The Building Completion Certificate uploaded is issued by the Architect who is not the Competent Government Authority. The institution has not uploaded an Affidavit on Rs. 100/-non-judicial stamp paper in prescribed format in respect of land and built-up area. The institution was required to upload the certified registered land documents issued by the Registering Authority or civil authority concerned. The institution has uploaded the photograph of Ramp, Lift and Fire Safety equipment. However, the institution has not uploaded the certificate from the Competent Government Authority to the effect that the institution's campus, building, furniture etc. is barrier free/Accessible for PWDs. Building Safety Certificate uploaded is issued by the Architect who is not the Competent Government Authority."

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

**Sh. Ashish Kumar Singh, Joint Registrar of Amity Institute of Education, Amity University, Khasra No. 39/4, Amity Road, Patuadi, Gwalior, Punchgaon, haryana, Gurgaon – 122413** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The required Building Plan with Khasra No./Plot No. is available and enclosed as Annexure-2. 2. The approval letter issued by the Competent Government Authority is available and enclosed as Annexure –3. 3. The Building Completion Certificate APPROVED by the Competent Government Authority is available and enclosed as Annexure-4. 4. The requisite affidavit on 100/- non-judicial stamp paper, as per the

prescribed format, is available and enclosed as Annexure-5. 5. Certified registered land documents issued by the concerned Registering Authority / Civil Authority, is available and enclosed as Annexure-6. 6. The certificate from the Competent Government Authority certifying the campus/building as barrier-free and accessible for Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) is available and enclosed as Annexure-7. 7. Building Safety Certificate approved by the Competent Government Authority is available and enclosed as Annexure-8. The appellant institution vide letter dated 24.03.2026 made the additional submission. –

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 ITEP Course on 26.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 27.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Amity Institute of Education, Amity University, Haryana (Gurgaon/Manesar), a multidisciplinary university established under the Haryana Private Universities (Amendment) Act, 2010, which has filed the present appeal against refusal of recognition for the ITEP

programme. The appellant institution submitted that the deficiencies pointed out in the refusal order primarily related to non-submission/deficiencies in building plan, building completion certificate, land documents, affidavit regarding land and built-up area, and certificates relating to safety and accessibility. In response, the institution stated that it has now submitted the required documents, including: (i) building plan duly reflecting Khasra/Plot details; (ii) approval letter issued by the competent Government authority; (iii) building completion certificate approved by the competent Government authority; (iv) affidavit on ₹100/- non-judicial stamp-paper in the prescribed format; (v) certified registered land documents issued by the competent registering authority; (vi) certificate from the competent Government authority certifying that the campus/building is barrier-free and accessible for Persons with Disabilities; and (vii) building safety certificate issued by the competent Government authority. The appellant institution further submitted that, being a multidisciplinary university, it has earmarked specific land and built-up area exclusively for the ITEP programme. It was stated that a total land area of 3743.35 sq. m. and a built-up area of 3621.84 sq. m. have been earmarked for the programme, situated on the relevant Khasra number, and that these meet the minimum requirements prescribed under NCTE norms. It was also submitted that the above details have been furnished through a certificate issued by the competent authority of the University, and that the institution remains committed to maintaining infrastructure and other requirements in accordance with the NCTE Act, Rules, and Regulations. The appellant institution requested that, in view of the compliance submitted, its case may be considered for grant of recognition for the ITEP programme.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with various documents in purported fulfilment of the deficiencies cited in the refusal order. At the same time, the Committee observed that a substantial part of the material relied upon by the appellant institution was either not before the NRC at the time of passing the impugned order dated 27.11.2025 or requires authentication and factual verification by the competent Regional Committee.

The Appeal Committee observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication, additional documents submitted during appellate proceedings cannot be ignored outright. Reliance was placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in

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

Noting the submissions placed on record and the documents submitted, the Appeal Committee observes that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification on the basis of the submissions and documents placed before the Appeal Committee. In the interests of justice, the Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants limited interference, strictly within the statutory framework. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims and without diluting or negating the findings recorded in the impugned order, the Appeal Committee sets aside the order dated 27.11.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee. The Northern Regional Committee shall re-examine the case afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted during the appellate proceedings, and assess compliance with the applicable shortlisting criteria, the requirements of a bona fide multidisciplinary institution, and the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines, if applicable. The said Regional Committee shall conduct such verification strictly in accordance with law and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed timeframe. The said Regional Committee, being the statutory custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity, completeness, and genuineness of all connected records, including those forming part of the original application and the documents submitted during appellate proceedings, before passing any consequential order. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules, and Regulations. The appellant institution shall

forward to the said Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the said Regional Committee shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and the directions contained herein.

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

**After 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 27.11.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme with the directions specified hereinabove. The NRC shall take a reasoned and speaking decision after considering all documents and subsequent submissions of the appellant, including compliance with the deficiencies cited in the impugned order. The appellant institution is also directed to forward the documents submitted in appeal to the NRC within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.**

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

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

1. **The Principal, Amity Institute of Education, Amity University, Khasra No. 39/4, Amity Road, Patuadi, Gwalior, Punchgaon, haryana, Gurgaon - 122413.**
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, Directorate of Higher Education, Government of Haryana, Shiksha Sadan, Ground & 1st Floor, Sec-5, Panchkula, Haryana-134105.**



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-67/E-397277/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLSRC202515415/E-89760

Dr. Rajabather Tagore Womens Teacher Training College, Plot No. 12/1, Krishnaveni Nagar, Melpettai Post, Nolambur Road, Tindivanam Taluk, Kilgudalore Village, Villupuram, Tamilnadu - 604307	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Mr. U. Sadhustephen, Administrative Officer</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, SRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **Dr. Rajabather Tagore Womens Teacher Training College, Plot No. 12/1, Krishnaveni Nagar, Melpettai Post, Nolambur Road, Tindivanam Taluk, Kilgudalore Village, Villupuram, Tamilnadu - 604307** dated 24.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/SRC/2627202505265445/TAMIL NADU/2025/REJC/2205** dated 25.08.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "In the application form, the institution has mentioned itself as a Category 1 institution, however, on perusal of reply to SCN submitted by the institution, it is clear that the institution is not a category 1 institution, hence, not eligible to apply to ITEP course as per shortlisting criteria prescribed by the Council (NCTE) for processing of applications for ITEP from multidisciplinary institutions for academic session 2026-2027. NOC from the affiliating body for proposed course not uploaded."

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

**Mr. U. Sadhustephen, Administrative Officer of Dr. Rajabather Tagore Womens Teacher Training College, Plot No. 12/1, Krishnaveni Nagar, Melpettai Post, Nolambur Road, Tindivanam Taluk, Kilgudalore Village, Villupuram, Tamilnadu - 604307** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. Dr. Rajabather Tagore Women's Teacher Training College functions under the Indira Gandhi Jayanthi Memorial Educational Cultural Charitable Trust, alongside the Indira Gandhi Jayanthi Women's Arts and Science College, established in 1997, together, these institutions constitute a multidisciplinary educational establishment, offering programmes in Teacher Education, Arts, Science, Commerce, Management, and Computer Science. The Arts and Science College, affiliated with the University of Madras (Since 1997), Thiruvalluvar University (Since 2004), and Annamalai University (Since 2024), offers Undergraduate and Postgraduate programmes in Biochemistry, Nutrition & Dietetics, Mathematics, Computer Science, Commerce, Business Administration, English, and Tamil. The academic linkage between these departments and the Teacher Education College ensures integrated and multidisciplinary learning experiences for prospective teachers. We respectfully

**submit that our institution will obtain NAAC accreditation upon the completion of the first batch of the ITEP programme, in accordance with the prescribed guidelines. Therefore, we humbly request the NCTE (SRC) to reconsider our application and grant relaxation by holding the application for further consideration rather than rejecting or refusing it outright. This is our sincere and primary request for reconsideration by the NCTE (SRC).** 2. Sir, we respectfully submit that our institution has already applied for the NOC to the Government of Tamil Nadu, Higher Education Department on 22/09/2025. The process is currently under consideration by the competent authority, and we are **awaiting the official issuance of the NOC**. Therefore, we humbly request your good self to grant us reasonable time to fulfill this condition and to kindly consider our appeal favorably.”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 27.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the SRC vide order dated 25.08.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present Meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee,

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

- (i) The appellant has failed to establish eligibility under Category-I as required under the NCTE framework. The mere existence of an Arts and Science College under the same Trust does not constitute a “multidisciplinary institution” in terms of NCTE norms. No documentary evidence has been produced demonstrating an integrated institutional structure, statutory recognition, or approval as a multidisciplinary institution. In absence of such proof, the application is rendered non-maintainable at the threshold.
- (ii) The mandatory requirement of submission of No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the affiliating body under NCTE Regulations, 2014 remains unfulfilled. Mere application for NOC or pendency of approval does not amount to compliance. No NOC or exemption issued by the competent authority has been placed on record. The deficiency remains unrectified.
- (iii) The appellant’s request for relaxation or deferment on the ground of prospective compliance is legally untenable. The regulatory framework mandates demonstrable compliance at the time of consideration, and no relaxation can be granted contrary to statutory provisions or prescribed eligibility criteria. Future compliance or anticipated accreditation cannot cure present ineligibility.

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

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

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

18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 25.08.2025 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

After 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 SRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 25.08.2025 issued by SRC is confirmed.

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Dr. Rajabather Tagore Womens Teacher Training College, Plot No. 12/1, Krishnaveni Nagar, Melpettai Post, Nolambur Road, Tindivanam Taluk, Kilgudalore Village, Villupuram, Tamilnadu - 604307.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**
3. **Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**
4. **The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Govt. of Tamil Nadu, Fort St. George, Chennai, Tamil Nadu-600009.**



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-71/E-398726/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLSRC202515445/E-89760

CMA B.Ed. College, Khata No. New 3, OTC Road, Cubbonepet, Bangalore South, Karnataka - 560002	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Mr. Mohammed Ghouse, Administrator</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, SRC</b>
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<b>30.03.2026</b>
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	<b>22.04.2026</b>

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL**

The appeal of **CMA B.Ed. College, Khata No. New 3, OTC Road, Cubbonepet, Bangalore South, Karnataka - 560002** dated 24.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. APS02013/B.Ed./2011-12/28518** dated 09.05.2011 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The management is running PUC College for Women, Degree College for Women & State Open University study centre are being run in the same building along with B.Ed. programme, which is not permitted as per NCTE norms. 2. As per the VT report the built-up area of only 10870 sq. ft. is earmarked in a multistory building which is still under construction. As per the NCTE norms, 16,000 sq. ft. built up area is required for the B.Ed. course. 3. B.Ed. programme is conducted in 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor and the remaining floors are used for conducting other than Teacher Education Programme. 4. The institute has not submitted the original approved Building Plan from a Competent Govt. Authority. 5. The latest Building Completion Certificate from the Competent Government Engineer is not submitted. 6. The institution has not submitted the Land Usage Certificate from a Competent Govt. Authority. 7. The management has to submit 3 lakhs fixed deposit in joint name towards Reserved Fund from a Nationalized Bank for a duration of 5 years. 8. Non-Encumbrance Certificate from the Competent Government Authorized person / Authorities to be submitted. 9. Language learning lab is not available. 10. Psychology lab and Education technology lab needs to be strengthened. 11. Teaching Faculty is not as per NCTE norms/specifications."

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

**Mr. Mohammed Ghouse, Administrator of CMA B.Ed. College, Khata No. New 3, OTC Road, Cubbonepet, Bangalore South, Karnataka - 560002** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. Management is not running any course in same premises running any distance course also affidavit is submitted. 2. Built-up area is as per NCTE Norms that is 4936.11 sq. mt. 3. B.Ed. program is not running in 2 floor all 3 floors is used only for purposed of B.Ed. College affidavit is

also submitted. 4. Building Plan is approved by Competent Authority. 5. BCC is approved by authority enclosed. 6. Land Usage Certificate is enclosed. 7. FDR enclosed 5 lakhs plus 7 lakh with Form A. 8. New latest Non-EC is enclosed. 9. Language Lab is available. 10. Psycho Lab Strengthened. 11. As per NCTE Norms faculty is enclosed.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee noted that appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru by filing Writ Petition No. 34405 of 2025. The operative portion of the said order reads verbatim as under:

- (i) ***The petition is disposed of.***
- (ii) ***Liberty is reserved in favour of the petitioner to file an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 before the appropriate Appellate Authority.***
- (iii) ***If the petitioner files such an appeal before the appropriate authority within a period of eight (8) weeks from today, the Appellate Authority shall condone the delay on the part of the petitioner in filing such an appeal and dispose off the appeal on merits and in accordance with law.***
- (iv) ***Immediately upon the petitioner filing such an appeal, the Appellate Authority shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders after providing sufficient and reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and hearing the petitioner, in accordance with law.***
- (v) ***It is made clear that the present order is passed in the peculiar/special/unique facts and circumstances of the instant case***

***and this order shall not be treated as precedent nor shall it carry as precedential value for any purpose or whatsoever.”***

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

- (i) The Appeal Committee notes that recognition of the institution stood withdrawn in May 2011 and has not been restored at any point thereafter. The record further reflects that the concerned University has not extended or renewed affiliation subsequent to such withdrawal. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any order evidencing subsisting recognition, continuation of affiliation, or any judicial direction authorizing continued academic operation. In the absence of lawful recognition and valid affiliation, the institution cannot, in the eyes of law, be regarded as an existing or functional teacher education institution and is, for regulatory purposes, non-existent.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee further notes that the appellant institution has failed to produce any documentary evidence demonstrating continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff, including proof of appointment approval by the affiliating University or payment of salary. The faculty list placed on record is not approved by the competent affiliating authority, as mandatorily required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Grant or restoration of recognition in the absence of duly approved faculty would amount to sanctioning a grave, substantive, and continuing breach of the

statutory framework, striking at the very foundation of quality assurance in teacher education.

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, and in due compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 09.05.2011 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, holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Any further opportunity would be contrary to the NCTE Act, 1993 and destructive of regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 09.05.2011 passed by the Southern Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.**

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

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

- 1. The Principal, CMA B.Ed. College, Khata No. New 3, OTC Road, Cubbonepet, Bangalore South, Karnataka - 560002.**
- 2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**

3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-75/E-396912/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202314698/E-89760

St. Aloysius Institute of Technology, Survey No. 64, 84, 85, Gour, Jabalpur, Mandla Road, Gouraiya Ghat, Mandla Road, Madhya Pradesh – 482002	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **St. Aloysius Institute of Technology, Survey No. 64, 84, 85, Gour, Jabalpur, Mandla Road, Gouraiya Ghat, Mandla Road, Madhya Pradesh - 482002** dated 22.09.2023 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2526202405142832/MADHYA PRADESH/2024/REJC/1110** dated 25.06.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "(i) The Building Completion Certificate uploaded by the institution is not approved by the Competent Government Authority. In the uploaded BCC, Autonomous is not mentioned in the name of the institution i.e. St. Aloysius College. Electricity and Telephone connection Numbers are not mentioned in uploaded BCC. Total land area and Total built up area earmarked for teacher training programmes are not mentioned course-wise. Details of Land Use Certificate for Educational purposes from the concerned Govt Authorities/any other govt. local body is not mentioned by the institution. BCC is not approved by the competent govt. authority or authority of Jabalpur Cantonment Board. (ii) Copy of Online Fire Safety Certificate is not uploaded by the institution instead of that Offline Fire Safety Certificate is uploaded. The institution has not uploaded Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Madhya Pradesh verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Madhya Pradesh. (iii) The institution has not uploaded Building Safety Certificate in adherence of safety guidelines as prescribed by National/State Disaster Management Authority issued by Competent Government Authority. (iv) The institution has not uploaded No Objection Certificate from the Competent Authority of Ministry of Defence for introducing new course of Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) notified by NCTE vide Gazette Notification No.509 dated 26.10.2021. It is observed from Non-Encumbrance Certificate uploaded by the institution that the Ministry of Defence has allotted the land for the purpose of running St. Aloysius High School & RC Church. (v) The institution has not uploaded Building Plan approved by the Competent Authority of State Government indicating the Khasra/Plot/Survey No. and mentioning the total land area and 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 programmes

including multi-disciplinary programmes. (vi) The recommendation of the State govt. has not been received by WRC, NCTE.

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

**No one from St. Aloysius Institute of Technology, Survey No. 64, 84, 85, Gour, Jabalpur, Mandla Road, Gouraiya Ghat, Mandla Road, Madhya Pradesh - 482002** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "Since 2018 we have successfully completed two batches of B.Sc. B.Ed. It's our requires to please give concern to open B.A. B.Ed. also we fulfil all the NCTE criteria for the same"

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 20.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 25.06.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee, in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The

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

- (i) The appellant has failed to submit a valid Building Completion Certificate issued by the competent Government authority containing mandatory particulars, including course-wise earmarked built-up area, land use details, and statutory approvals, as required under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. No revised or compliant BCC has been furnished. The deficiency remains unrectified.
- (ii) The institution has not produced a Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent Government authority that is verifiable on the official portal of the State Fire Department. Submission of an offline certificate does not meet the requirement of authenticated and verifiable compliance under NCTE norms. The deficiency remains unfulfilled.
- (iii) No Building Safety Certificate issued by the competent Government authority in conformity with National/State Disaster Management guidelines has been submitted. The absence of such certification reflects non-compliance with mandatory safety norms under the Regulations
- (iv) The appellant has failed to furnish No Objection Certificate from the Ministry of Defence permitting use of the land for the proposed programme, despite the land being allotted for specific purposes as per the Non-Encumbrance Certificate. In absence of such permission, lawful use of land for the proposed course is not established.
- (v) The institution has not submitted a duly approved building plan issued by the competent Government authority indicating Khasra/Survey details and programme-wise demarcation of land and built-up area. This constitutes non-compliance with Appendix norms relating to infrastructure.

- (vi) The mandatory recommendation of the State Government has not been produced. No documentary evidence has been placed on record to establish compliance with this requirement.

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are

fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Western Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 25.06.2025 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 WRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 25.06.2025 issued by WRC is confirmed.

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, St. Aloysius Institute of Technology, Survey No. 64, 84, 85, Gour, Jabalpur, Mandla Road, Gouraiya Ghat, Mandla Road, Madhya Pradesh - 482002.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, 2nd floor, Annex-3, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh-462004.



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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-82/E-398959/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202615537/E-89760

RKDF University, Department of Education, Khata No. 487/1/1, 487/1/2, Gondermau, RGPV, Airport Bypass Road, Huzur, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh - 462033	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL**

The appeal of **RKDF University, Department of Education, Khata No. 487/1/1, 487/1/2, Gondermau, RGPV, Airport Bypass Road, Huzur, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh - 462033** dated 11.02.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202505154550/MADHYA PRADESH/2025/REJC/1493** dated 04.12.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “1. The institution has not uploaded recommendations of the State Government /UT Administration. 2. The institution has uploaded Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by the Ayushmati Education & Social Society letter dated 27.06.2017. However, the institution has not uploaded Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by the Competent Authority of State Government. 3. The Affidavit regarding land document has not been uploaded by the institution. 4. The institution has not uploaded all the list of admitted students for all running programmes along with supporting documents certified by the Affiliating University. 5. The institution has not uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey Number issued by Competent Government Authority. 6. The institution has not uploaded Building Safety Certificate in adherence of safety guidelines as prescribed by National/State Disaster Management Authority issued by Competent Government. 7. The institution has not uploaded latest Building Completion Certificate (BCC) in the prescribed format of NCTE (17 points) issued by the Competent Government Authority for all the courses being conducted in the premises. 8. The institution has not updated and maintained its website in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time. 9. The institution has not uploaded Building Plan approved by the Competent Authority of State Government mentioning the name of institution, Khara/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 programmes including multi-disciplinary programmes.”

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

**No one from RKDF University, Department of Education, Khata No. 487/1/1, 487/1/2, Gondermau, RGPV, Airport Bypass Road, Huzur, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh - 462033** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “The Vedica College of Education was established in the year 2006 at Airport Road Gandhi Nagar, Bhopal. After establishment of RKDF University, Bhopal and after the approval of Govt. of M.P. Department of Higher Education vide State Gazette notification No. 4437-245---(.) Dated 19-07-2011 (Copy Enclosed Annexure -1) & after the approval of Stature & Ordinance vide Govt. of M.P. Department of Higher Education M.P. State Gazette notification No. R-158-cc-2012-XXXVIII dated 01-05-2012 under the ordinance No. 9 Following Institutes shall be treated as Constituent Institute of Ram Krishan Dharmarth Foundation University, Bhopal. (Copy enclosed at Annexure 2). • J.k.jain memorial college of education, Bhopal. • Vedica college of education, Bhopal. • Vedica institute of technology, Bhopal. • Sri satya sai college of engineering, Bhopal. • Bhabha college of engineering, Bhopal. • Rkdf college of technology & research, Bhopal. • Vedica college of pharmacy, Bhopal. • Agnos college of technology, Bhopal. • Vedica college of pharmacy, (polytechnic), Bhopal. • Sri satya sai institute of pharmaceutical sciences, Bhopal. • Sri satya sai institute of pharmacy (polytechnic), Bhopal. • Dr. satyendra kumar memorial college of pharmacy, Bhopal. For the following Institute the following powers were also mentioned in ordinance No. 9. The above-mentioned departments/Institutes will be governed by the RKDF University, Bhopal and their decision shall be binding upon it. All administrative, Academic and financial powers would be vested with constituent Bodies, Boards and Authorities of the University. The College would work as a Teaching Department of the University copy enclosed at Annexure. -2. Due to this reason and after the approval of the competent authority, the Registrar, RKDF University, Bhopal has issued a No Objection Certificate for Vedica College of Education. 2. The Sponsoring Society Ayushmati Education & Social Society for RKDF University, Bhopal, as per Govt. of India Ministry of Finance Income Tax Department Letter dated 29-09-2025, is declared as a Charitable Trust and it works on a No Profit & No Loss basis. (Copy enclosed at Annexure - 3).”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 27.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 04.12.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

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

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

- (i) The appellant has failed to furnish the mandatory recommendation of the State Government/UT Administration as required for processing of ITEP applications. No document issued by the competent authority has been produced. The application remains incomplete
- (ii) The requirement of submission of a Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by the competent State Government authority remains unfulfilled. Reliance on certificates issued by the sponsoring society or Income Tax Department does not satisfy the statutory requirement under the NCTE Regulations
- (iii) The institution has not submitted the prescribed affidavit regarding land documents. Further, it has failed to furnish a complete list of admitted students for all programmes duly certified by the affiliating University, in violation of disclosure requirements under Regulations 7, 8 and 10
- (iv) No Land Use Certificate (CLU) issued by the competent Government authority indicating all relevant Khasra/Plot numbers has been produced, thereby failing to establish lawful use of land.
- (v) The institution has not submitted a Building Safety Certificate in accordance with National/State Disaster Management norms, nor a Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed NCTE format (17 points) issued by the competent authority. These deficiencies reflect non-compliance with mandatory safety and infrastructure norms.
- (vi) The institution has failed to demonstrate compliance with mandatory website disclosure requirements under Clauses 7(14), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014. No evidence has been furnished to establish that the website is updated as per norms.
- (vii) No duly approved building plan issued by the competent Government authority indicating Khasra/Plot details and programme-wise demarcation of land and built-up area has been submitted, rendering infrastructure compliance unverifiable.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable and adequate opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to furnish its reply

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

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

infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 04.12.2025 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 appellent institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, concluded that the WRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 04.12.2025 issued by WRC is confirmed.

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, RKDF University, Department of Education, Khata No. 487/1/1, 487/1/2, Gondermau, RGPV, Airport Bypass Road, Huzur, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh - 462033.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**
3. **Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**
4. **The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, 2nd floor, Annex-3, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh-462004.**



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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-87/E-398698/2026 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLERC202615532/E-89760

Bajali Teachers Training College, Plot No. 716, 568, 605, 815, 567, 714, Bajali, Barpeta, Patacharukuchi, Assam – 781326  <b>APPELLANT</b>	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075  <b>RESPONDENT</b>
---	------------------	--

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. Homeswar Das, Administrative Officer</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, ERC</b>
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<b>30.03.2026</b>
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	<b>22.04.2026</b>

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. FOUNDATIONS OF ORDER

The appeal of **Bajali Teachers Training College, Plot No. 716, 568, 605, 815, 567, 714, Bajali, Barpeta, Patacharukuchi, Assam - 781326** dated 01.02.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order No. **NCTE/ERC/2526202405042620/Assam/2024/Rejc/933** dated 31.12.2024 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution does not qualify the shortlisting criteria of minimum 10 points for processing of the application on the basis of extant norms and standards prescribed by NCTE"

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Dr. Homeswar Das, Administrative Officer of Bajali Teachers Training College, Plot No. 716, 568, 605, 815, 567, 714, Bajali, Barpeta, Patacharukuchi, Assam – 781326** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. It is to inform you that the application of the said programme of Gossaigaon B.Ed. College, Gossaigaon, Dist. Kokrajhar (Application No.2526202404302501) was also rejected showing the same grounds in the minutes of the 353rd Meeting of ERC held on 15th - 16th October, 2024 (Sl. No. 57). 2. Thereafter, we approached Hon'ble Gauhati High Court for seeking justice when we could not get any reply/clarification of our letters No. BTTC/02/ITEP/2025-26/2025 dated 14-07-2025 & 12-08-2025 and Hon'ble Court was pleased to pass an order i.e. WP(C)/7389/2025 dated 19-12-2025 under Section 18 of the NCTE Act to prefer an appeal. It is stated that Bajali Teachers Training College was established in 1992 (completed 33 years) running B.Ed., D.El.Ed. & B.A. programmes with NAAC "B+" Grade and Gossaigaon B.Ed. College was established in 1995 (completed 30 years) having B.Ed., D.El.Ed. & B.A. Programmes with NAAC "B" Grade It is not understood how Gossagaon B.Ed. College had been allowed to constitute VT for the ITEP in the minutes of the 368th meeting of ERC held on 17th - 18th June, 2025. Simultaneously accorded recognition for the ITEP in minutes of the 387th Hybrid meeting of ERC held on 16th January, 2026 (Sl. No/Item No.17) vide application No.2627202505073830." The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution, Bajali Teachers' Training College,

Patacharkuchi, Assam, vide letter dated 26.03.2026, submitted its reply in the form of a duly sworn affidavit. The Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that it is the authorized representative to prefer the present appeal before the Appeal Division, NCTE. The appellant institution further submitted that its ITEP application bearing No. 2526202405042620 was rejected in the 354th meeting of the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) held on 10.12.2024 on the ground that the institution did not qualify the shortlisting criteria of minimum 10 points as prescribed under the extant norms and standards of NCTE. It was further submitted that the ITEP application of Gossaigaon B.Ed. College, Gossaigaon, Assam was also rejected in the 352nd meeting of ERC held on 15–16.10.2024 on the ground that the institution had secured only 07 points, which is below the prescribed minimum requirement for eligibility as per Public Notice dated 22.04.2024 issued by NCTE (HQ). The appellant institution submitted that subsequently, Gossaigaon B.Ed. College, Gossaigaon, Assam has been granted recognition in the 387th meeting of ERC held on 16.01.2026, despite being allegedly inferior to the appellant institution. The appellant institution further submitted that it filed the present appeal on 01.02.2026 before the Appeal Division, NCTE after coming to know of the decision taken in respect of Gossaigaon College. It was also submitted that the appellant institution is accredited with B+ Grade by NAAC and has applied for NIRF ranking on 21.01.2026, whereas Gossaigaon B.Ed. College is stated to be accredited with “B” Grade by NAAC and has not applied for NIRF. The institution further submitted that it was established in the year 1992 and is offering B.Ed., B.A., and D.El.Ed. programmes, whereas Gossaigaon B.Ed. College was established in 1995 offering similar programmes. The appellant institution affirmed that the information submitted by it in the ITEP application for the academic session 2025–2026 is true and complete, and that no material information has been concealed. It was further stated that in case any information is found to be false, incomplete, or misleading, the NCTE may take appropriate action in accordance with law. The appellant institution accordingly requested that its case be considered appropriately in light of the above submissions.

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 20.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order No. **NCTE/ERC/2526202405042620/Assam/2024/Rejc/933** dated 31.12.2024.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the Appellant Institution with the directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee in the present meeting, reconsidered the matter and carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted that the Hon'ble High Court of Gauhati WP (C)No. 7389/2025 vide order dated 19.12.2025 order the following: -

- (i) *.....Mr. Boruah, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that without giving any prior opportunity to clarify the drawback, if any, the petition was rejected by the NCTE, but they have issued letter of intent to Gossaigaon B.Ed. College, who had secured 7 points only. But, the petitioner herein has secured 8 points and despite securing 8 points, they have not considered the application filed by the petitioner No. 1. He also submits that the petitioners had also filed applications on 14.07.2025 and 15.09.2025 to the respondent Nos. 4 and 5 and the same are not yet disposed of. And as such, Mr. Boruah submits that at this stage, notice may be issued to the respondents and also it may be observed that pendency of this petition should not be a bar in disposing of the application filed by the petitioner to the respondent No. 4 and 5 on 14.07.2025 and 15.09.2025.*
- (ii) *However, Mr. Alam, learned standing counsel for the respondent NCTE has vehemently opposed the petition. Mr. Alam submits that in view of Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 provides for appeal against any order made under Section 14 and 15 or Section 17 of the Act and without exhausting the aforementioned remedy, the petitioner is not entitled to move the present writ petition directly before this court.*
- (iii) *At this age, Mr Boruah submits that this writ petition may be disposed of by directing the petitioner approach the respondent authorities by filing an appeal as provide under Section 18 of the said Act.*

- (iv) *Accordingly, taking note of the submission of learned counsel for both the parties, this Court is inclined to dispose of this petition by directing the petitioner to approach the appropriate authority under Section 18 of the NCTE Act and in the even of the filing such an appeal, the respondent authorities shall consider and dispose of the same in accordance with law.*
- (v) *In terms of above, this writ petition stands **disposed of**.*

The Appeal Committee noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Bajali Teachers' Training College, Patacharkuchi, Assam, in respect of its appeal against rejection of its ITEP application by the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC). The Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that its application bearing No. 2526202405042620 was rejected in the 354th meeting of ERC held on 10.12.2024 on the ground that it did not qualify the minimum shortlisting criteria of 10 points as prescribed under the extant NCTE norms and standards. The appellant institution further submitted that a similarly placed institution, namely Gossaigaon B.Ed. College, Gossaigaon, Assam, whose application was also rejected in the 353rd meeting of ERC held on 15–16.10.2024 for securing only 07 points, was subsequently permitted for further processing, including constitution of Visiting Team in the 368th meeting of ERC held on 17–18.06.2025, and was ultimately granted recognition for ITEP in the 387th meeting of ERC held on 16.01.2026. It was submitted that the appellant institution approached the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court due to non-receipt of clarification on its representations dated 14.07.2025 and 12.08.2025, and the Hon'ble Court, vide order dated 19.12.2025 in WP(C)/7389/2025, permitted the institution to prefer an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993. The appellant institution further submitted that it was established in 1992 and is offering B.Ed., D.El.Ed., and B.A. programmes, and is accredited with NAAC "B+" Grade. It was stated that the institution has also applied for NIRF ranking on 21.01.2026. In comparison, it was submitted that Gossaigaon B.Ed. College was established in 1995, offers similar programmes, and is accredited with NAAC "B" Grade. The appellant institution submitted that it filed the present appeal on 01.02.2026 upon becoming aware of the decision taken in respect of Gossaigaon B.Ed. College. The appellant institution also submitted, by way of a duly sworn affidavit dated 26.03.2026, that it is authorized to prefer the present appeal and affirmed that the information furnished in its ITEP application is true and complete, and that no material facts have been concealed. It was further stated that

the Council may take appropriate action in accordance with law in case any information is found to be false or misleading. The appellant institution requested that its case be considered in light of the above submissions.

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 ERC at the time of passing the impugned order dated 31.12.2024 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 31.12.2024 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification and remands the matter to the Eastern 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 31.12.2024 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme with the directions specified hereinabove. The ERC 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 ERC 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, Bajali Teachers Training College, Plot No. 716, 568, 605, 815, 567, 714, Bajali, Barpeta, Patacharukuchi, Assam - 781326.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**
3. **Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**

4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Assam, Assam Secretariat, Block 'C', 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Secretariat Road, Dispur, Guwahati, Assam-781006.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-505/E- 394069/2025 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLNRC202515466/ E-89760

Bhartiya College of Education, Khasra No. 68, Industrial Estate Dhar Road Udampur, Nagrota, Udampur, Jammu & Kashmir – 182101  <b>APPELLANT</b>	<b>Vs</b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075  <b>RESPONDENT</b>
---	-----------	---

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Ashok Khajuria, Managing Director</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF ORDER**

The appeal of **Bhartiya College of Education, Khasra No. 68, Industrial Estate Dhar Road Udampur, Nagrota, Udampur, Jammu & Kashmir - 182101** dated 13.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per recognition order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / FR-2122-NRC-55103729 / JAMMU AND KASHMIR / 2020 / Recognition Order** dated 03.03.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, granting recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course. The Appellant Institution in its appeal report submitted the grounds that "the intake of the college in respect of the B.Ed. course was reduced from existing 150 seats to 100 seats."

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

**Sh. Ashok Khajuria, Managing Director of Bhartiya College of Education, Khasra No. 68, Industrial Estate Dhar Road Udampur, Nagrota, Udampur, Jammu & Kashmir - 182101** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "That Bhartiya College of Education was established in the Year 2003 with all due permissions from the Government of Jammu & Kashmir and is duly affiliated to the University of Jammu. The intake capacity of the College was 334 seats (including 10 social infrastructure seats and 24 management seats) till the Academic Session 2014-15 when the B.Ed. course was of one year duration. The intake capacity of the College was fixed at 150 seats during the Academic Session 2015-16 when the duration of the B.Ed. course was increased to two years (Four Semesters) and the intake of 150 seats remained continued till Academic Session 2024-25. After the promulgation of the Jammu & Kashmir Reorganization Act, 2019, the Union Territory of Jammu & Kashmir came under the preview of NCTE. The NCTE issued a Public Notice in the year 2020 inviting applications from all Teacher Education Institutions in the Union Territories of Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh for recognition of their Teacher Education Courses. Bhartiya College of Education applied on the NCTE portal for recognition of B.Ed. Course with intake capacity of 150 seats on 30th August 2020. The inspection of the College was conducted by the visiting team of the NCTE for B.Ed. Course in respect of 150 seats. The LOI reply submitted by the College for B.Ed. Course in terms of faculty, financial resources, etc. was for intake

of 150 seats. NRC, NCTE issued a Recognition order vide No NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-NRC-55103729/JAMMU AND KASHMIR/2020/Recognition Order on 03.03.2025 reducing the intake capacity of B.Ed. Course from existing 150 to 100 seats from the Academic Session 2025-26. The College fulfills all requirements under the provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules, and relevant regulations, including the prescribed norms and standards for Teacher Education Programmes such as instructional resources, infrastructure, and academic facilities for running the B.Ed. course with intake of 150 seats. The College was advised by the NRC, NCTE in its 451st meeting (Vol-II) of NRC held on 19th, 20th & 21st November 2025 to prefer an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act 1993 against the order passed by the Northern Regional Committee. The College is filing an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act 1993 for not considering the intake of existing 150 seats for B.Ed. Course despite the College fulfills all requirements under the provision of the NCTE Act, Rules, and relevant regulations, including the prescribed norms and standards for Teacher Education Programmes such as instructional resources, infrastructure, and academic facilities for running the B.Ed. course with intake of 150 seats. Reducing the intake of the B.Ed Course from 150 seats to 100 seats by NRC, NCTE has not only challenged the financial viability of the College but also the permanent faculty working in the College is at the verge of losing their jobs/livelihood. Supporting documents in respect of above-mentioned facts shall be submitted to NCTE by speed post.”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 30.08.2020. The NRC granted recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme vide dated 03.03.2025 for 100 students (two units).

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

– The Appeal Committee, in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution submitted that it has been running the B.Ed. programme since 2003 with due permissions from the Government of Jammu & Kashmir and affiliation from the University of Jammu. It was stated that the institution has been conducting the B.Ed. course with an intake of 150 seats since the academic session 2015–16, following the introduction of the two-year programme, and that all inspections, LOI compliance, and submissions made before the NRC were for an intake of 150 seats. The institution contended that, despite fulfilling the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, Rules, and Regulations, the NRC reduced the intake from 150 to 100 seats vide recognition order dated 03.03.2025. The appellant asserted that the reduction adversely affects the institution's academic functioning, financial viability, and existing faculty, and therefore sought restoration of the approved intake of 150 seats for the B.Ed. programme.

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

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

- (i) The appellant has failed to establish compliance with the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended) for restoration of intake capacity of 150 seats. The faculty list submitted is deficient, not in conformity with prescribed qualifications, unsupported by requisite documents, and not approved by the affiliating University. No complete and verifiable evidence of duly qualified, full-time, and approved faculty commensurate with 150 intake has been furnished. Further, no updated and credible documentary evidence regarding infrastructure, including built-up area, instructional facilities, and resource allocation corresponding to 150 seats, has been produced. This constitutes non-compliance with the provisions as per NCTE Regulations.
- (ii) The appellant's reliance on historical intake approvals prior to applicability of the NCTE regulatory framework is legally untenable. Recognition and intake capacity under the NCTE Act, 1993 are contingent upon current and demonstrable compliance with statutory norms. Past approvals do not confer any vested right to continuation of intake in absence of present compliance.

The Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive examination of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, records available on file, documents placed on record, and submissions advanced during the hearing, is satisfied that the impugned order is legally sound, reasoned, and in conformity with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The same does not suffer from any procedural irregularity, perversity, arbitrariness, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that adequate, effective, and meaningful opportunity of hearing was afforded to the appellant institution.

The grounds for non-grant/restoration of additional intake pertain to core statutory requirements, including adequacy of infrastructure, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, instructional facilities, and overall regulatory compliance. The

deficiencies identified are substantive, fundamental, and go to the root of eligibility, and cannot be treated as minor or curable irregularities in absence of contemporaneous, credible, and verifiable documentary compliance.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee holds that recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon strict and continuous compliance with the prescribed norms. No institution can claim any vested or accrued right to recognition or intake capacity in absence of demonstrable compliance at the time of consideration. Past status or assertions unsupported by legally admissible evidence cannot override the statutory framework. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities, the appellant institution has failed to discharge the statutory burden of establishing compliance with the mandatory provisions of the Act and Regulations. The action of the Regional Committee is thus lawful, justified, and in accordance with the regulatory framework, warranting no appellate interference. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity in the impugned order dated 03.03.2025, and the same is hereby affirmed.

#### **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 instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 03.03.2025 issued by NRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.**

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Bhartiya College of Education, Khasra No. 68, Industrial Estate Dhar Road Udampur, Nagrota, Udampur, Jammu & Kashmir - 182101.**
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

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-313/E-374398/2025 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLWRC202515220 / E-89760

Shri Dr. Ratilal Kanjibhai Patel and Shri Kanthibai Patel B.Ed. College, Post hadad, Taluka Danta, District Banaskantha, Gujrat, Pincode – 385110	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Nirmal A. Jani, Clerk</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL**

The appeal of **Shri Dr. Ratilal Kanjibhai Patel and Shri Kanthibai Patel B.Ed. College, Post hadad, Taluka Danta, District Banaskantha, Gujrat, Pincode - 385110** dated 08.07.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per **Minute of 415<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> March 2025** of the Western Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that “1) All faculties are appointed on 28.05.2024 and faculties of Pedagogy/ies are without NET & Ph.D. qualification as prescribed by NCTE. 2) Principal is not appointed. 3) Faculties are appointed with conditionally approval of the countersigned by the Registrar of Hemchandracharya North Gujarat University, Patan, Gujarat, which is not as per Clause-5 of Appendix-4 of NCTE Regulations, 2014, together with provisions of Point No. 8 of GOI No. 237 dated 09.06.2017 and submitted staff list is not in the prescribed format of NCTE.”

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

**Sh. Nirmal A. Jani, Clerk of Shri Dr. Ratilal Kanjibhai Patel and Shri Kanthibai Patel B.Ed. College, Post hadad, Taluka Danta, District Banaskantha, Gujrat, Pincode – 385110** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, it is submitted that “• Sh. Dr. Ratilal Kanjibhai Patel and Sh. Kantibhai Patel B.Ed. College is an old Teacher Education Institution (TEI) which was granted recognition by WRC by its order dated 01.03.2007 for running B.Ed. course with intake of 100 seats (two basic units). After coming into force of NCTE Regulations, 2014, WRC issued revised recognition order dated 31.05.2015 for 100 seats (two basic units). • WRC issued a letter dated 22.06.2018 which was duly replied by letter dated 06.09.2018 along with all requisite documents and details of faculty. The said letter was not a show cause notice under Section 17 of NCTE Act, 1993. • Thereafter, WRC issued another letter dated 05.02.2019 which again was not a show cause notice under Section 17. Our institute duly submitted reply to said letter on 22.03.2019 along with all requisite details and supporting documents. • Thus, deficiencies pointed out by letter dated 22.06.2018 of WRC was duly replied by our letter dated 06.09.2018. Further, deficiencies pointed out by letter dated 05.02.2019 was replied by our letter dated 22.03.2019. • Thereafter, WRC

issued first show cause notice dated 07.04.2021 under Section 17 of NCTE Act, 1993, to our institute, which was duly replied by our college by letter dated 01.05.2021. Copy of reply dated 01.05.2021 is annexed as Annexure-1. • Thereafter, suddenly without issuing 2nd show cause notice under Section 17 of NCTE Act, 1993, WRC in its 415th meeting held on 10th – 12th March, 2025 decided to withdraw recognition of B.Ed. course of our college. • The decision taken by WRC to withdraw recognition is completely illegal and also in violation of principles of natural justice. It is submitted that in the first instance, WRC did not provide any opportunity of hearing to our college to clarify our position and explain our stand regarding fulfilment of norms & standards of NCTE. Further, as per Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) notified by NCTE itself, at least two show cause notices under Section 17 are required to be issued to a recognized institution, but, 2nd show cause notice under Section 17 was never issued to our institution by WRC. Thus, the decision of withdrawal taken by WRC cannot be sustained and is liable to be set aside by the appeal committee. • It is further submitted that in the decision taken by WRC to withdraw recognition of B.Ed. course, they have relied upon the faculty list dated 24.12.2024 sent by Hemchandracharya North Gujarat University. Though WRC has relied upon the said faculty list to effect withdrawal of recognition but, the said approved faculty list and deficiency in terms thereof was never put to our college so as to enable us to submit our explanation. • It is further submitted that WRC has withdrawn recognition of B.Ed. course of our college on three specific grounds mentioned in impugned decision. It is submitted that Affiliating University by its letter dated 20.05.2023 approved faculty list of B.Ed. course of our college which includes 11 faculties including Principal. A copy of faculty list approved by University by its letter dated 20.05.2023 is annexed as Annexure-2. • Thereafter, university by its another letter dated 24.12.2024 approved another faculty list which includes 9 faculties. A copy of faculty list approved by University by its letter dated 24.12.2024 is annexed as Annexure-3. • Thus, in terms of faculties approved by affiliating university by its letter dated 20.05.2023 read with letter dated 24.12.2024, our college, at present, has requisite faculties as per norms of NCTE. • It is respectfully submitted that as per Appendix-IV of NCTE Regulations, 2014, 16 faculties (including Principal) is required for the intake of 100 seats of B.Ed. course and 8 faculties (including Principal) is required for the intake of 50 seats of B.Ed. course. Our college has more than requisite faculties for running B.Ed. course with intake of 100 seats (two basic units). • As the decision has been taken by WRC to withdraw recognition of our B.Ed.

course in the middle of counselling & admission process for academic session 2025-26 and withdrawal order has not yet been communicated, we are submitting the present appeal against the decision taken by WRC in its 415th meeting held on 10th – 12th March, 2025 at Agenda Item No.5.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 from the records that the recognition of the appellant institution was withdrawn by the Western Regional Committee (WRC) as per the decision as per **Minute of 415<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> March 2025** of the Western Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 10th Meeting, 2025 held on 08.08.2025 & 13th Meeting, 2025 held on 24.09.2025 respectively. 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 directions to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee perused the relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted that the Appellant Institution filed a Writ Petition W.P.(C) 10043/2025 & CM APPL. 41764/2025 before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi at New Delhi. Hon'ble High Court passed an order dated 17.07.2025. The operative part of the order is as under: -

***“....8. In view of the above, it is directed that operation of the impugned decision taken by WRC in its 415th meeting whereby recognition of petitioners' institution was withdrawn, shall remain stayed during the pendency of petitioners' appeal before the Appellate Committee. Consequently, the respondent no.2/WRC is also directed to update its***

**website reflecting that status of petitioners' institution as recognized institution.**

**9. The petition alongwith pending application is disposed of in the above terms. 10. Needless to say that all concerned authorities including affiliating University will take cognizance of updation of petitioners' status on the website of the NCTE pursuant to the instant order."**

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

- (i) The appellant has failed to establish that pedagogy faculty possess the minimum prescribed qualifications (NET/Ph.D.) under NCTE Regulations, 2014. The reliance on faculty lists purportedly approved by the affiliating University is unsupported by complete qualification records and verifiable documentary evidence and does not demonstrate compliance with statutory eligibility requirements. The deficiency remains unsubstantiated.
- (ii) The mandatory requirement of appointment of a duly qualified and approved Principal has not been established. No appointment order, joining report, or approval by the affiliating University has been produced. The existence of a Principal is thus not supported by verifiable evidence, constituting non-compliance with the Regulations.
- (iii) The faculty approvals relied upon are conditional and not in conformity with NCTE Regulations, and the staff list is not in the prescribed NCTE format. No revised, unconditional, and duly approved faculty list has been furnished. Conditional approvals and non-standard documentation do not satisfy statutory requirements, and the deficiency remains unrectified.

- (iv) The appellant's reliance on procedural objections, including alleged absence of further show cause notice and violation of natural justice, is untenable. The record reflects issuance of show cause notice dated 07.04.2021 and consideration thereof. In any event, procedural contentions cannot cure substantive and continuing non-compliance with mandatory statutory requirements relating to faculty qualifications and appointment of Principal.

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

ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Western Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the decision of the Western Regional Committee (WRC) taken in its 415th Meeting held on 10–12 March 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 WRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the decision of the Western Regional Committee (WRC) taken in its 415th Meeting held on 10–12 March 2025 is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.**

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

- 1. The Principal, Shri Dr. Ratilal Kanjibhai Patel and Shri Kanthibai Patel  
B.Ed. College, Post hadad, Taluka Danta, District Banaskantha, Gujrat,  
Pincode - 385110.**

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, Government of Gujarat, Block No. 5, 8th Floor, Sachivalaya, Gandhinagar.



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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 22.04.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-512/E- 394538/2025 Appeal/5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026

APPLNRC202515480/E-89760

Shri Ram College, Khasra No. 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, Opposite Almaspur, Telephone Exchange, Parikrama Marg, Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh - 251001	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>The Representative</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	30.03.2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	22.04.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### **I. GROUND'S OF ORDER**

The appeal of **Shri Ram College, Khasra No. 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, Opposite Almaspur, Telephone Exchange, Parikrama Marg, Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh - 251001** dated 23.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2526202404242292 / UTTAR PRADESH / 2024 / Recognition Order** dated 29.10.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, granting recognition for conducting ITEP Course. The Appellant Institution in its appeal report submitted grounds that “no ground of decrease in no’s of units is known to the appellant.”

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

The Representative from **Shri Ram College, Khasra No. 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, Opposite Almaspur, Telephone Exchange, Parikrama Marg, Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh - 251001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 30.03.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “ 1. That the NCTE has invited online applications for the academic session 2025-26 for 4th phase of Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), aligned with NEP 2020 from the multidisciplinary Colleges based upon the shortlisting criteria prescribed by the NCTE upto 31st May 2024 vide Public Notice dated 15.03.2024, 22.04.2024 and 20.05.2024. 2. That Shri Ram College (presently an Autonomous College with A++ Grade by NAAC, UGC) was fulfilling the criteria prescribed by the NCTE, therefore, applied for approval of Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) from NCTE from the academic session 2025-26 in the Disciplines and Stages as per following:- (i) B.A. B.Ed. : Secondary (2 units), Middle (2 units), Foundational (2 units), Preparatory (2 units) (ii) B.Sc. B.Ed. : Secondary (2 units), Middle (2 units), Foundational (2 units), Preparatory (2 units) (iii) B.Com. B.Ed. : Secondary (2 units). 3. That the College has submitted online application on dated 30.05.2024 within time. Since the application was complete in all respect and fully satisfying the requirement of NCTE, therefore, inspection by VT was arranged. 4. That VT was conducted by the NCTE on 2nd May 2025. VT has verified the entire infrastructure and other required facilities in the College. They were fully satisfied and nothing indicated was short. 5. That Letter of Intent (LOI) was issued to the College

on dated 17.05.2025 with the direction to submit the documents and Endowment Fund & Reserve Fund as envisaged in NCTE Regulations 2014. 6. That in compliance of LOI, the College has selected/ appointed discipline wise and stage wise faculties for 2 units in each applied stages duly approved by the affiliating University with qualification as per NCTE Regulation. 7. That the College has submitted compliance of LOI within stipulated time submitting the list of selected/ appointed Teachers for 2 units in 9 stages i.e. for 18 units and Rs 1.08 Crore against Endowment Fund & Reserve Fund as required by the NCTE. 8. That the NCTE vide its order dated 29.10.2025 granted Recognition of one unit each instead of 2 units in each applied stages. 9. That the College has made all arrangements keeping in view 2 units in each applied stages and allotted sufficient land and infrastructure as per norms of NCTE for the proposed programme. 10. That the College has submitted well demarcated land area, approved building plan, stream wise faculty list for 2 units in 9 stages of 3 disciplines duly approved by the affiliating University. 11. That the NCTE has mentioned in the Letter of Intent (LOI) that "On the basis of the scrutiny of the documents submitted by the College and Visiting Team Report, the Northern Regional Committee, NCTE is satisfied that the above College has adequate infrastructural, instructional and financial resources as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended from time to time)". 12. That NCTE has mentioned again in Letter of Recognition at point no. 2 that "AND WHEREAS, on scrutiny of the application, the documents attached herewith, the affidavit submitted and the inspection report received from Visiting Team and compliance report of Letter of Intent submitted by the College, the Committee is satisfied that the applicant fulfills the requirement under the provisions of NCTE Act, Rules and relevant Regulations including the Norms and Standards for the said Teacher Education Programme such as instructional facilities, infrastructural facilities, financial resources, etc. for running the said programme". 13. That the above-mentioned abstract of order of NCTE clearly shows that there was nothing short and objected by the NCTE. Hence, there is no reason for deduction of units in the Recognition Order. 14. Therefore, it is prayed that an order to be passed directing the NCTE to amend the Recognition Order dated 29.10.2025 mentioning 2 units in 9 applied stages of 3 disciplines instead of one unit each."

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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 ITEP Course on 30.05.2024. The NRC vide order dated 29.10.2025 granted recognition for 9 units of ITEP programme.

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

The Appeal Committee, in the present meeting carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The appellant institution submitted that, pursuant to the public notices issued by NCTE for the 4<sup>th</sup> phase of ITEP, it applied within the stipulated time for approval of ITEP with two units each across multiple stages and disciplines, asserting that it fulfilled the prescribed shortlisting criteria. It was stated that the Visiting Team conducted inspection and found the infrastructure and facilities adequate, whereafter a Letter of Intent dated 17.05.2025 was issued. The institution contended that it complied with the LOI within the prescribed timeframe, including appointment of discipline-wise and stage-wise qualified faculty for two units, duly approved by the affiliating University, and deposit of the requisite Endowment and Reserve Funds. It was further submitted that, despite NCTE having recorded satisfaction regarding infrastructural, instructional, and financial compliance in both the LOI and Recognition Order, recognition was granted for only one unit per stage vide order dated 29.10.2025. The appellant asserted that it had made full infrastructural and faculty arrangements for two units in each applied stage and therefore sought

amendment of the Recognition Order to restore approval of two units in the applied stages and disciplines.

The Appeal Committee considered the Appeal Report, documents placed on record, and submissions of the appellant institution. The Appeal Committee upon independent, objective, and comprehensive examination of the entire material, and in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Committee finds that the appellant has failed to discharge the statutory burden of establishing entitlement for grant of additional units of the ITEP programme through cogent, credible, and verifiable documentary evidence, as required under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended by the Amendment Regulations, 2021). 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 Committee notes that the institution has already been granted recognition for 09 Units of ITEP programme. It is further noted that Clause 1.8 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021 provides as under: **“ITEP shall be implemented in a phase wise manner starting from piloting in multidisciplinary HEIs/TEIs and thereby country wide expansion as per NEP 2020 timeframe.”** Accordingly, implementation and expansion of ITEP, including determination of number of units, is phased, conditional, and contingent upon demonstrable compliance with prescribed norms. Any enhancement of intake or additional units can be considered only upon verified operationalization and compliance, as assessed by the Regional Committee concerned.
- (ii) The appellant’s reliance on observations contained in the Letter of Intent and Recognition Order is misplaced. Such observations relate to minimum eligibility for grant of recognition and do not confer any entitlement to approval of all units applied for. The determination of number of units is based on verified adequacy of resources proportionate to intake, as assessed by the Regional Committee. No material has been produced to establish that the decision of the Regional Committee is arbitrary or contrary to record.
- (iii) The appellant has failed to establish adequacy of land and built-up area vis-à-vis cumulative intake of all existing and proposed programmes, including ITEP. The

record indicates that the institution is conducting multiple programmes, each requiring separate, norm-prescribed infrastructural allocation. However, the appellant has not furnished programme-wise demarcation of land and built-up area, nor any approved and integrated infrastructural plan. The claim of adequacy is unsupported by verifiable documentary evidence and is based on aggregate and fragmented assertions, which are impermissible under the Regulations. Compliance with Appendix norms thus remains unestablished.

The Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the Appeal Report and material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, arbitrariness, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record establishes that adequate and reasonable opportunity was afforded to the appellant. The Committee further notes that determination of intake and number of units by the Regional Committee is based on verified adequacy of resources and compliance with statutory norms, and such determination is substantive and foundational, going to the root of eligibility. These cannot be treated as technical or curable irregularities. It is well settled that recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon strict and demonstrable compliance with the prescribed norms under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). No institution acquires any vested or accrued right to recognition or intake in the absence of such compliance.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the mandatory provisions of the Act and Regulations through credible and verifiable documentary evidence. The decision of the Northern Regional Committee is thus lawful, justified, and within its statutory jurisdiction, warranting no interference. Accordingly, in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no ground to interfere with the impugned order dated 29.10.2025, which 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 NRC was justified in issuance of impugned order for 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 order dated 29.10.2025 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 Ram College, Khasra No. 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, Opposite Almaspur, Telephone Exchange, Parikrama Marg, Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh - 251001.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, Room No. 03, Naveen Bhawan, U.P. Secretariat, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226001.