



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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-118/E-404142/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615582 / E-89966

Kalyani Devi Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. 104/01, Village-Naila, Post Office - Kanota, Taluka/Mandal- Jamwaramgarh, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan-303012 APPELLANT	Vs	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 RESPONDENT
--	-----------	--

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Rajesh Kumar Gupta, Director
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Kalyani Devi Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. 104/01, Village-Naila, Post Office - Kanota, Taluka/Mandal-Jamwaramgarh, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan-303012** dated **30.03.2026** filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509243176/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJ/49** dated **27.01.2026** of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has mentioned 'No' in the column of Multi-Disciplinary Programme(s) of the online Transition application portal. 2. The institution is not running Multi-Disciplinary courses in the filed of science, commerce or mathematics as per Regulation No. NCTE-RegI011/80/2018-MS(Regulation)-HQ dated 26.10.2021 as amended from time to time and NCTE Public Notice No. NCTE-RegI012/7/2025-Reg. Sec-HQ dated 12.09.2025 related with extension of timeline to existing recognized Teacher Education Institutions for Transition from B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programme to ITEP before the start of Academic Session 2026-27. The institution does not fall in the category of multi-Disciplinary institution. 3. The website of institution has not been found operational. The institution is require to update and maintain its official 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."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Rajesh Kumar Gupta, Director of Kalyani Devi Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. 104/01, Village-Naila, Post Office - Kanota, Taluka/Mandal-Jamwaramgarh, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan-303012 appeared online to present the case of the appellent institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellent institution submitted that "1. Multi-Disciplinary programs are indeed conducted at the institute however, due to a clerical error, "No" was selected instead of "Yes" Sir, since the 2013 Academic Session, this institute has been operating a B.A. and B.Sc. degree college under the name "Kalyani Devi Mahavidyalaya," which holds the affiliation number Acad.II/2025/15051 dated 29.12.2025 (University of Rajasthan) for the 2025-26 session. 2. This institute offers multidisciplinary courses in the fields of science and arts. A copy of the State Governments NOC and Rajasthan University's affiliation for the 2025-26 session is enclosed. 3. The institutes website is operational. The institute strives to regularly update and maintain its official website, the link of which is <http://kdmjaipur.com>."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 03.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 27.01.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution. The Committee noted that the appeal pertains to the issue of eligibility under the category of a multidisciplinary institution, wherein the Regional Committee had observed that the institution had not indicated itself as multidisciplinary in its application. The appellant institution submitted that multidisciplinary programmes are being conducted; however, due to a clerical error, "No" was selected instead of "Yes" in the application. It was further submitted that since the academic session 2013, the institution has been operating a B.A. and B.Sc. degree college under the name "Kalyani Devi Mahavidyalaya," affiliated to the University of Rajasthan, with affiliation number Acad.II/2025/15051 dated 29.12.2025 for the academic session 2025–26. The appellant institution further submitted that it offers multidisciplinary courses in the fields of Science and Arts, and has enclosed a copy of the State Government NOC and affiliation granted by the University of Rajasthan for the academic session 2025–26 in support of its claim. It was also submitted that the institution maintains an operational website, namely <http://kdmjaipur.com>, and that efforts are made to regularly update and maintain the same in accordance with applicable requirements.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the

mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and

continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 27.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014,

as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 27.01.2026 and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, Kalyani Devi Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. 104/01, Village-Naila, Post Office - Kanota, Taluka/Mandal-Jamwaramgarh, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan-303012.**
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, 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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-119/E-404407/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLERC202615586

L.K. Mishra College of Teachers Education, Village - Darbhanga, Post Office-Lal Bagh, Street/Road-Dilli More, Taluka/Mandal-Sadar. District-Darbhanga, Bihar-846004	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Kamal Ahmad, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **L.K. Mishra College of Teachers Education, Village - Darbhanga, Post Office-Lal Bagh, Street/Road-Dilli More, Taluka/Mandal-Sadar. District-Darbhanga, Bihar-846004** dated 02.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. ER-391.1/NCTE/B.Ed./ERCAPP2016 46319(ID-10832)/BR/2026/(72909-72916)** dated 25.02.2026 of the Eastern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "The institution has submitted a copy of teaching faculty list (1+15) dated 17.01.2026 which is not approved by the concerned affiliating body."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Kamal Ahmad, Principal of L.K. Mishra College of Teachers Education, Village - Darbhanga, Post Office-Lal Bagh, Street/Road-Dilli More, Taluka/Mandal-Sadar. District-Darbhanga, Bihar-846004 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "The list of the faculty duly approved by the affiliating body enclosed for kind consideration please."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 two-year duration with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students vide order dated 14.11.2017. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the ERC vide order dated 25.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution. The Committee noted that the appeal pertains to deficiencies relating to faculty as observed by the Regional Committee concerned. The appellant institution submitted that the list of faculty, duly approved by

the affiliating body, has been enclosed for consideration. It was stated that the said submission is in compliance with the requirements relating to faculty approval.

The Appeal Committee noted that, at the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with supporting documents purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies forming the basis of the withdrawal order. The Committee further observed that a substantial portion of the material so-relied upon was either not available before the concerned Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in the manner contemplated under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. Under the statutory scheme of the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the applicable Regulations, compliance with prescribed recognition norms is required to be established through duly verified and authenticated records. Consequently, the material now placed on record necessitates factual scrutiny and regulatory examination by the competent Regional Committee before any conclusive determination regarding compliance can be arrived at. The Appeal Committee further observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication and in light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016]***, subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasised that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 25.02.2026 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 Eastern Regional Committee and without creating any equity in favour of the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned withdrawal order dated 25.02.2026 solely for the purpose of fresh factual verification and regulatory reassessment. The Eastern Regional Committee is directed to re-examine the case of the appellant institution afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted, afford reasonable

opportunity of hearing to the institution, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the guidelines issued by the Council from time to time, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined only to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish full compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with law. The Regional Committee concerned, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is directed to forward all documents relied upon in the appeal to the Eastern 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, concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 25.02.2026 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) 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, L.K. Mishra College of Teachers Education, Village - Darbhanga, Post Office-Lal Bagh, Street/Road-Dilli More, Taluka/Mandal-Sadar. District-Darbhanga, Bihar-846004.**
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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-120/E-404474/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615580 -

Khandela Sah Shiksha B.A. B.Ed. Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1388, 1012, Village - Dayara, Taluka/Mandal - Khandela, District- Sikar, Rajasthan-332709	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative of the Institution
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Khandela Sah Shiksha B.A. B.Ed. Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1388, 1012, Village - Dayara, Taluka/Mandal - Khandela, District-Sikar, Rajasthan-332709** dated 28.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509202963/RAJASTHAN /2025/REJC/223** dated 28.01.2026 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 'Merger', as stipulated in the NCTE Guidelines for transforming NCTE recognized stand-alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. However, the Institution has not uploaded any Memorandum of Merger (MoM). 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 4.2.2 of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. 3. The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence that both institutions proposed for Merger are affiliated with the same university, as required under Clause 4.2(ii) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. 4. The proposal for 'merger' between the institutions has not been approved by their affiliating university, as required under Clause 4.2.2 of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. 5. The institution has not uploaded the 'Fresh certificate of merger' issued by the Registrar of Societies as required under Clause 4.2.2 of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. supportive documents submitted. 6. The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence confirming that 'Khandela Sah Shiksha B.A. B.Ed. Mahavidyalaya' and 'the institution to be merged with', are situated within the radius of 03 Kilometers as per Clause 2(c) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative from **Khandela Sah Shiksha B.A. B.Ed. Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1388, 1012, Village - Dayara, Taluka/Mandal -**

Khandela, District-Sikar, Rajasthan-332709 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "Supportive documents submitted." The institution also submitted a representation informing therein that :- (i) The institution uploaded signed and authorized MoM. (ii). The institution has uploaded the certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan justifying the requirement for a Teacher Education Programme in the area, as required under clause 4.2.2 of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. (iii). The institution has uploaded documentary evidence that both institutions proposed for Merger are Affiliated with the same university, as required under clause 4.2(ii) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. (iv). The proposed for 'merger' between the institutions has been approved by their Affiliating University, as required under clause 4.2.2 of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. (v). The institution has uploaded the 'Fresh Certificate of Merger' issued by the State Govt. as required under clause 4.2.2 of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. (vi). The institution has uploaded documentary evidence confirming that 'Khandela Sah Shiksha B.A. B.Ed. Mahavidyalaya' and 'the institution to be merged with', are situated within the radius of 3 Kilometers as per clause 2(c) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into multidisciplinary Higher Education Institution, issue by Assistant Engineer.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Western Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 04.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 28.01.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, namely, Khandela Sah Shiksha B.A. B.Ed.

Mahavidyalaya, in respect of compliance with the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. The appellant institution submitted that supportive documents had been uploaded in response to the deficiencies pointed out. The institution further submitted that it had uploaded the signed and duly authorized Minutes of Meeting relating to the proposed merger. It was also submitted that the institution had furnished the certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan justifying the requirement of the Teacher Education Programme in the area, in terms of Clause 4.2.2 of the applicable NCTE Guidelines. The appellant institution further submitted documentary evidence to establish that both institutions proposed for merger are affiliated to the same University, as required under Clause 4.2(ii) of the said Guidelines. The appellant institution additionally submitted that approval of the proposed merger had been granted by the affiliating University in terms of Clause 4.2.2 of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. It was further submitted that a fresh Certificate of Merger issued by the State Government had also been uploaded in compliance with the aforesaid Guidelines. The institution also submitted documentary evidence, certified by the Assistant Engineer, indicating that Khandela Sah Shiksha B.A. B.Ed. Mahavidyalaya and the institution proposed to be merged are situated within a radius of 3 kilometres, in terms of Clause 2(c) of the said Guidelines.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The

Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may

appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 28.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand

is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellatant institution.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, and the submissions made by the appellatant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, hereby sets aside the impugned order dated 28.01.2026 and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellatant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, Khandela Sah Shiksha B.A. B.Ed. Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1388, 1012, Village - Dayara, Taluka/Mandal - Khandela, District-Sikar, Rajasthan-332709.**
- 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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-123/E-404405/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615579

Faculty of Education IASE, (Shikshan Mahavidyalaya), Plot No. 97 TP3, Village - Usmanpura, Income Tax, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad City, Gujarat-380009	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative of the Institution
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Faculty of Education IASE, (Shikshan Mahavidyalaya), Plot No. 97 TP3, Village - Usmanpura, Income Tax, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad City, Gujarat-380009** dated 27.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2526202404222164 /GUJARAT/2024/REJC/150** dated 29.01.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. With regard to VT observation "Particulars of Authorized Person/Representative is not accepted and not verified", institution uploaded a copy of notarized affidavit dated 02.05.2024 regarding letter of authorization and submits explanation "when the institution applied for ITEP 2025-26, at that time according to the given format by NCTE, we have submitted the affidavit for letter of authorization. for your kind information the same person of the institution has also appeared before the Hon'ble VT on dated 23-09-2025. 2. With regard to observation of VT "Details of Head/ Principal of the Institution is not accepted and not verified", Institution uploaded a forwarding letter dated 30.10.2025 of Institution authenticating the authorized person and Principal/Head by Registrar, enclosing list of faculties for ITEP i.e. B.A. B.Ed. (Foundation) - 1 unit and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Middle) - 1 unit countersigned by Registrar, Gujarat Vidyapith. 3. With regard to VT observation "Land details is not accepted. Uploaded Land Documents are in Gujarati language. No English translation copy is provided during online VT meeting", institution uploaded English translated version land document (without notarized) and approved site plan of institution building. 4. With regard to VT observation "Details of mutation certificate of land is not accepted, the same is not uploaded and not provided during online VT meeting", institution uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 5. With regard to VT observation "Details of Non-encumbrance certificate is not accepted, the same is not uploaded and not provided during online VT meeting", institution uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 6. With regard to VT observation "Building Plan is not accepted. Shown updated building plans are not approved by the Council of Architecture registered Architect", institution uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025

signed by Registrar seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 7. With regard to VT observation "Break-up of built-up area mentioned in the building plan for the teacher education programme/s is not accepted. Uploaded building plans are in low resolution, not readable at all", institution uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 signed by Registrar seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 8. With regard to VT observation "Other information required is not accepted. Building Safety Certificate not provided. Fire Safety Certificate is not issued by the competent authority", institution uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 signed by Registrar seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 9. With regard to VT observation "Building Completion is not accepted. Building Completion Certificate is not issued by the competent authority", institution uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 signed by Registrar seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 10. With regard to VT observation "Floor Wise Built-Up Area (in sq m) is not accepted. Uploaded building plans are in low resolution, not readable at all", institution uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 signed by 3/27/26, 12:55 PM Gujarat Vidyapith Mail - Refusal Order for Post Inspection SCN Reply not Accepted <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=cdbd5714c6&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1855636363907578702&simpl=msg-f:1855636363907578702> 2/4 Registrar seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 11. With regard to VT observation "Multipurpose Hall is not accepted. Uploaded building plans are in low resolution, not readable at all", institution uploaded 16 photos (without geotagged) related with sitting arrangement, stage, guest room, server room, small meeting hall. 12. With regard to VT observation "Seating Capacity of Multipurpose Hall: Not accepted", institution uploaded 04 photographs (without geotagged) related with multipurpose hall and mentioning seating capacity 350+ in the portal. 13. With regard to VT observation "Humanities Stream Laboratories is not available and not satisfactory", institution uploaded geotag photograph dated 16.08.2024 in respect of IASE Bridge Lesson at the address 2HV9+F23, Sattar Taluka Society, Usmanpura, Ahmedabad. In its explanation, stated that this pertains to a Language Lab and a Psychology Lab for Humanities. 14. With regard to VT observation "Activity Cum Resource Center is not available and not shown", institution uploaded two photographs (without geotagged) related with Activity cum Resource Center,

which may be perused by WRC. 15. With regard to VT observation "Common Room is not available and not shown", institution uploaded a geotagged photograph dated 30.11.2023 showing an event of Faculty of Education, GVP on the theme Workshop on Research Methodology Phase-1 at the address 2HV9+F23, Sattar Taluka Society; Usmanpura, Ahmedabad, and mentions in its explanation "Separate Chambers for Separate Chambers for All Faculties, Common Meeting Room for Staff & Student Representatives. 16. With regard to VT observation "Land Mutation, Non-Encumbrance Certificate and Building Safety Certificate are not uploaded and not provided during online VT meeting", institution uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 signed by Registrar seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 17. With regard to VT observation "Shown updated building plans are not approved by the Council of Architecture registered Architect", institution has uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 signed by Registrar seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 18. With regard to VT observation "Uploaded building plans are in low resolution, not readable at all", institution has uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 signed by Registrar seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document. 19. With regard to VT observation "Fire Safety Certificate is not issued by the competent authority", institution has uploaded a copy of request letter dated 30.10.2025 signed by Registrar seeking extension of time of 7 days (up to 8.11.2025) for uploading of related document."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative of Faculty of Education IASE, (Shikshan Mahavidyalaya), Plot No. 97 TP3, Village - Usmanpura, Income Tax, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad City, Gujarat-380009 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. When the institution applied for ITEP 2025-26, at that time according to the given for mate by NCTE, we have submitted the affidavit for letter of authorization. for your kind information the same person of the institution has also appeared before the Hon'ble VT on dated 23-09-2025. Also, all authentic documents were uploaded on the portal. 2. The institution has uploaded a forwarding letter dated 30.10.2025 of Institution authenticating the authorized person and Principal/Head by Registrar, enclosing list of faculties for ITEP i.e. B.A. B.Ed. (Foundation) – 1 unit and

B.Sc. B.Ed. (Middle) - 1 unit countersigned by Registrar, Gujarat Vidyapith. 3. We have uploaded land documents in Gujarati language as well as uploaded English translated version of land document but without notarized. now we have notarized English translated version of land document. We have also uploaded approved site plan of institution building. 4. With reference to the observation regarding non-submission of the Mutation Certificate of Land, it is respectfully submitted that the land pertaining to Gujarat Vidyapith is duly owned and possessed by the institution, and all primary land records are available with us. However, the formal mutation entry certification process is presently under progress with the concerned revenue authorities. It is pertinent to mention that the mutation process is a statutory procedure governed by the State Revenue Department, which involves multiple stages such as: • Verification of ownership records and historical land entries • Scrutiny of title documents by the revenue office • Entry of mutation in official land records (Village Form / City Survey Records) • Certification and approval by the competent revenue (Mamlatdar / City Survey Superintendent) Due to the involvement of government authorities and mandatory verification protocols, the process requires considerable administrative time and cannot be expedited beyond prescribed procedures. The delay, if any, is purely procedural and not due to lack of compliance or intent on the part of the institution. It is also humbly submitted that the land is free from any dispute and is being used exclusively for educational purposes and relevant supporting documents such as ownership records, land documents, and institutional possession are available with Gujarat Vidyapith. However, the formal mutation certificate is pending final certification. The institution assures that the Mutation Certificate shall be obtained and submitted immediately upon completion of the process, which is expected within the next few months. In view of the above, it is requested that this point may kindly be considered as under process, and the institution may be granted reasonable time to submit the certified Mutation document. 5. With reference to the observation regarding non-submission of the Non-Encumbrance Certificate, it is respectfully submitted that the concerned land of Gujarat Vidyapith is free from any legal encumbrances, charges, or liabilities. However, the formal Non-Encumbrance Certificate is required to be issued by the competent authority after due verification of land records over a specified period. The process involves: • Verification of registered transactions in the Sub-Registrar Office • Scrutiny of historical encumbrance records • Issuance of certified Non-

Encumbrance Certificate Since this is an official certification process involving government records, it requires time for verification and issuance. The same shall be submitted immediately upon receipt.

6. With reference to the observation that the Building Plan is not approved by a Council of Architecture registered Architect, it is respectfully submitted that Gujarat Vidyapith has already prepared and maintained all requisite building plans, maps, and related documents pertaining to the infrastructure of Gujarat Vidyapith. It is pertinent to state that:

- All architectural drawings, layout plans, and structural details are readily available with the institution.
- The infrastructure has been developed in accordance with the requirements of an educational institution and is fully functional. However, the formal approval and certification by a Council of Architecture registered Architect is currently under process. The approval procedure involves:
 - Verification and vetting of existing building plans by a registered Architect
 - Ensuring compliance with applicable norms and regulatory standards
 - Formal certification and endorsement by the Architect registered under the Council of Architecture

This process is procedural in nature and requires due professional scrutiny and certification, which takes time as per standard practice. It is further submitted that Gujarat Vidyapith has already ensured that no deficiency exists in terms of availability of plans, but only formal approval is pending. Therefore, the delay is not due to non-availability of documents, but only due to completion of the formal approval procedure. The institution assures that the approved building plans, duly certified by a Council of Architecture registered Architect shall be submitted at the earliest upon completion of the process, which is expected within the next few months. In view of the above, it is humbly requested that this observation may kindly be considered as complied in substance and under process procedurally and reasonable time may be granted for submission of the approved documents.

7. Detailed break-up of built-up area is being compiled and updated plans are under preparation. The earlier issue of low-resolution documents is being rectified and fresh, clear documents shall be submitted upon completion.

8. With reference to the observations regarding non-submission of the Building Safety Certificate and Building Completion Certificate, it is respectfully submitted that the infrastructure of Gujarat Vidyapith is fully developed, operational, and being regularly utilized for academic purposes. It is pertinent to state that:

- Gujarat Vidyapith possesses all relevant building records, structural details, and technical documentation.
- The infrastructure has been constructed and maintained in

accordance with standard norms applicable to educational institutions. • There is no deficiency in the physical availability or usability of the infrastructure, and only formal statutory certifications are pending. However, the issuance of the above-mentioned certificates is currently under process with the respective competent authorities. The procedure for obtaining these certificates involves multiple statutory steps, such as:

Building Safety Certificate: • Inspection by qualified structural engineer / competent authority • Assessment of structural stability and safety compliance • Certification after due verification.

9. Verification of construction as per approved plans • Inspection by local/municipal authority • Confirmation of compliance with building regulations

It is respectfully submitted that the Gujarat Vidyapith has already ensured readiness of infrastructure for inspection and certification. The delay, if any, is purely procedural and administrative, as these certifications involve: • Official inspections • Scheduling by government authorities • Multi-level verification processes which require statutory time and are beyond the immediate control of the institution. In view of the above, it is humbly requested that these observations may kindly be considered as complied in substance and under process procedurally, and the institution may be granted reasonable time for submission of the certificates.

10. Detailed Floor-wise built-up area is being compiled and updated plans are under preparation. The earlier issue of low-resolution documents is being rectified, and fresh, clear documents shall be submitted upon completion.

11. We have uploaded 16 photos in pdf that's why it's not showing that its geotagged. but we have captured all 16 photos in geotagged related with sitting arrangement, stage, guest room, server room, small meeting hall.

12. We have uploaded 04 photos in pdf that's why it's not showing that its geotagged. but we have captured all 04 photos in geotagged related with multipurpose hall and mentioning seating capacity 350+ in the portal.

13. Due to some technical issue, it may be happened that uploaded geotag photograph showed that photo dated 16.08.2024 in respect of IASE Bridge Lesson at the address 2HV9+F23, Sattar Taluka Society, Usmanpura, Ahmedabad, but we have available chemistry lab. physics lab, microbiology lab, Language Lab and a Psychology Lab as humanities stream laboratories. we will produce all geotagged photos of these laboratories.

14. We have uploaded 02 photos in pdf that's why it's not showing that its geotagged. but we have captured all 02 photos in geotagged related Activity Cum Resource Center.

15. separate chambers for all faculties, common meeting room for staff at Hall 2 on the ground floor. Moreover, for student representative's dean/hod

room no.109-110 on the first floor. 16. This kitchen garden is maintained by the students. They use the vegetables in their respective hostels. If the production is surplus, they sell the excess in the community as part of the "Earn While You Learn" initiative. Due to the rainy season, the land was filled with water, and when the rain stopped, the vegetables got spoiled. Now therefore, the students ploughed the land during the VT. now we have developed kitchen garden & also taken their geotagged photos & its available to upload whenever needed. 17. Explanations as per above. 18. As stated in point no.4, 5 and 8 above, all these documents are under process with respective authorities and shall be submitted upon completion. 19. Gujarat Vidyapith is in the process of obtaining approval from a Council of Architecture registered Architect as mentioned in point no.6. Necessary compliance measures are being undertaken. 20. The issue of unreadable/low-resolution documents has been acknowledged. Fresh high-resolution plans are being prepared and will be resubmitted. 21. With reference to the observation regarding non-submission of the Fire Safety Certificate, it is respectfully submitted that the infrastructure of Gujarat Vidyapith is fully developed, operational and being regularly utilized for academic purposes. It is pertinent to state that:

- The institution possesses all relevant building records, structural details, and technical documentation.
- The infrastructure has been constructed and maintained in accordance with standard norms applicable to educational institutions.
- Adequate fire safety measures and precautions have been adopted within the premises to ensure safety.

It is further submitted that as per the general provisions of the National Building Code of India, stringent fire safety certification requirements are primarily applicable to buildings exceeding 15 meters in height. In the present case:

- The Faculty of Education building is below 15 meters in height.
- Therefore, the requirement of Fire Safety Certificate is not of the same mandatory nature as applicable to high-rise buildings, though basic fire safety compliance is duly maintained.

Without prejudice to the above, it is respectfully submitted that:

- The institution is committed to full compliance with all safety norms
- If required by the Hon'ble Committee, the institution shall approach the competent Fire Authority to obtain the Fire Safety Certificate or necessary clarification
- Necessary steps in this regard can be initiated immediately and the same shall be submitted upon issuance

In view of the above, it is humbly requested that this observation may kindly be considered in light of the actual applicability of norms and existing safety compliance, and reasonable time may be granted to submit the

certificate, if required by the competent authority. We assure the Hon'ble Committee that all required documents shall be submitted within the next few months as soon as the statutory processes are completed. 22. When the institution applied for ITEP 2025-26, at that time according to the given format by NCTE, we have submitted the affidavit for letter of authorization. for your kind information the same person of the institution has also appeared before the Hon'ble VT on dated 23-09-2025. Also, all authentic documents were uploaded on the portal. 23. The institution has uploaded a forwarding letter dated 30-10.2025 of Institution authenticating the authorized person and Principal/Head by Registrar, enclosing list of faculties for ITEP i.e. B.A. B.Ed. (Foundation) – 1 unit and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Middle) - 1 unit countersigned by Registrar, Gujarat Vidyapith. 24. We have uploaded land documents in Gujarati language as well as uploaded English translated version of land document but without notarized. now we have notarized English translated version of land document. We have also uploaded approved site plan of institution building. 25. With reference to the observation regarding non-submission of the Mutation Certificate of Land, it is respectfully submitted that the land pertaining to Gujarat Vidyapith is duly owned and possessed by the institution, and all primary land records are available with us. However, the formal mutation entry certification process is presently under progress with the concerned revenue authorities. It is pertinent to mention that the mutation process is a statutory procedure governed by the State Revenue Department, which involves multiple stages such as: • Verification of ownership records and historical land entries • Scrutiny of title documents by the revenue office • Entry of mutation in official land records (Village Form / City Survey Records) • Certification and approval by the competent revenue (Mamlatdar / City Survey Superintendent) Due to the involvement of government authorities and mandatory verification protocols, the process requires considerable administrative time and cannot be expedited beyond prescribed procedures. The delay, if any, is purely procedural and not due to lack of compliance or intent on the part of the institution. It is also humbly submitted that the land is free from any dispute and is being used exclusively for educational purposes and relevant supporting documents such as ownership records, land documents, and institutional possession are available with Gujarat Vidyapith. However, the formal mutation certificate is pending final certification. The institution assures that the Mutation Certificate shall be obtained and submitted immediately upon completion of the process, which is expected within

the next few months. In view of the above, it is requested that this point may kindly be considered as under process, and the institution may be granted reasonable time to submit the certified Mutation document. 26. With reference to the observation regarding non-submission of the Non-Encumbrance Certificate, it is respectfully submitted that the concerned land of Gujarat Vidyapith is free from any legal encumbrances, charges, or liabilities. However, the formal Non-Encumbrance Certificate is required to be issued by the competent authority after due verification of land records over a specified period. The process involves:

- Verification of registered transactions in the Sub-Registrar Office
- Scrutiny of historical encumbrance records
- Issuance of certified Non-Encumbrance Certificate

Since this is an official certification process involving government records, it requires time for verification and issuance. The same shall be submitted immediately upon receipt.

27. With reference to the observation that the Building Plan is not approved by a Council of Architecture registered Architect, it is respectfully submitted that Gujarat Vidyapith has already prepared and maintained all requisite building plans, maps, and related documents pertaining to the infrastructure of Gujarat Vidyapith. It is pertinent to state that:

- All architectural drawings, layout plans, and structural details are readily available with the institution.
- The infrastructure has been developed in accordance with the requirements of an educational institution and is fully functional.

However, the formal approval and certification by a Council of Architecture registered Architect is currently under process. The approval procedure involves:

- Verification and vetting of existing building plans by a registered Architect
- Ensuring compliance with applicable norms and regulatory standards
- Formal certification and endorsement by the Architect registered under the Council of Architecture

This process is procedural in nature and requires due professional scrutiny and certification, which takes time as per standard practice. It is further submitted that Gujarat Vidyapith has already ensured that no deficiency exists in terms of availability of plans, but only formal approval is pending. Therefore, the delay is not due to non-availability of documents, but only due to completion of the formal approval procedure. The institution assures that the approved building plans, duly certified by a Council of Architecture registered Architect shall be submitted at the earliest upon completion of the process, which is expected within the next few months. In view of the above, it is humbly requested that this observation may kindly be considered as complied in substance and under process procedurally and reasonable time may be

granted for submission of the approved documents. 28. Detailed break-up of built-up area is being compiled and updated plans are under preparation. The earlier issue of low-resolution documents is being rectified and fresh, clear documents shall be submitted upon completion. 29. With reference to the observations regarding non-submission of the Building Safety Certificate and Building Completion Certificate, it is respectfully submitted that the infrastructure of Gujarat Vidyapith is fully developed, operational, and being regularly utilized for academic purposes. It is pertinent to state that:

- Gujarat Vidyapith possesses all relevant building records, structural details, and technical documentation.
- The infrastructure has been constructed and maintained in accordance with standard norms applicable to educational institutions.
- There is no deficiency in the physical availability or usability of the infrastructure, and only formal statutory certifications are pending. However, the issuance of the above-mentioned certificates is currently under process with the respective competent authorities. The procedure for obtaining these certificates involves multiple statutory steps, such as: Building Safety Certificate: • Inspection by qualified structural engineer / competent authority • Assessment of structural stability and safety compliance • Certification after due verification.

30. Verification of construction as per approved plans • Inspection by local/municipal authority • Confirmation of compliance with building regulations It is respectfully submitted that the Gujarat Vidyapith has already ensured readiness of infrastructure for inspection and certification The delay, if any, is purely procedural and administrative, as these certifications involve:

- Official inspections
- Scheduling by government authorities
- Multi-level verification processes which require statutory time and are beyond the immediate control of the institution.

In view of the above, it is humbly requested that these observations may kindly be considered as complied in substance and under process procedurally, and the institution may be granted reasonable time for submission of the certificates. 31. Detailed Floor-wise built-up area is being compiled and updated plans are under preparation. The earlier issue of low-resolution documents is being rectified and fresh, clear documents shall be submitted upon completion. 32. We have uploaded 16 photos in pdf that's why its not showing that its geotagged. but we have captured all 16 photos in geotagged related with sitting arrangement, stage, guest room, server room, small meeting hall. 33. We have uploaded 04 photos in pdf that's why its not showing that its geotagged. but we have captured all 04 photos in geotagged related with multipurpose hall and mentioning

seating capacity 350+ in the portal. 34. Due to some technical issue it may be happened that uploaded geotag photograph showed that photo dated 16.08.2024 in respect of IASE Bridge Lesson at the address 2HV9+F23, Sattar Taluka Society, Usmanpura, Ahmedabad, but we have available chemistry lab. physics lab, microbiology lab, Language Lab and a Psychology Lab as humanities stream laboratories. we will produce all geotagged photos of this laboratory. 25. We have uploaded 02 photos in pdf that's why it's not showing that its geotagged. but we have captured all-02 photos in geotagged related Activity Cum Resource Center. 36. Separate chambers for all faculties, common meeting room for staff at Hall 2 on the ground floor. Moreover, for student representatives dean/hod room no.109-110 on the first floor. 37. This kitchen garden is maintained by the students. They use the vegetables in their respective hostels. If the production is surplus, they sell the excess in the community as part of the "Earn While You Learn" initiative. Due to the rainy season, the land was filled with water, and when the rain stopped, the vegetables got spoiled. Therefore, the students ploughed the land during the VT. now we have developed kitchen garden & also taken their geotagged photos & its available to upload whenever needed. 38. Explanations as per above. 39. As stated in point no.4, 5 and 8 above, all these documents are under process with respective authorities and shall be submitted upon completion. 40. Gujarat Vidyapith is in the process of obtaining approval from a Council of Architecture registered Architect as mentioned in point no.6. Necessary compliance measures are being undertaken. 41. The issue of unreadable/low-resolution documents has been acknowledged. Fresh high-resolution plans are being prepared and will be resubmitted. 42. With reference to the observation regarding non-submission of the Fire Safety Certificate, it is respectfully submitted that the infrastructure of Gujarat Vidyapith is fully developed, operational and being regularly utilized for academic purposes. It is pertinent to state that:

- The institution possesses all relevant building records, structural details, and technical documentation.
- The infrastructure has been constructed and maintained in accordance with standard norms applicable to educational institutions.
- Adequate fire safety measures and precautions have been adopted within the premises to ensure safety.

It is further submitted that as per the general provisions of the National Building Code of India, stringent fire safety certification requirements are primarily applicable to buildings exceeding 15 meters in height. In the present case:

- The Faculty of Education building is below 15 meters in height.
- Therefore, the

requirement of Fire Safety Certificate is not of the same mandatory nature as applicable to high-rise buildings, though basic fire safety compliance is duly maintained. Without prejudice to the above, it is respectfully submitted that: • The institution is committed to full compliance with all safety norms • If required by the Hon'ble Committee, the institution shall approach the competent Fire Authority to obtain the Fire Safety Certificate or necessary clarification • Necessary steps in this regard can be initiated immediately and the same shall be submitted upon issuance In view of the above, it is humbly requested that this observation may kindly be considered in light of the actual applicability of norms and existing safety compliance, and reasonable time may be granted to submit the certificate, if required by the competent authority. We assure the Hon'ble Committee that all required documents shall be submitted within the next few months as soon as the statutory processes are completed."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 24.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 29.01.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution. The Committee noted that the appeal pertains to deficiencies relating to authorization, land documents, statutory certifications, building approvals, infrastructure details, and documentary compliance as observed by the concerned Regional Committee in respect of the ITEP application. The appellant institution, Gujarat Vidyapith, submitted that at the time of application for ITEP 2025-26, an affidavit for authorization was duly submitted as per the prescribed format, and the

authorized representative had also appeared before the Visiting Team on 23.09.2025. It was further submitted that all requisite documents were uploaded on the portal, including a forwarding letter dated 30.10.2025 authenticated by the Registrar, Gujarat Vidyapith, enclosing the list of faculty for B.A. B.Ed. (Foundation) – 1 unit and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Middle) – 1 unit, duly countersigned by the affiliating authority. With regard to land-related deficiencies, the appellant submitted that land documents were uploaded in Gujarati along with an English translation, which has now been notarized. It was stated that the land is owned and possessed by the institution, and relevant ownership and possession records are available. The mutation certificate and Non-Encumbrance Certificate are stated to be under process with the competent revenue authorities, involving statutory procedures such as verification of title, historical entries, and certification by competent officials, and shall be submitted upon completion. Regarding infrastructure and building-related deficiencies, the appellant submitted that approved site plans and building plans are available, and formal approval by a Council of Architecture registered architect is under process. It was stated that all architectural drawings and infrastructure facilities are in place and functional, and only formal certification remains pending. The institution further submitted that detailed break-up of built-up area and updated building plans are being prepared, and earlier issues relating to low-resolution documents are being rectified. On the issue of Building Safety Certificate and Building Completion Certificate, it was submitted that the infrastructure is fully developed and operational, and all relevant records are available; however, issuance of statutory certificates is under process with competent authorities, involving inspection and verification procedures. Similar submissions were made regarding Fire Safety Certificate, wherein it was stated that the building height is below 15 meters and basic fire safety measures are in place; however, the institution is willing to obtain certification if required. With respect to photographic evidence, the appellant submitted that geotagged photographs were uploaded in PDF format, due to which geotagging was not reflected, and that all facilities including laboratories, multipurpose hall, activity centre, and other infrastructure are available and can be substantiated through proper geotagged photographs. It was further submitted that facilities such as faculty chambers, meeting rooms, laboratories, and a kitchen garden are available and functional. The appellant institution reiterated that certain deficiencies relate to procedural delays in obtaining statutory certifications from competent authorities and not to absence of infrastructure or records.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found on findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including compliance with the prescribed shortlisting criteria, and are neither procedural nor technical in nature. At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents and a compliance report purporting to rectify the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not been subjected to verification, authentication, or scrutiny by the competent authority in accordance with the procedure prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. It is a settled position under the statutory framework that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and such compliance is necessarily to be assessed by the competent Regional Committee, being the statutory authority entrusted with such examination under the Act. The Appeal Committee further reiterates that the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance with the statutory norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory in character and remains conditional upon demonstrable adherence to the prescribed norms at the relevant point of time; it does not confer any vested, accrued, or equitable right in favour of the applicant institution in the absence of such compliance. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies, which are essentially factual and capable of objective verification, and bearing in mind the limited scope of appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of enabling a factual re-examination of the material now placed on record, without expressing any opinion on merits and without diluting the statutory requirements. In this context, the Committee also

takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of factual re-verification of the appellant's claim of compliance. Such interference is confined to ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory consistency and shall not be construed as dilution of the mandatory statutory requirements or as any expression on the merits of the appellant's claims. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 29.01.2026 is set aside, and the matter is remanded to the Western Regional Committee for the limited purpose of factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team. The appellant institution shall, within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of this order, submit to the concerned Regional Committee: (a) A duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon; and (b) Certified copies of all approvals, certificates, and statutory documents issued by the competent authorities in support of its claim of compliance. The Online Visiting Team shall verify, on the basis of the documents and physical/virtual inspection, the specific deficiencies noted in the impugned order, including infrastructural, instructional, and statutory requirements, and assess compliance with 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 dated 15.05.2025 (where applicable). Upon receipt of the Visiting Team Report, the Western Regional Committee shall examine the same along with the affidavit and supporting documents, verify their authenticity, and pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations contained herein, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined strictly to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny. It shall not be construed as conferring any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish strict and complete compliance with the prescribed norms and standards upon such re-verification shall entail rejection in accordance with law, without further opportunity. The Regional Committee, being the custodian of records, shall ensure the authenticity, completeness, and proper verification of all documents before passing any consequential order and shall ensure time-bound disposal of the matter.

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 29.01.2026 and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee for limited factual re-verification through an Online Visiting Team, subject to strict compliance with the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite 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, Faculty of Education IASE, (Shikshan Mahavidyalaya), Plot No. 97 TP3, Village - Usmanpura, Income Tax, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad City, Gujarat-380009.
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.



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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-116/E-403912/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLNRC202615575 -

Venkateshwara Institute of Computer Science and Technology, Khasra No. 944945920-949, NH-58, Jatoli Meerut, Sardhana, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh – 250001	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Vikas Kumar Kaushik, Registrar
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Venkateshwara Institute of Computer Science and Technology, Khasra No. 944945920-949, NH-58, Jatoli Meerut, Sardhana, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh - 250001** dated 23.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2627202509202991/UTTAR PRADESH/2025/REJC/138** dated 24.01.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. As per the decision of NRC taken in its 453rd meeting held on 11th & 12th December 2025, Final SCN for Deficiency-Preliminary Scrutiny was issued to the institution on 24.12.2025. 2. The institution has not uploaded the reply of Final SCN for Deficiency-Preliminary Scrutiny within stipulated period."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Vikas Kumar Kaushik, Registrar of Venkateshwara Institute of Computer Science and Technology, Khasra No. 944945920-949, NH-58, Jatoli Meerut, Sardhana, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh - 250001 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. Institution already submitted the reply 2 time of the First Show Cause Notice by personally hard copy in NCTE office. 2. Institution again submitted the reply though speed post in concern Regional Office within stipulated time. The appellant also submitted represented that Institute already running BBA, BCA, B.Com., B.Lib. courses. Approval of BA course is also attached Not-For-Profit certificate issued by the Competent Government Authority is attached. Revised recognition order for M.Ed. course is attached. An affidavit on Rs. 100/- non-judicial stamp paper regarding land and built-up area is attached Latest certified copy of land documents in respect of Khasra Nos. 849@1] 850] 914@1] 920@2] 921] 922] 923] 924] 925] 926] 927] 928] 929] 930] 931] 933@1] 944] 945 issued by the Revenue Department is attached. Mutation Certificate issued by the Competent Revenue Authority is attached Land Use Certificate issued by the Competent Revenue Authority to use the land for educational purposes. The latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Competent Revenue Authority indicating that the land is free from all

encumbrances is attached. Building plan duly approved by the Competent Government Authority indicating the name of the course, name of the institution, Khasra /Plot No., total land area and total built-up area with the measurements of the Multi-purpose Hall as well as other infrastructural facilities such as classrooms etc. along with approval letter issue by the Competent Government Authority is attached. Fire Safety Certificate issue by the Competent Government Authority is attached. Building Safety Certificate citing that the building of the institution has been constructed as per National Building Code and the same is fully safe and structural sound having load bearing capacity as per the Code/ Standards, for offering the teacher training course, issue by the Competent Government Authority is attached. Certificate that the institution's campus, building, furniture etc. is barrier free/Accessible is attached. Building Completion Certificate duly signed by the Competent Government Authority in prescribed format of NCTE is attached.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 05.10.2025. 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 replies to the First Show Cause Notice had already been submitted twice, initially through physical submission in hard copy at the NCTE office and subsequently through Speed Post to the concerned Regional Office within the stipulated time. The appellant institution further submitted that it is already running BBA, BCA, B.Com., and B.Lib. courses and has also enclosed approval relating to the B.A. course. The appellant institution represented that, in compliance with the deficiencies pointed out, it has submitted a Not-for-Profit

Certificate issued by the competent Government Authority, revised recognition order for the M.Ed. programme, and an affidavit executed on a Rs.100/- non-judicial stamp paper regarding land and built-up area. It was further submitted that the institution has enclosed the latest certified copies of land documents pertaining to Khasra Nos. 849@1, 850, 914@1, 920@2, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 933@1, 944 and 945, issued by the Revenue Department, along with Mutation Certificate, Land Use Certificate for educational purposes, and the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent Revenue Authority. –The appellant institution also submitted that it has enclosed a duly approved Building Plan issued by the competent Government Authority indicating the name of the course, name of the institution, khasra/plot numbers, total land area, total built-up area, and measurements of the multipurpose hall and other infrastructural facilities, along with the approval letter of the competent authority. Further, Fire Safety Certificate, Building Safety Certificate certifying compliance with the National Building Code and structural safety for offering teacher education programmes, certificate regarding barrier-free/accessibility provisions, and Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed NCTE format duly issued by the competent Government Authority have also been submitted.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order

or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate

stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 24.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 24.01.2026 and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, Venkateshwara Institute of Computer Science and Technology, Khasra No. 944945920-949, NH-58, Jatoli Meerut, Sardhana, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh - 250001.
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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-125/E-404685/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLNRC202615585 ✓

Sanskar College, Khasra No. 509, Village-Sansarpur, Street/Road- Kalssiya -Chhutmalpur Road, Taluka/Mandal-Behat, District- Saharanpur, UP-247129	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Praveen Choudhary, Managing Director
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Sanskar College, Khasra No. 509, Village-Sansarpur, Street/Road-Kalssiya -Chhutmalpur Road, Taluka/Mandal-Behat, District-Saharanpur, UP-247129** dated 30.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2627202509273392 /UTTAR PRADESH/2025/REJC/89** dated 26.02.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "As per the decision of NRC in its 455th meeting, the Final SCN post inspection was issued to the institution on 29.01.2026. The institution has uploaded a reply to the Final SCN post inspection on 02.02.2026. However, the same is still deficient on the following grounds:- The institution joined the virtual inspection at around 11:10 A.M., However, during the inspection, the institution was neither able to present the relevant documents nor provide any satisfactory response on the basis of which, the resources and relevant documents of the institution could not be verified. The institution itself admitted that due to technical issues and unstable internet connectivity at both ends, the documents could not be properly viewed by the VT members. As such, the institution has not participated in conducting the inspection. As per sub-regulation (7) of the Regulation 7 of the NCTE Regulations 2014 as amended from time to time, the inspection of the institution shall not be subject to the consent of the institution."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Praveen Choudhary, Managing Director from **Sanskar College, Khasra No. 509, Village-Sansarpur, Street/Road-Kalssiya -Chhutmalpur Road, Taluka/Mandal-Behat, District-Saharanpur, UP-247129** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The institution joined the online inspection meeting within the stipulated time. However, due to technical issues and unstable internet connectivity, certain documents could not be displayed instantly. It is respectfully submitted that all statutory and academic documents are duly available with the institution and are now being submitted online as supporting documents. 2. On the date of inspection, the internet connectivity in the area was extremely poor, resulting in interruption during the virtual campus tour. This was a temporary issue

beyond the control of the institution. At present, high-speed broadband and alternative internet arrangements have been ensured. 3. Due to the above technical constraints, the Visiting Team could not verify the documents effectively. It is clarified that the institution has not withheld any information. All documents are genuine, valid and in compliance with NCTE norms. 4. The institution fully respects the provisions of the NCTE Act and Regulations, including Regulation 7(7) of NCTE Regulations, 2014. Our humble submission is only to request kind consideration of the technical difficulties faced during inspection while evaluating the submitted documents.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 04.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 26.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that the appeal pertains to deficiencies arising during the conduct of the online inspection by the Visiting Team. The appellant institution submitted that it had joined the online inspection within the stipulated time; however, due to technical issues and unstable internet connectivity, certain documents could not be displayed during the inspection. It was further submitted that all statutory and academic documents are duly available with the institution and are now being furnished online as supporting documents. The institution submitted that on the date of inspection, poor internet connectivity resulted in interruptions during the virtual campus tour, which was beyond its control. It was further stated that the institution has since ensured availability of high-speed broadband and alternative internet arrangements. The appellant clarified that due to the technical constraints, the Visiting Team could not

effectively verify the documents, and that no information was withheld. It was submitted that all documents are genuine, valid, and in compliance with NCTE norms. The institution further submitted that it respects the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014, including Regulation 7(7), and requested that the technical difficulties faced during the inspection be considered while evaluating the documents submitted.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee has been rendered in the context of compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the applicable Guidelines, including the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The Committee notes that the issues arising in the present appeal pertain to matters relating to verification of compliance with prescribed norms, including aspects connected with the conduct of virtual inspection and verification of relevant institutional records and resources. The material available on record further indicates that certain constraints were stated to have arisen during the inspection process, which, according to the appellant institution, affected effective verification of documents and institutional resources. The deficiencies involved in the present case are, therefore, essentially factual and technical in nature and are capable of objective verification by the competent authority in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory framework. At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution clarified that, due to technical constraints and connectivity issues, the Visiting Team could not effectively verify the documents during the virtual inspection and that no information or record was intentionally withheld from verification. It is a settled position under the statutory framework governing recognition that compliance with prescribed norms and standards is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable

documentary evidence, and such compliance is necessarily to be assessed by the competent Regional Committee, being the statutory authority entrusted with such examination under the Act. The Appeal Committee further reiterates that the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance with the statutory norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory in character and remains conditional upon demonstrable adherence to the prescribed norms at the relevant point of time; it does not confer any vested, accrued, or equitable right in favour of the applicant institution in the absence of such compliance. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies, which are essentially factual and capable of objective verification, and bearing in mind the limited scope of appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of enabling factual re-verification by the Visiting Team on the basis of the material now placed on record, without expressing any opinion on merits and without diluting the statutory requirements governing recognition. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in *Rambha College of Education v. NCTE*, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has further recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993

and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

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, is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of factual re-verification of the appellant's claim of compliance. Such interference is confined to ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory consistency and shall not be construed as dilution of the mandatory statutory requirements or as any expression on the merits of the appellant's claims. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 26.02.2026 is set aside, and the matter is remanded to the Northern Regional Committee for the limited purpose of factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team. The appellant institution shall, within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of this order, submit to the concerned Regional Committee: (a) A duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon; and (b) Certified copies of all approvals, certificates, and statutory documents issued by the competent authorities in support of its claim of compliance. The Online Visiting Team shall verify, on the basis of the documents and physical/virtual inspection, the specific deficiencies noted in the impugned order, including infrastructural, instructional, and statutory requirements, and assess compliance with 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 dated 15.05.2025 (where applicable). Upon receipt of the Visiting Team Report, the Northern Regional Committee shall examine the same along with the affidavit and supporting documents, verify their authenticity, and pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations contained herein, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined strictly to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny. It shall not be construed as conferring any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish strict and complete compliance with the

prescribed norms and standards upon such re-verification shall entail rejection in accordance with law, without further opportunity. The Regional Committee, being the custodian of records, shall ensure the authenticity, completeness, and proper verification of all documents before passing any consequential order and shall ensure time-bound disposal of the matter.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided to set aside the impugned order dated 26.02.2026 and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee for limited factual re-verification through an Online Visiting Team, subject to strict compliance with the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite 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, Sanskar College, Khasra No. 509, Village-Sansarpur, Street/Road-Kalssiya -Chhutmalpur Road, Taluka/Mandal-Behat, District-Saharanpur, UP-247129.**
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 - 14.05.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-126/E-405217/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615563 -

Kasturi Devi College, Khasra No. 4983, 5023, 5024, 5025, 5026, Village - Chakshu, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-303901	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Rajendra Prasad Sharma, Secretary
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Kasturi Devi College, Khasra No. 4983, 5023, 5024, 5025, 5026, Village - Chakshu, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-303901** dated 14.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/252620242091170/RAJASTHAN/2024/REJC/170** dated 05.02.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. Letter of intent (LOI) prior to grant of recognition/permission for transition of existing B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. into integrated Teacher Education programme (ITEP) under Section 7(13) of NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 was issued to the Secretary, Kasturi Devi College, Chaksu, Jaipur, Rajasthan – 303901 vide letter F. No. NCTE/WRC/2526202402091170/RAJASTHAN /2024/LOI dated 05.05.2025. 2. In response to the LOI, the institution has not uploaded any reply within stipulated time period."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Rajendra Prasad Sharma, Secretary from **Kasturi Devi College, Khasra No. 4983, 5023, 5024, 5025, 5026, Village - Chakshu, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-303901** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. Appeal The Appellant Institution most respectfully submits this Appeal against the Refusal Order issued by the Western Regional Committee (WRC), NCTE in respect of the application for Transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) for the 4-year Integrated Programme (B.A.B.Ed. / B.Sc.B.Ed.) and submits as under:- 1. **Background of Recognition-** The Appellant Institution has been duly recognized by NCTE for conducting 4-year Integrated B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes with an intake of 2 units (100 seats) since the academic session 2018–2019. Since the grant of recognition, the institution has been successfully running these programmes and has consistently maintained the required infrastructural, instructional and academic facilities as prescribed under the NCTE Regulations. 2. Application for Transition to ITEP In pursuance of the policy decision of NCTE for transition of existing 4-year Integrated Teacher Education Programmes to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), the Appellant Institution applied for: B.A. B.Ed. – 1

Unit Secondary Level – 1 Unit B.Sc. B.Ed. – 1 Units Secondary Level – 1 Unit Thus, the institution applied for transition of both existing integrated programmes with the same intake capacity already recognized by NCTE. 3. Discrepancy in the Letter of Intent (LOI) However, in the Letter of Intent (LOI) issued under Clause 7(13) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as recorded in WRC Minutes No. 419, the LOI was issued only for: B.A.B.Ed. – 1 Unit (ITEP Transition) The LOI did not include the remaining units/programmes for which the institution had applied, particularly the B.Sc.B.Ed. programme and additional units. This resulted in a serious discrepancy between the application submitted by the institution and the LOI issued by NCTE, thereby creating confusion and procedural difficulty for the Appellant Institution. 4. Delay in Approval of Teaching Staff by the University Following receipt of the LOI, the institution immediately initiated the process for obtaining approval of teaching staff from the affiliating University (University of Rajasthan) as required for compliance with the LOI conditions. However, due to delay on the part of the University in granting approval of the teaching staff, the institution could not obtain the requisite approval within the stipulated time period. It is submitted that the delay occurred due to circumstances beyond the control of the institution. 5. Submission of Reply to First Show Cause Notice Subsequently, the institution received a First Show Cause Notice (FSCN). The Appellant Institution duly submitted its reply to the FSCN through the online portal. However, while submitting the reply: The portal did not provide an option to upload the complete compliance/LOI response. Consequently, the institution could not submit the full set of LOI compliance documents despite its readiness to do so. 6. Issuance of Refusal Order Without adequately considering the submissions made by the Appellant Institution and without providing an effective opportunity to submit the complete LOI compliance, the Western Regional Committee proceeded to issue a Refusal Order. 7. Availability of Infrastructure and Instructional Facilities - It is respectfully submitted that the Appellant Institution fully satisfies all infrastructural, instructional and academic requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, including: - Adequate land and built-up area - Well-equipped classrooms and laboratories - Library and ICT facilities - Qualified teaching faculty - Other academic and instructional resources The institution has already been successfully running the 4-year integrated programmes - since 2018-19, which itself demonstrates the availability of the required facilities and institutional capacity. 8. Injustice Caused to

the Institution It is respectfully submitted that: - The institution was already running 2 units (100 seats) of 4-year integrated programmes. However, the LOI was issued only for 1 unit, which is not commensurate with the existing recognition and operational capacity of the institution. - The refusal order has therefore resulted in serious prejudice and injustice to the institution, despite its full compliance with NCTE norms and regulations. 9. Principles of Natural Justice The impugned refusal order has been passed without providing a fair and effective opportunity to the institution to submit the complete LOI compliance, particularly in view of: - The discrepancy in the LOI issued - Technical limitations in the online submission portal - Delay in university approval which was beyond the institution's control. 10. Prayer In view of the facts and circumstances stated above, the Appellant Institution most respectfully prays that the Hon'ble Appeal Committee may kindly: - Set aside the Refusal Order issued by the Western Regional Committee (WRC), NCTE. - Consider the application of the institution for transition to ITEP for both programmes and units as originally applied. - Direct the Regional Committee to re-consider the matter and constitute a Visiting Team to verify the infrastructural and instructional facilities available with the institution. - Pass any other order deemed fit and proper in the interest of justice."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 28.02.2024. 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 the appeal has been preferred against the refusal order issued by the Western Regional Committee (WRC), NCTE in respect of its application for transition to the Integrated

Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) for the 4-year integrated programmes (B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed.). The appellant institution submitted that it has been duly recognized by NCTE since the academic session 2018–2019 for conducting 4-year integrated B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes with an intake of two units (100 seats), and has been running the programmes with requisite infrastructural, instructional, and academic facilities as per NCTE Regulations. It was further submitted that, in pursuance of NCTE policy for transition to ITEP, the institution applied for transition of both existing programmes with the same intake capacity. The institution contended that, however, the Letter of Intent (LOI) issued under Clause 7(13) of the NCTE Regulations, as recorded in WRC Minutes No. 419, covered only one unit of B.A. B.Ed. (ITEP Transition), and did not include the B.Sc. B.Ed. programme and other units applied for, resulting in discrepancy between the application and the LOI. The appellant further submitted that it initiated compliance with LOI conditions, including obtaining approval of teaching staff from the affiliating University (University of Rajasthan), but the approval was delayed by the University, which was beyond the control of the institution. It was also submitted that, in response to the First Show Cause Notice, the institution uploaded its reply on the portal; however, due to technical limitations of the portal, it could not upload the complete LOI compliance documents. It was contended that the refusal order was issued without adequately considering the submissions made and without providing an effective opportunity to submit complete compliance. The institution further submitted that it possesses all required infrastructural and instructional facilities, including adequate land, built-up area, classrooms, laboratories, library, ICT facilities, and qualified faculty, and has been successfully running the integrated programmes since 2018–19. The appellant institution submitted that the issuance of LOI for only one unit, despite existing recognition for two units, and the subsequent refusal order have caused prejudice and injustice. It was further contended that the impugned order was passed without affording a fair and effective opportunity, particularly in view of the discrepancy in LOI, technical limitations of the portal, and delay in university approval. Accordingly, the appellant institution has prayed for setting aside of the refusal order, consideration of its application for transition to ITEP for both programmes and units as originally applied, and for direction to the Regional Committee to reconsider the matter, including verification of infrastructural and instructional facilities.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective

competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 05.02.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the

concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

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 for fresh consideration and re-examination in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), subject to the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite 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, Kasturi Devi College, Khasra No. 4983, 5023, 5024, 5025, 5026, Village - Chakshu, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-303901.**

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 - 14.05.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-127/E-403625/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLNRC202615578 -

Baba Kirpal Dass College of Education for Women, Khasara No. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, 3140, Village-Devinagar, Street/Road, Ward No. 9, Taluka/Mandal- Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh-173025	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Harpuneet Kaur, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Baba Kirpal Dass College of Education for Women, Khasara No. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, 3140, Village-Devinagar, Street/Road, Ward No. 9, Taluka/Mandal- Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh-173025** dated 27.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. NRC/NCTE/HP-22+HP-83, HP-144/B.Ed., B.Ed. Add. & D.El.Ed. /451st Meeting (Vol-II), (Sl. No. 14)/2025/ (235834-235844)** dated 20.02.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "As per decision of NRC taken in its 433rd Meeting held on 30th & 31st January, 2025, Final Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 28.03.2025. The institution has submitted a reply to Final SCN on 17.04.2025. The committee considered the reply and found the same deficient on the following grounds: - 1. The Institution has submitted an agreement of land which is between Sh. Sanjeev Gupta & Baba Sri Chand ji Memorial Trust (Regd.), however, the same is not registered in the office of Sub-Registrar concerned. 2. The Agreement of land is not acceptable as per NCTE Regulations 2014. The said Regulations provide that the land free from all encumbrances could either on ownership basis or on lease from Govt or Govt institutions for a period of not less than 30 years. 3. Building Plan submitted by the institution signed by the Architect and approved by the Executive officer Municipal Council Paonta Sahib, Urban Development Authority. The seal of the approving authority is not stamped on the building plan. 4. Building plan is for Khasra No. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139 & 3140 total measuring 6643-09 Sq. Mtr. whereas the land agreement submitted by the institution is for Khasra No. 126/1 of the land area 8 bigha which do not tally with each other. 5. Multipurpose Hall is not depicted on the building plan. 6. The building completion certificate submitted by the institution is not in the prescribed format of NCTE. Total area of land is not mentioned in BCC. The plot no./ Khasra no. / House no. 166/167 mentioned in the BCC do not tally with the agreement of land and building plan. 7. Land use certificate for plot no/ khasra no. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, & 3140 submitted by the institution is issued by the Tehsildar whereas the land agreement is for plot no./ khasra no. 126/1. 8. NEC submitted by the institution is issued by the Tehsildar for plot no/ khasra no. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136,

3137, 3138, 3139, & 3140 whereas the land agreement is for plot no./ khasra no. 126/1. 9. The list of faculty submitted for D.El.Ed. Programme is not in prescribed format NCTE. 10. The Institution has submitted an agreement of land which is between Sh. Sanjeev Gupta & Baba Sri Chand ji Memorial Trust (Regd.), however, the same is not registered in the office of Sub-Registrar concerned. 11. The Agreement of land is not acceptable as per NCTE Regulations 2014. The said Regulations provide that the land free from all encumbrances could either on ownership basis or on lease from Govt or Govt institutions for a period of not less than 30-years. 12. Building Plan submitted by the institution signed by the Architect and approved by the Executive officer Municipal Council Paonta Sahib, Urban Development Authority. The seal of the approving authority is not stamped on the building plan. 13. Building plan is for Khasra No. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139 & 3140 total measuring 6643-09 Sq. Mtr. whereas the land agreement submitted by the institution is for Khasra No. 126/1 of the land area 8 bigha which do not tally with each other. 14. Multipurpose Hall is not depicted on the building plan. 15. The building completion certificate submitted by the institution is not in the prescribed format of NCTE. Total area of land is not mentioned in BCC. The plot no./ Khasra no. / House no. 166/167 mentioned in the BCC do not tally with the agreement of land and building plan. 16. Land use certificate for plot no/ khasra no. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, & 3140 submitted by the institution is issued by the Tehsildar whereas the land agreement is for plot no./ khasra no. 126/1. 17. NEC submitted by the institution is issued by the Tehsildar for plot no/ khasra no. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, & 3140 whereas the land agreement is for plot no./ khasra no. 126/1. 18. The list of faculty submitted for D.El.Ed. Programme is not in prescribed format NCTE.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Harpuneet Kaur, Principal from Baba Kirpal Dass College of Education for Women, Khasara No. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, 3140, Village-Devinagar, Street/Road, Ward No. 9, Taluka/Mandal-Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh-173025 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Although in the month of February 1995, an agreement (Annexure - 14) was duly scribed and attested between Sh. Sanjeev Gupta S/o Sh. Santosh Kumar and the Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust through

which Sh. Sanjeev Gupta had sold his entire land along with building built thereon in his possession comprised in Khata Khatauni no. 12/85, Khasra no. 126/1, measuring 08-00-00 Bigha, situated at Mohal Devinagar, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmour, H.P. Whereas mutation of transfer of possession has been already incorporated revenue records on the basis of aforesaid agreement in favour of Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust and now Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is in recorded possession of said property. Hence the said agreement has been specifically performed and now registration of said agreement is not needed and the said agreement is now part of the history chain of title. 2. The said property is free from all encumbrances and whereas the Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is in recorded possession of said property and mutation of which duly incorporated in revenue records and further Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is in peaceful possession of the same and their possession is absolute and prolonged and Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust have constructed college institution building on the said land and also got building map approved from M.C Paonta Sahib, H.P. and also paid house tax/ property tax (Annexure - 15) on the said property to M.C Paonta Sahib, H.P. and also have electricity (Annexure – 15A) connection in name of Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust on the said property and also paying other utility bills in their name on said property, hence Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is in undisputed possession on the said property and as per prevailing govt policies ownership of the said land and building can also be conferred to Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust in future as same is going on some other revenue villages in Tehsil Paonta Sahib, H.P. and therefore possession of Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is clear, peaceful and undisputed and as good as ownership of the said land. 3. The building plan submitted by the institution is duly signed by the architect and approved by the competent authority Municipal Council Paonta Sahib and also stamped by the approving authority (Annexure - 13 & 13A). 4. That the said land as per agreement bearing Khasra No. 126/1 measuring 8 bigha has been updated at the time of bando basti i.e. updation of revenue records of revenue village Upsampada Devinagar and area unit of said revenue village converted from unit bigha to unit sq.mtr and Khasra No. are also updated as per spot and after updation of record of Khasra No. 126/1 as per Missal hakiyat 2002-03, the said land got new Khasra No. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139 & 3140, Kite-10, and area of said land is converted into unit sq.mtr i.e. total measuring 6643-09 Sq. Mtr. (Annexure - 12). 5. The multipurpose

hall has been depicted on the duly approved building plan and has been highlighted as pointed out by NRC (Annexure - 13).. 6. The latest building completion certificate duly signed by competent authority as per the prescribed format of NCTE with all required details is submitted (Annexure - 16 & 16A). 7. The latest land use certificate issued by the naib tahsildar (competent authority) is submitted hereby which declared that new khasra number 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, & 3140 and old khasra number 126/1 are for the same land (Annexure - 12). 8. The latest non encumbrance certificate issued by the Naib tehsildar (competent authority) is submitted here by which declared that new khasra number 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, & 3140 and old khasra number 126/1 are for the same land (Annexure - 11). 9. List of D.El.Ed faculty in the prescribed format of NCTE duly verified by Principal DIET Nahan and counter signed by Secretary HP board of School Education Dharamshala (Annexure - 17 & 17A). 10. Although in the month of February 1995, an agreement (Annexure - 14) was duly scribed and attested between Sh. Sanjeev Gupta S/o Sh. Santosh Kumar and the Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust through which Sh. Sanjeev Gupta had sold his entire land along with building built thereon in his possession comprised in Khata Khatauni no. 12/85, Khasra no. 126/1, measuring 08-00-00 Bigha, situated at Mohal Devinagar, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmour, H.P. Whereas mutation of transfer of possession has been already incorporated revenue records on the basis of aforesaid agreement in favour of Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust and now Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is in recorded possession of said property. Hence the said agreement has been specifically performed and now registration of said agreement is not needed and the said agreement is now part of the history chain of title. 11. The said property is free from all encumbrances and whereas the Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is in recorded possession of said property and mutation of which duly incorporated in revenue records and further Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is in peaceful possession of the same and their possession is absolute and prolonged and Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust have constructed college institution building on the said land and also got building map approved from M.C Paonta Sahib, H.P. and also paid house tax/ property tax (Annexure - 15) on the said property to M.C Paonta Sahib, H.P. and also have electricity (Annexure - 15A) connection in name of Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust on the said property and also paying other utility bills in their name on said property, hence Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is in undisputed

possession on the said property and as per prevailing govt policies ownership of the said land and building can also be conferred to Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust in future as same is going on some other revenue villages in Tehsil Paonta Sahib, H.P. and therefore possession of Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust is clear, peaceful and undisputed and as good as ownership of the said land. 12. The building plan submitted by the institution is duly signed by the architect and approved by the competent authority Municipal Council Paonta Sahib and also stamped by the approving authority (Annexure - 13 & 13A). 13. That the said land as per agreement bearing Khasra No. 126/1 measuring 8 bigha has been updated at the time of bando basti i.e. updation of revenue records of revenue village Upsampada Devinagar and area unit of said revenue village converted from unit bigha to unit sq.mtr and Khasra No. are also updated as per spot and after updation of record of Khasra No. 126/1 as per Missal hakiyat 2002-03, the said land got new Khasra No. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139 & 3140, Kite-10, and area of said land is converted into unit sq.mtr i.e. total measuring 6643-09 Sq. Mtr. (Annexure - 12). 14. The multipurpose hall has been depicted on the duly approved building plan and has been highlighted as pointed out by NRC (Annexure - 13). 15. The latest building completion certificate duly signed by competent authority as per the prescribed format of NCTE with all required details is submitted (Annexure - 16 & 16A). 16. The latest land use certificate issued by the naib tahsildar (competent authority) is submitted hereby which declared that new khasra number 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, & 3140 and old khasra number 126/1 are for the same land (Annexure - 12). 17. The latest non encumbrance certificate issued by the Naib tahsildar (competent authority) is submitted here by which declared that new khasra number 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, & 3140 and old khasra number 126/1 are for the same land (Annexure - 11). 18. List of D.El.Ed faculty in the prescribed format of NCTE duly verified by Principal DIET Nahan and counter signed by Secretary HP board of School Education Dharamshala (Annexure - 17 & 17A)."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 60 (sixty) students vide order dated 07.09.1999. The institution was subsequently granted additional intake of 40 (forty) students vide order dated 10.03.2005 thus making total intake of 100 (one hundred) students. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 a Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 06.06.2015. As per request of the institution and decision taken by the NRC in its 265th meeting, the intake of the institution was reduced to 50 students vide order dated 27.04.2017 from the academic session 2017-2018. The recognition was also granted to the institution for conducting ETE programme with an intake of 50 students vide order dated 10.01.2006. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed/B.Ed. Addl. And D.El.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 20.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that the land in question measuring 8 bigha originally comprised in Khasra No. 126/1, Khata Khatauni No. 12/85, situated at Mohal Devinagar, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh, was transferred in favour of Baba Shri Chand Memorial Trust through an agreement dated February 1995 executed by the previous owner. It has been submitted that the mutation of possession has been duly incorporated in the revenue records in favour of the Trust, which is in recorded, peaceful, and undisputed possession of the property, and that the said agreement forms part of the chain of title. The appellant institution further submitted that the said land is free from encumbrances and that the Trust has constructed the institutional building on the said land, obtained approval of the building plan from Municipal Council, Paonta Sahib, paid applicable house/property tax, and holds electricity and other utility connections in its name, thereby establishing possession and use of the property for educational purposes. It was also submitted that, pursuant to updation of revenue records (bandobast), the original Khasra No. 126/1 has been assigned new Khasra

numbers 3131 to 3140, with the total land area recorded as 6643.09 sq. mtrs. The appellant institution submitted that the approved building plan duly signed by the architect and sanctioned by the competent authority has been furnished, wherein the multipurpose hall is duly indicated. It was further submitted that the latest Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed NCTE format has been issued by the competent authority and submitted along with requisite details. It was also submitted that the Land Use Certificate and Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Naib Tehsildar (competent authority) have been furnished, certifying that both the old and updated Khasra numbers pertain to the same land and that the land is free from encumbrances. Further, the appellant institution submitted that the list of D.El.Ed. faculty in the prescribed NCTE format has been furnished, duly verified by the Principal, DIET Nahan, and countersigned by the Secretary, Himachal Pradesh Board of School Education, Dharamshala.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observed that although the appellant institution had preferred the present appeal in respect of the B.Ed. programme, the submissions made during the appellate proceedings also sought consideration of the B.Ed. (AI) and D.El.Ed. programmes covered under the impugned order. During the online hearing, the Committee sought clarification regarding the inclusion of the additional programmes, whereupon the appellant institution submitted that, owing to limitations in the online filing format, only one programme could be reflected at the time of submission of the appeal, and accordingly requested that the appeal be considered in respect of all programmes covered under the impugned order dated 20.02.2026. The Appeal Committee, upon examination of the records, noted that the Regional Committee concerned had issued the impugned order dated 20.02.2026 in respect of all the aforesaid programmes. Accordingly, the Committee found it appropriate, in the interest of comprehensive adjudication, to consider and hear the matter in respect of all programmes covered under the impugned order. The Appeal Committee thereafter proceeded to hear the case and noted that the decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time.

The Appeal Committee noted that, at the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with supporting documents purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies forming the basis of the withdrawal order. The Committee further observed that a substantial portion of the material so relied upon was either not available before the concerned Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in the manner contemplated under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. Under the statutory scheme of the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the applicable Regulations, compliance with prescribed recognition norms is required to be established through duly verified and authenticated records. Consequently, the material now placed on record necessitates factual scrutiny and regulatory examination by the competent Regional Committee before any conclusive determination regarding compliance can be arrived at. The Appeal Committee further observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication and in light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016]***, subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasised that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

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

“Appellate Committee of NCTE, is directed to ensure that, whenever an

order of remand is passed, the status of the impugned is clearly spelt out so that the institution is not compelled to approach the Court in this manner.”

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

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

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of ensuring factual verification and regulatory scrutiny of the appellant institution's claim of compliance. Such interference is confined to ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory consistency and shall not be construed as dilution of the mandatory statutory requirements or as any expression on the merits of the appellant's claims. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 20.02.2026 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the Northern Regional Committee for fresh consideration and comprehensive re-examination of the appellant institution's claim of compliance. The appellant institution shall, within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of this order, submit to the concerned Regional Committee a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon, along with certified copies of all approvals, certificates, and statutory documents issued by the competent authorities in support of its claim. The concerned Regional Committee shall examine the entire record strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure)

Regulations, 2014 (as amended), verify the authenticity and adequacy of the documents, and, if deemed necessary, undertake further verification, including through appropriate means such as a Visiting Team, for the purpose of ascertaining factual and regulatory compliance. Thereafter, the Regional Committee shall pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations contained herein, within the prescribed timeframe. The Regional Committee, being the custodian of records, shall ensure authenticity, completeness, and proper verification of all documents before passing any consequential order and shall ensure time-bound disposal of the matter. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined to ensuring due verification and regulatory scrutiny and shall not be construed as conferring any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish strict and complete compliance with the prescribed statutory requirements shall entail rejection in accordance with law, without any further opportunity.

IV. DECISION:

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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, sets aside the impugned order dated 20.02.2026 and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee for fresh consideration and re-examination in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), subject to the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite 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, Baba Kirpal Dass College of Education for Women, Khasara No. 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, 3140, Village-**

Devinagar, Street/Road, Ward No. 9, Taluka/Mandal- Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh-173025.

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.



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 - 14.05.2026

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

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-130/E-405959/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026

APPLERC202615596

Mohan Shakuntala Teachers Training College, Ward No. 04, Village - Madhepura, Goshala Chowk District-Madhepura, Bihar-852113 APPELLANT	Vs	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 RESPONDENT
--	-----------	--

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Mohan Shakuntala Teachers Training College, Ward No. 04, Village - Madhepura, Goshala Chowk District-Madhepura, Bihar-852113** dated 17.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. ER-390.7/NCTE/B.Ed./ERCAPP201645155/BR/2026/7277 3-72779** dated 20.02.2026 of the Eastern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has submitted a copy of Teaching faculty list (1+06) date 29.01.2026 approved by the Registrar, B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura, Bihar, which is lesser in number than what is required under NCTE Regulation for one unit of B.Ed. programme amended from time to time. 2. The institution has not appointed subject wise teaching faculty as per NCTE, Regulation amended from time to time."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative from Mohan Shakuntala Teachers Training College, Ward No. 04, Village - Madhepura, Goshala Chowk District-Madhepura, Bihar-852113 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the earlier faculty list consisted of 1 Principal and 06 teaching staff. However, the institution has now rectified the deficiency and appointed the required number of teaching staff (1 Principal + 08 faculty members) as per the NCTE norms. An updated faculty list duly approved by the Registrar, B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura has been submitted, along with a notarized affidavit confirming the appointment, qualification, and compliance of all teaching staff. 2. It is respectfully submitted that the said deficiency has also been duly complied with. The institution has now appointed subject-wise qualified faculty for all required areas including Foundation, Social Science, Language, Mathematics, Science, Fine Arts, Music, and Physical Education as per NCTE Norms. The same is supported by the updated faculty list approved by the Registrar and the affidavit submitted, confirming that all appointments are made as per NCTE Regulations.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 two year duration with an annual intake of 50 (one basic units) students vide order dated 31.01.2018. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the ERC vide order dated 20.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that the earlier deficiency regarding faculty strength has been rectified. The institution submitted that the earlier faculty list comprised 1 Principal and 06 teaching staff; however, it has now appointed the requisite staff strength comprising 1 Principal and 08 faculty members in accordance with NCTE norms. It was further submitted that an updated faculty list duly approved by the Registrar, B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura has been furnished along with a notarized affidavit affirming the appointment, qualifications, and compliance of the teaching staff. The appellant institution further submitted that subject-wise qualified faculty have now been appointed across all required areas, including Foundation, Social Science, Language, Mathematics, Science, Fine Arts, Music, and Physical Education, as per NCTE norms. The same is stated to be supported by the updated faculty list approved by the affiliating University and the affidavit confirming that all appointments have been made in accordance with the NCTE Regulations.

The Appeal Committee noted that, at the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with supporting documents purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies forming the basis of the withdrawal order. The Committee further observed that a substantial portion of the material so relied upon was either not available before the concerned Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not

undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in the manner contemplated under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. Under the statutory scheme of the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the applicable Regulations, compliance with prescribed recognition norms is required to be established through duly verified and authenticated records. Consequently, the material now placed on record necessitates factual scrutiny and regulatory examination by the competent Regional Committee before any conclusive determination regarding compliance can be arrived at. The Appeal Committee further observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication and in light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016]***, subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasised that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 20.02.2026 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 Eastern Regional Committee and without creating any equity in favour of the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned withdrawal order dated 20.02.2026 solely for the purpose of fresh factual verification and regulatory reassessment. The Eastern Regional Committee is directed to re-examine the case of the appellant institution afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted, afford reasonable opportunity of hearing to the institution, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the guidelines issued by the Council from time to time, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined only to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish full compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with law. The Regional Committee concerned, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure

time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is directed to forward all documents relied upon in the appeal to the Eastern 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, concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 20.02.2026 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) 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, Mohan Shakuntala Teachers Training College, Ward No. 04, Village - Madhepura, Goshala Chowk District-Madhepura, Bihar-852113.**
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.



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 - 14.05.2026

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

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-131/E-405972/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026

APPLERC202615584 -

S Kula Womens College, Plot No. 21, Village-Kongkham, Steet/Road-Nambol, District-Bishnupur, Manipur-795134 APPELLANT	Vs	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 RESPONDENT
---	-----------	--

Representative of Appellant	Sh. N. Binesh Kumar Singh, Assistant Professor
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **S Kula Womens College, Plot No. 21, Village-Kongkham, Steet/Road-Nambol, District-Bishnupur, Manipur-795134** dated 01.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202505164670/MANIPUR/2025/REJC/92** dated 10.02.2026 of the Eastern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "Show Cause Notice post inspection was issued to the institution on 17.11.2025. But the institution has not submitted reply to Show Cause Notice."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. N. Binesh Kumar Singh, Assistant Professor from S Kula Womens College, Plot No. 21, Village-Kongkham, Steet/Road-Nambol, District-Bishnupur, Manipur-795134 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "The institution has received a Virtual Inspection intimation letter on the same day of inspection, dated 13.11.2025 at 11.50 am due to delayed information communicated to us by the former Principal, Dr. W. Robindro Singh. At the time, we were totally handicapper and were unable arrange all the necessary items for the Virtual Inspection. And we also had a short discussion regarding inconveniences and the impossibility of Virtual Inspection on that day through a virtual meeting (photo enclosed), and also requested from our side to fix another convenient date and time so that we can join without fail. On the same day (13.11.2025) we also send e-mail showing the updation of the contact number and email ID of our new Principal, Dr. R.K. Lokendra Singh. Unfortunately, on 17th February, 2026, we have received a Show Cause Notice mentioning "The institution has not participated during the inspection fixed by NCTE," and we replied with reason face by us on 19/02/2026."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 25.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 10.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that the intimation for Virtual Inspection dated 13.11.2025 was received on the same day at 11:50 AM, allegedly due to delayed communication by the then Principal, Dr. W. Robindro Singh. The institution submitted that, owing to such short notice, it was unable to make necessary arrangements for participation in the Virtual Inspection and raised concerns regarding the inconvenience and impracticability of conducting the inspection on that date. It was further submitted that a request was made during a virtual interaction, along with supporting evidence, for rescheduling the inspection to a convenient date and time. The appellant institution further submitted that, on the same day i.e., 13.11.2025, it communicated to the authorities through email regarding updation of contact details, including the contact number and email ID of the newly appointed Principal, Dr. R.K. Lokendra Singh. It was also submitted that subsequently a Show Cause Notice dated 17.02.2026 was received stating that the institution had not participated in the scheduled inspection, to which the institution submitted its reply on 19.02.2026 explaining the reasons for non-participation.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee has been rendered in the context of compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the applicable Guidelines, including the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The Committee notes that the issues arising in the present appeal pertain to matters relating to verification of compliance with prescribed norms, including aspects connected with the conduct of virtual inspection and verification of relevant

institutional records and resources. The material available on record further indicates that certain constraints were stated to have arisen during the inspection process, which, according to the appellant institution, affected effective verification of documents and institutional resources. The deficiencies involved in the present case are, therefore, essentially factual and technical in nature and are capable of objective verification by the competent authority in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory framework. At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution clarified that, due to technical constraints and connectivity issues, the Visiting Team could not effectively verify the documents during the virtual inspection and that no information or record was intentionally withheld from verification. It is a settled position under the statutory framework governing recognition that compliance with prescribed norms and standards is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and such compliance is necessarily to be assessed by the competent Regional Committee, being the statutory authority entrusted with such examination under the Act. The Appeal Committee further reiterates that the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance with the statutory norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory in character and remains conditional upon demonstrable adherence to the prescribed norms at the relevant point of time; it does not confer any vested, accrued, or equitable right in favour of the applicant institution in the absence of such compliance. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies, which are essentially factual and capable of objective verification, and bearing in mind the limited scope of appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of enabling factual re-verification by the Visiting Team on the basis of the material now placed on record, without expressing any opinion on merits and without diluting the statutory requirements governing recognition. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the **Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016**, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that

the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has further recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of factual re-verification of the appellant's claim of compliance. Such interference is confined to ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory consistency and shall not be construed as dilution of the mandatory statutory requirements or as any expression on the merits of the appellant's claims. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 10.02.2026 is set aside, and the matter is remanded to the Eastern Regional Committee for the limited purpose of factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team. The appellant institution shall, within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of this order, submit to the concerned Regional Committee: (a) A duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon; and (b) Certified copies of all approvals, certificates, and statutory documents issued by the competent authorities in support of its claim of compliance. The Online Visiting Team shall verify, on the basis of the documents and physical/virtual inspection, the specific deficiencies noted in the impugned order, including infrastructural, instructional, and statutory requirements, and assess compliance with 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 dated 15.05.2025 (where applicable). Upon receipt of the Visiting Team Report, the Eastern Regional Committee shall examine the same along with the affidavit and supporting documents, verify their authenticity, and pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations contained herein, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined strictly to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny. It shall not be construed as conferring any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish strict and complete compliance with the prescribed norms and standards upon such re-verification shall entail rejection in accordance with law, without further opportunity. The Regional Committee, being the custodian of records, shall ensure the authenticity, completeness, and proper verification of all documents before passing any consequential order and shall ensure time-bound disposal of the matter.

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 10.02.2026 and remands the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee for limited factual re-verification through an Online Visiting Team, subject to strict compliance with the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite 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, S Kula Womens College, Plot No. 21, Village-Kongkham, Steet/Road-Nambol, District-Bishnupur, Manipur-795134.**

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, Directorate of University & Higher Education, Government of Manipur, Nityaipat Chuthek, Near Raj Bhavan, Imphal, Manipur-795001.



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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-133/E-406067/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202615602 ✓

Raj Shree Mahavidyalaya Sanchore, Khasra No. 3704/2572, Village-Sanchore, Moti Nagar, Badsam Road, District-Jalore, Rajasthan-343041	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Raj Shree Mahavidhyalaya Sanchore, Khasra No. 3704/2572, Village-Sanchore, Moti Nagar, Badsam Road, District-Jalore, Rajasthan-343041** dated 19.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509172690/RAJASTHAN /2025/REJC/1875** dated 26.10.2024 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. In response to SCN that other school courses run in the same building, the institution has simply stated that no other school is operated in the campus without any documentary evidence / proof to the effect. 2. As per the BCC uploaded the institution has mentioned the total built-up area 3256sq.mts. earmarked for teacher education programme. No built area is earmarked for the courses other than teacher education programme. 3. The institution has the total land area of 5250 sqm which is not sufficient for the existing Degree College and proposed ITEP Course, as per the norms of NCTE and the policy of the State Govt of Rajasthan. 4. The institution has not uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) as per Rajasthan Urban Areas (Permission for use of Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes and Allotment) Rules, 2012 in Form-11 of Rule 7(1) while mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Government Authority. Uploaded CLU is not in specific format. 5. The uploaded building plan is not proper. 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. 6. The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. unit-4, B.Sc. unit-1, M.A unit-1+1=2, combined intake cannot be ascertained as denomination of the unit is not mentioned and the teacher education B.A., B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit) B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), the total built-up area 3256 sqmts. built up area is not sufficient to run the multidisciplinary and teacher education programme. vii. The institution is not loaded 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://sso.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx.

8. The institution has not uploaded university approved teaching staff list in the prescribed format of NCTE and as per NCTE norms. 9. It cannot be ascertained from the bank statement uploaded by the institution that salary is being paid as per the Central/State Government pay scale. 10. Committee check the website of institution i.e. <https://srcollegeesanchar.com>. the website of institution <https://srcollegeesanchar.com>. has been not 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 still this date.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative of Raj Shree Mahavidhyalaya Sanchore, Khasra No. 3704/2572, Village-Sanchore, Moti Nagar, Badsam Road, District-Jalore, Rajasthan-343041 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Declaration by applicant in the form of affidavit. 2. The institution upload latest Building Completion Certificate (BCC) in the prescribed format of NCTE (17 points) issued by the Competent Government Authority for all the course being conducted in the premises. 3. The institution upload Land Use Certificate (CLU) as per Rajasthan Urban Areas (Permission for use of Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes and Allotment for the purposes of educational use) Rules, 2012 in Form-II of Rule 7(1) while mentioning all Khasra Plot Survey No. issued by Competent Government Authority. 4. The institution uploaded legible 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 8050 Sq. mts and total built-up area 6554.45 Sq. Mts earmarked for each course being run in the premises and the demarcated land area 3000 Sq. Mts and built-up area 2200 Sq. Mts for the teacher education programmes. 5. Institution website <https://www.rajeshwricollegesanchor.com> “running and updated with additional information as per clause 7(14), 8(6), 10(3) of the NCTE Regulation 2014 as amended from time to time is uploaded. 6. As per the uploaded Mutation Certificate, the land at Khasra No. 3704/2572 has been denoted and transferred from the name of Rajeshwari Devi w/o Manoj Kumar on the name of M.G. Welfare Society Sanchore dist., Jalore, three times total land area 8050 sq. mts. The institution uploaded the

mutation certificate mentioning all Khasra No. issued by the competent Government Authority. 7. As per the uploaded Mutation Certificate, the land at Khasra No. 3704/2572 has been denoted and transferred from the name of Rajeshwari Devi w/o Manoj Kumar on the name of M.G. Welfare Society Sanchore dist, Jalore, three times total land area 8050 sq. mts. The institution uploaded the mutation certificate mentioning all Khasra No. issued by the competent Government Authority. 8. The Fire NOC was issued offline mode so is not verifiable on the portal of the Rajasthan Government. The institution has uploaded new online 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://sso.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx. 9. The NEC uploaded by the institution is issued on 15.05.2023. The institution has uploaded LATEST Non-Encumbrance Certificate mentioning all the khasra No. total land area and mode of Possession issued by the Competent Government Authority. 10. The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. unit-4, BSc. unit-1, M.A unit-1+12, combined intake cannot be ascertained as denomination of the unit is not mentioned. The sufficiency of land area and built-up area for 550 intake of multidisciplinary courses and 100x4400 intake for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. course cannot be ascertained since the institution has mentioned the total built-up area 6554.45 sq. mts. out of which the 2200 sq. mts built-up area is earmarked for the teacher education programme as per the BCC is uploaded by it. 11. The initially approved teaching staff has left new teaching faculties uploaded on website list. The six month salary from bank transferred documents has been uploaded.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 07.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that it has furnished the declaration in the form of an affidavit and has uploaded the latest Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed NCTE format issued by the competent Government authority for all courses being conducted in the premises. The institution further submitted that it has uploaded the Land Use Certificate (CLU) issued under the Rajasthan Urban Areas Rules, 2012 in Form-II, indicating all Khasra/Plot/Survey numbers. The appellant institution submitted that it has uploaded a legible building plan duly approved by the competent State Government authority, indicating the name of the institution, Khasra/Plot details, total land area of 8050 sq. mtrs., and total built-up area of 6554.45 sq. mtrs., including earmarking of 3000 sq. mtrs. land and 2200 sq. mtrs. built-up area for teacher education programmes. It was further submitted that the institutional website is operational and updated in compliance with clauses 7(14), 8(6), and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The institution submitted that mutation certificates have been furnished indicating transfer of land bearing Khasra No. 3704/2572 in favour of M.G. Welfare Society, Sanchore, District Jalore, covering total land area of 8050 sq. mtrs., duly issued by the competent Government authority. It was further submitted that a latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate has been uploaded indicating all Khasra details, land area, and mode of possession. The appellant institution further submitted that an online Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan, verifiable on the official portal, has been uploaded in place of the earlier offline certificate. It was also submitted that updated faculty details have been uploaded on the website, and salary payment records for six months through bank transfer have been furnished. The institution additionally submitted details regarding programmes being conducted, including B.A., B.Sc., and M.A., and stated that the built-up area earmarked for teacher education programmes is 2200 sq. mtrs. out of the total built-up area of 6554.45 sq. mtrs., as reflected in the Building Completion Certificate.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory

requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the

Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 07.04.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure

facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 07.04.2026 and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, Raj Shree Mahavidyalaya Sanchore, Khasra No. 3704/2572, Village-Sanchore, Moti Nagar, Badsam Road, District-Jalore, Rajasthan-343041.
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 - 14.05.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-135/E-406078/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615603 -

Lord Shiva Girls T T College, Khasra No. 4432/1, 4432/8, 4432/9, 7537/4432, Village - Bhinmal, Near Mahaveer Nagar, District-Jalore, Rajasthan-343029	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Lord Shiva Girls T. T. College, Khasra No. 4432/1, 4432/8, 4432/9, 7537/4432, Village - Bhinmal, Near Mahaveer Nagar, District-Jalore, Rajasthan-343029** dated 20.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509233134/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/304** dated 07.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “1. There is a difference between “deemed to be approved” and “approved”. Uploaded order is JNVU/Affl./2026/1931 dated 2/01/2026 is a Provisional No Objection Certificate. The institution has not uploaded the approved order to the effect that the proposal for collaboration between the institutions has been approved by their affiliating university, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. 2. The uploaded documents by institution are not proper. 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, the institution is required to upload the same. 3. The institution uploaded Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) but the seal is not legible. 4. The institution has not uploaded the Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by government competent authority. Sworn Affidavit is uploaded in place of NEC. 5. The name of applicant College is not reflected on any part of building in the geotagged photo uploaded. 6. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of Library reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. 7. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the Multipurpose Hall is not as per NCTE norms and furniture in the multipurpose hall is inadequate. 8. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the college does not have adequate playgrounds and sports facility. 9. The website address “WWW.LORDSHIVAA.ORG” as per online portal, in reply of final SCN, webpage screenshot uploaded showing website address “https://www.lordshivaa.org.in/”. which has not been updated and maintained and in violation of 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. 10. 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. 11. The institution has applied B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), Middle (1 unit) & B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), Middle (1 unit) with 200 intake (Transition to ITEP) and B.Ed. with 100 intake. It has mentioned its total built-up area 3128.49 sq. mts. The total built-up area is not adequate for the above teacher training education programme as per the NCTE norms and standards. 12. The uploaded building plan is not proper. 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. 13. The institution has not uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) as per Rajasthan Urban Areas (Permission for use of Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes and Allotment) Rules, 2012 in Form-11 of Rule 7(1) while mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Government Authority. Uploaded CLU is not in specific format.

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative from Lord Shiva Girls T. T. College, Khasra No. 4432/1, 4432/8, 4432/9, 7537/4432, Village - Bhinmal, Near Mahaveer Nagar, District-Jalore, Rajasthan-343029 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The Proposal for collaboration between Lord Shiva Girls T.T. College , Bhinmal and Sudarshan Mahavidyalaya has been approved by Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur vide his letter no. JNVU/AFFL./2026/1931 Dated 02.01.2026, letter enclosed. Such Order issued by the university is always deemed to be approved. 2. There is no Girls T.T. College in Jalore District, so this Girls T.T. College is very essential for girls Education in this area. Previously State Govt. of Rajasthan issued NOC for B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. keeping in view the necessity of Lord Shiva Girls T.T. College vide his letter no. F.24(Noc25- 26)/B.Ed./DCE/2025/ Dated 03.07.2025 3. Both Lord Shiva Girls T.T. College, Bhinmal and Sudarshan Mahavidyalaya, Bhinmal are affiliated with the same Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur. The letter of this effect issued by Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur bearing letter No: JNVU/AFFL./2025/1939 Dated 08.01.2026. 4. Both Lord Shiva

Girls T.T. College, Bhinmal and Sudarshan Mahavidyalaya, Bhinmal are affiliated with the same Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur. The letter of this effect issued by Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur bearing letter No: JNVU/AFFL./2025/1939 Dated 08.01.2026. 5. Lord Shiva Girls T.T. College, Bhinmal is a private institution. It is affiliated with Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur. It is a recognized institution as well. 6. The website is functional and updated as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 of para 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) as amended from time to time Screenshot of website 7. New NOC of university is Uploaded. 8. When applied for Lord Shiva Girls T.T. College, Bhinmal and B.A. B.Ed., B.Sc. B.Ed. 4 year's integrated course on 26.5.2015, the Sansthan had land of Khasra Nos 4432/1 and 4432. But before getting the sanction of Four-Year B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed., the Sansthan got additional land from Khasara No 4432/1, 4432/8, 4432/9 and 7537/4432 through registered gift deed. These all parts are of the same and one single khasra. Now all these four khasra are registered in the name of the Sansthan. This land is situated in the Revenue Village Bhinmal-A. Thereafter, this land was converted by Nagar Palika, Bhinmal to be used for the purpose of Educational institution, vide PATTA VILEKH No. 1803 dtd 17.2.2024 total being land 10,900 square meter and out of this 10668.12 square meter is to be used for education purpose. Copies of documents are being uploaded on portal. 9. The Institution has upload the Authorization letter on the 100 Rupees of stamp paper as per admissible government rate 10. Previously the sansthan had got 10,900 square meter land and built up area of 3128.49 square meter before getting sanction for Lord Shiva Girls T.T. College, Bhinmal. But as requirements grew more construction work was undertaken and now there is built up area of 3928.34 square meter. The institution is conducted run in this built-up area and the construction work is still going on. 11. Lord Shiva Shikshan Prashikshan Avam Takniki Sansthan, Bhinmal were registered with Rajasthan Co-operative Society, Jalore under Rajasthan Registration Act 1958 vide Registration No 06/Jalore/2007-08 Dt 9.4.2007. The institutions are being run on the base of 'Not for Profit.' The Affidavit on Stamp Paper of Rs 100/- of this effect is being uploaded on the portal 12. Lord Shiva Girls T.T. College, Bhinmal run by Lord Shiva Shikshan Prashikshan Avam Takniki Sansthan, Bhinmal has obtained Exemption Certificate from Income Tax Department under Income Tax Act 12A(A). The Exemption Certificate is uploaded. 13. Sudarshan Mahavidyalaya, Bhinmal with whom collaboration is Proposed for ITEP has the sanctioned and approved intake capacity

of three sections of Arts and one section of Commerce. His recognition order No JNVU/Acad/A/19/12855 Dt 17.8.2019 with Intake capacity is uploaded. 14. The institution has upload the complete details of Society/Trust/Members with Aadhar and PAN number issued. 15. The institution has uploaded year-wise the admitted students list in respect of all running programme(s) countersigned by Affiliating University. 16. Previously the sansthan had got 10,900 square meter land and built-up area of 3128.49 square meter before getting sanction for Lord Shiva G.T.T. College, Bhinmal. But as requirements-grew more construction work was undertaken and now there is built up area of 3928.34 square meter. The institution is conducted run in this built up area and the construction work is still going on. 17. The institution has upload certified land documents clearly mentioning all the Khasra Nos. 4432/1 , 4432/8 , 4432/9 , 7537/4432 issued by Competent Authority of State Government showing that the building is situated on a single plot. 18. The institution has upload certified land documents clearly mentioning all the Khasra Nos. 4432/1, 4432/8, 4432/9, 7537/4432 issued by Competent Authority of State Government showing that the building is situated on a single plot. 19. The institution has upload Land Use Certificate (CLU) as per Rajasthan Urban Arese (Permission for use of Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes and Allotment) Rules, 2012 in Form-11 of Rule 7(1) while mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Government Authority. 20. The institution has upload latest Non- Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) dated 26.02.2026 mentioning all Khasra No. and land area issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 21. The institution has upload Building Plan legible and 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 area and built-up area for the teacher education programmes. 22. The institution has uploaded the list of teaching staff and bank statement of last six months indicating the transaction of the salary / remuneration to its teaching staff. 23. Fire Safety Certificate issued No LSG/BHINMAL/FIRENOC/2025- 26/52418 Dated 24.07.2025 issued by competent authority is uploaded 24. 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. 25. The institution has uploaded geotag photos with different angles of Ramp, Electricity, Safe Drinking Water and Accessible Toilet

indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph. 26.The institution has uploaded geotag photos with different angles of front view, rear view, multipurpose hall, library, lab 1, lab 2, lab 3 and playground indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph. 27.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. 28.The institution has uploaded the affiliation order issue by the affiliating university for conducting the Multidisciplinary courses by the-“Sudarshan Mahavidyalaya” with whom the applicant institution is collaborating. The Appellant has also informed that it has obtained approval from the State Govt. approving collaboration with Sudarshan Mahavidhyalya, Jalore.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Western Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 04.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 07.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that the proposal for collaboration between Lord Shiva Girls T.T. College, Bhinmal and Sudarshan Mahavidyalaya has been approved by Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur vide letter dated 02.01.2026, and that both institutions are affiliated to the same University, as confirmed by the University vide letter dated 08.01.2026. The Appellant has also informed that it has obtained approval from the State Govt. approving collaboration with Sudarshan Mahavidhyalya, Jalore. The institution submitted that Sudarshan Mahavidyalaya is offering multidisciplinary programmes and holds

approved intake in Arts and Commerce streams. The appellant institution further submitted that it is a recognized private institution affiliated with Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur, and that its website is functional and updated in compliance with the provisions of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). It was also submitted that a fresh NOC from the affiliating University has been uploaded. The institution submitted that it possesses land measuring 10,900 sq. mtrs., comprising Khasra Nos. 4432/1, 4432/8, 4432/9, and 7537/4432, which are stated to constitute a single contiguous plot, duly converted for educational use vide Patta Vilekh dated 17.02.2024, with 10,668.12 sq. mtrs. earmarked for educational purposes. It was further submitted that the built-up area has been increased from 3128.49 sq. mtrs. to 3928.34 sq. mtrs., and that construction activities are ongoing. Certified land documents, CLU, latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate dated 26.02.2026, and approved building plan indicating land and built-up area earmarked for each course have been uploaded. The appellant institution submitted that it has uploaded the Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed NCTE format issued by the competent authority, along with Building Safety Certificate and Fire Safety Certificate dated 24.07.2025 issued by the competent authority. It was also submitted that geotagged photographs depicting infrastructure, including classrooms, laboratories, library, multipurpose hall, playground, ramp, electricity, drinking water, and accessible toilets, have been uploaded. The institution further submitted that it is registered under the Rajasthan Registration Act, 1958, operates on a not-for-profit basis, and holds exemption under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act. It was also submitted that authorization letter, details of society members, and year-wise lists of admitted students duly countersigned by the affiliating University have been uploaded. The appellant institution submitted that the list of teaching staff along with bank statements indicating payment of salary/remuneration for the last six months has been furnished. It was further submitted that affiliation orders for multidisciplinary courses conducted by the collaborating institution have been uploaded.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education

Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions,

post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 07.04.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated

15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 07.04.2026 and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, Lord Shiva Girls T. T. College, Khasra No. 4432/1, 4432/8, 4432/9, 7537/4432, Village - Bhinmal, Near Mahaveer Nagar, District-Jalore, Rajasthan-343029.**
- 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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-136/E-406080/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615599 -

Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1/2, Bassi Sitaram Pura, PO. Ambabari, Sikar Road, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302039 APPELLANT	Vs	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 RESPONDENT
---	-----------	--

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Meena Rathaur, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1/2, Bassi Sitaram Pura, PO. Ambabari, Sikar Road, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302039** dated 18.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509172703/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/1738** dated 02.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The name of applicant institution is Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya and the name of multidisciplinary institution is Shri Bhawani Niketan P.G. Mahila Mahavidyalaya, both names mismatch. 2. The website of institution <https://shribhawaniniketanmnn.com/> has. Not been maintained and updated which is in violation of 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. 3. As per their own uploaded statement, institution is paying basic pay salary and other in between Rs.15,300 to 27,946/-. The institution uploaded bank statement also, but it cannot be ascertained from the bank statement and their uploaded own statement that salary is being paid as per the Central/State Government pay scale. 4. The institution has not uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) as per Rajasthan Urban Areas (Permission for use of Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes and Allotment) Rules, 2012 in Form-11 of Rule 7(1) while mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Government Authority. Uploaded CLU is not in specific format. 5. NCTE (WRC) Committee noted that, the institution is mentioned the land area in the land details column is 105509.34 sq. mts. whereas the Fire portal NOC mentions the plot area is 9520 sq. mts. 6. The institution has not uploaded Mutation Certificate mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 7. In the Land Details, Built Up area mentioned in the Affidavit (in sq.m) is 7711. The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. 540x31620, B.Com. 300x3900, B.Sc.360x31080, B.Sc. Home Science 60x3180, M.A. 260x2520, M.Com. 40x280., M.Sc. 60x2120 Total students strength is 4500. The sufficiency of land area and built-up area for the above courses with of multidisciplinary courses and intake for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), Middle (1 unit) B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), Middle

(1 unit) 200x4800 course cannot be ascertained. 8. The institution has not uploaded latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 9. The uploaded geotagged photographs show that the size of the multi-purpose hall is not as per NCTE norms. There is insufficient furniture in the multi-purpose hall. 10. 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 area and built-up area for the teacher education programmes including multi-disciplinary programmes. 11. The institution is running multidisciplinary and teacher education programme in the same premises. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of library reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. 12. The institution has uploaded Form No.10 AC. The institution has not uploaded the Exemption Certificate (Form 12A) issued by the Income Tax Department or issued by government competent authority. 13. The institution uploaded the same certificate again. Khasra number, plot number, building construction area details are not mentioned in the uploaded Building safety certificate.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Meena Rathaur, Principal of Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1/2, Bassi Sitaram Pura, PO. Ambabari, Sikar Road, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302039 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The refusal order stated that the name of applicant institution Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya and the name of multidisciplinary institution Shri Bhawani Niketan P.G. Mahila Mahavidyalaya do not match. We submitted the University Affiliation order dated 07/11/2025, University NOC for Transition to ITEP dated 04/10/2025, Directorate of Higher Education NOC dated, NCTE recognition letter for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. 4-year Integrated course dated 02/05/2017. In all the above stated latest documents the name of the applicant institution (which is a multidisciplinary institution) is the same, i.e., Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya. If there is any discrepancy in the name of the institution in any document, it is absolutely a manual mistake and has been rectified in the latest documents as submitted with the appeal. That our institution Shri

Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya, affiliated to University of Rajasthan is a multidisciplinary institution running various UG and PG programmes since 1990 and B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. 4 year Integrated course since 2017 in the same campus and same premises. That there is no other college of similar name in Jaipur affiliated to University of Rajasthan. That same can be verified from the official website of the Rajasthan University. We are resubmitting the Affiliation letters and NOCs for your verification. 2. The refusal order stated that website of the institution is not maintained and updated. We humbly state that our official college website i.e., <https://shribhawaniniktanmm.com>. is maintained and updated regularly in compliance to provisions under clause 7(14), 8(6),8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulation 2014. We had submitted a print of the college website showing all these uploads. We are resubmitting the print of college website. Availability of the details of course, staff list, student list, affidavits, mandatory disclosure, fee structure, infrastructural facilities, recognition and affiliation orders, land documents, balance sheet, income & expenditure of college, audit report, geo-tagged photographs, hyperlinks of NCTE and WRC and any other documents required from time to time are uploaded. The same can be verified by logging in the official website <https://shribhawaniniktanmm.com>. 3. The refusal order states that from bank statement it cannot be ascertained that salary is being paid as per government pay scale. The pay band for Assistant Professors is PB 3 (15,600 to 39,100 + AGP 6000) as per Government of Rajasthan. Our institution is paying as salary Rs. 19525 to Rs. 30644 per month to the teaching staff as mentioned in the salary slip of Jan 2026. 4. The refusal order states that the land use certificate (CLU) has not been uploaded. We have uploaded Appendix 13 Land and Building Certificate dated 17/07/2025 issued by Tehsildar (Land Records/ Settlements) Tehsil Jaipur which clearly mentions the land of Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya, Sikar Road is for educational use. We have uploaded Certificate issued by competent authority i.e. Jaipur Development Authority, Jaipur, dated 31/03/2015 declaring the land of Shri Bhawani Niketan Education and Charitable Trust is for institutional purpose. Rajasthan Urban Area (Permission for use of Agricultural land for non-Agricultural purposes and Allotment) Rules 2012, Chapter – 1 Definition (xii), clearly mentions that “Institutional Purpose” means the use of any premises by any organization for the promotion of some object specially of general utility, charitable, educational or

like nature except public utility purpose.” Certificate of land issued by competent land authority i.e. Tehsildar dated 21/01/2026 is also uploaded. Copies of all the aforesaid documents are being resubmitted. 5. The refusal order states that the land area in land details column is 105509.34 sq. mtr. whereas the fire portal NOC mentions the plot area is 9520 sq. mtr. This is to state that the total land area in possession of the institution is 105509.34 sq. mtr. which includes the built up area and open space. The total built up area is 9419.16 sq. mtr. which includes built up area 3855.50 sq. mtr. and corridor area 854.08 sq. mtr. on the ground floor and built up area 3855.50 sq. mtr. and corridor area 854.08 sq. mtrs. on the first floor as mentioned in the building plan. The Fire Department has mentioned only the built up area in the fire portal NOC. 6. The refusal order stated that the mutation certificate mentioning Khasra no issued by competent authority has not been uploaded. Our institution most humbly states that Mutation Certificate issued by Tehsildar (Land Records/ Settlement) who is competent Government authority, has been uploaded. This certificate clearly mentions the Khasra no ½ and Rakba as 41 Bigha 14 Biswa at Bassi Sitarampura. The document further mentions the existence of college building and playgrounds in the aforesaid piece of land. Copy of the mutation certificate is being submitted again for your kind perusal. 7. The refusal order states that the sufficiency of land area and built-up area in the institution cannot be ascertained. In response to this deficiency, we humbly state that the built up area mentioned in the affidavit 7711 sq. mtr. is the area of classrooms only. The total built-up area on the ground floor and first floor which includes the classrooms, labs, libraries, corridors etc is 9419.16 sq. mtr. while the total land area is 105509.34 sq. mtr. The total strength of the student mentioned in the refusal order is 4500. We want to bring to your kind notice that this is the maximum sanctioned seats and not the actual intake. As we had already mentioned in the letter no SBNMM/1958/26 dated 23/01/2026 (attached with the reply of show cause notice dated 25/02/2026) total number of students studying in college in session 2024-25 was 2374 and not 4500. We have also mentioned that we have 40 classrooms and 16 labs with college timing stretching from 8.00 AM to 4.00 PM. We have sufficient land area and built up area for existing programmes and enough vacant classrooms for the proposed ITEP. College time-table of various UG and PG programmes and B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. 4 year Integrated programme is being attached. The rooms presently allotted for B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. will be available for ITEP classes in the coming sessions as the

course will be replaced with ITEP. Details of classrooms available for ITEP in session 2026-27 is also being resubmitted. The total number of students in previous five years is also being submitted: Multidisciplinary courses U.G. & P.G. 1870 (2021-22), 1941 (2022-23), 2022 (2023-24), 2028 (2024-25) & 2046 (2025-26). B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. 4-year Integrated Programme 367 (2021-22), 362 (2022-23), 332 (2023-24), 346 (2024-25) & 320 (2025-26). 8. The refusal order states that the institution has not uploaded latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by competent authority. We wish to bring to your kind notice that we had submitted the Non-Encumbrance Certificate no "w@v@2025@3049 dated 19/06/2025 issued by the office of Tehsildar (Land Records / Settlements), Tehsil Jaipur. Tehsildar in Rajasthan is competent authority to issue Non-Encumbrance Certificate and the certificate is latest certificate issued on 19/06/2025. 9. The refusal order states that the uploaded geo tagged photo shows the size of multipurpose hall and number of furniture is insufficient. It is humbly stated that we have three multipurpose halls in our college. The details of which are as follows: Multipurpose Hall (1) - area 105.94 sq. mtr. Multipurpose hall (2) - area 114.98 sq. mtr. Multipurpose hall (3) - area 111.44 sq. mtr. We have sufficient furniture in all the three multipurpose halls. Geo tagged photographs of all the three multipurpose hall with furniture are being submitted. 10. The refusal order states that demarcated land area and built up area for various programmes is not mentioned in the building plan. Our institution had uploaded building plan approved by State Government official in which the name of the institution Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila PG Mahavidyalaya Jaipur. Khasra 4/5 no ½ , village/city- Bassi Sitarampura, Dist. – Jaipur, State – Rajasthan, total land area (in Bighas)- 41 Bighas 14 Biswa, Total land area (in sq.mt) – 105509.34 sq.mt. is clearly mentioned on the lower left side of the map on both the floors. The total built up area on the ground floor is 3855.50 sq. mtr. and corridor area – 854.08 sq.mtr. similarly on the first floor also the built up area is 3855.50 sq. mtr. and corridor area – 854.08 sq.mtr. This total area is clearly mentioned on right hand side of the building plan Multidisciplinary programmes and teacher education programme are being run in the same campus and same premises. The classrooms and open space is shared by various course. With the introduction of multidisciplinary courses in NEP, there cannot be a totally demarcated area for each course as students move between different departments for cross disciplinary projects and courses. The college time table is being attached with this appeal which clearly mentions the allotted rooms and time for various subjects and

papers. 11. The refusal order states that the sitting capacity of library reading room as shown in geo tagged photographs is not sufficient. We have one library reading room with sitting capacity of 160 students at the ground floor another library reading room with the sitting capacity of 60 students is at the first floor. Fresh geo-tagged photos of library reading rooms are being submitted. An additional reading room with sitting capacity of 500 students is proposed and will be functional soon. 12. Educational Institutes having gross receipts / income exceeding Rupees one Crore are required to approve under clause (i) of first proviso to sub clause (23C) of section 10 and exemption is u/s 10(23C)(vi) of Income Tax act, 1961 as mentioned in row 6 of Form 10 AC for Shri Bhawani Niketan Shiksha Samiti and approval is from A.Y. 2022-23 to A.Y.2026-27 as mentioned in row 8 of Form-10AC and after amendment into Income Tax Act, 1961 now exemption is u/s 10 (23C)(vi) of Income Tax Act 1961 but renewal of approval will be under 12AB(1)(b) w.e.f. 01/04/2026 and being issued in Form 10AD. 13. The refusal order states that in the Building Safety Certificate Khasra no. and plot no. are not mentioned. We have submitted Building Safety Certificate issued by competent authority, i.e., Office of the Executive Engineer, PWD City DN. III, Jaipur No. – EE-III/BSC/D-79 dated 19-05-2025. We are resubmitting latest Building Safety Certificate mentioning Khasra No ½ Bassi Sitaram Pura, Sikar Road, Jaipur and Building construction area details as required.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 02.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that the alleged

discrepancy in the name of the institution stands rectified, and that the institution, namely Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya, Jaipur, affiliated to the University of Rajasthan, is a multidisciplinary institution running UG and PG programmes since 1990 and B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. four-year integrated programmes since 2017 on the same campus. It was submitted that affiliation orders, University NOC, Directorate of Higher Education NOC, and NCTE recognition letter have been furnished reflecting a consistent name, and any earlier variation was due to manual error. The appellant institution further submitted that its official website is functional and updated in compliance with clauses 7(14), 8(6), 8(14), and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and that relevant disclosures including course details, staff, students, infrastructure, financials, and statutory documents are available thereon. It was submitted that salary to teaching staff is being paid as per State Government pay scales, and salary records have been furnished. The institution further submitted that land use for educational purposes has been certified by competent authorities, including the Tehsildar and Jaipur Development Authority, and relevant certificates have been uploaded. The appellant institution submitted that it possesses total land measuring 105509.34 sq. mtrs. and total built-up area of 9419.16 sq. mtrs., and clarified that the area reflected in the Fire NOC pertains to built-up area only. It was further submitted that mutation certificate issued by the competent authority mentioning Khasra details has been furnished. The institution submitted that it has sufficient land and built-up area for all existing programmes and proposed ITEP, clarifying that actual student strength is lower than the maximum sanctioned intake. It was also submitted that classrooms and facilities are adequate, supported by timetable and utilization details. The appellant institution further submitted that the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent authority has been furnished. It was also submitted that three multipurpose halls with adequate area and furniture are available, and additional geo-tagged photographs have been provided. It was submitted that the building plan approved by the competent authority contains details of land, Khasra numbers, and built-up area, and that facilities are shared across multidisciplinary programmes. The institution further submitted that library reading rooms with adequate seating capacity are available and additional facilities are proposed. The appellant institution also submitted that it holds exemption under the applicable provisions of the Income Tax Act and that relevant approval documents have been furnished. It was further submitted that a revised Building Safety Certificate incorporating Khasra details has been obtained from the competent authority and submitted.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be

established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 02.04.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for

Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 02.04.2026 and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, Shri Bhawani Niketan Mahila P.G. Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1/2, Bassi Sitaram Pura, PO. Ambabari, Sikar Road, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302039.
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 - 14.05.2026

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

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-137/E-406075/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202615591 -

Sunder T. T. College, Khasra No. 1100, 1118, Village - Mahapura, Ajmer Road, Taluka/Mandal-Sanganer, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302026	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Sunder T. T. College, Khasra No. 1100, 1118, Village - Mahapura, Ajmer Road, Taluka/Mandal-Sanganer, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302026** dated 15.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509243179/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/91** dated 07.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. NCTE (WRC) Committee noted that, the of applicant institution name is Sunder TT College, Mahapura Jaipur Mahapura and multidisciplinary institution name is Sunder Mahavidyalaya. The both institution names are mismatch. 2. The institution has uploaded new geotagged photograph. Uploaded geotagged photograph show that the multi-purpose hall is not as per NCTE norms and furniture is not sufficient in multi-purpose hall. 3. The institution has not uploaded the building plan mentioning the names of all the courses run in the same premises of the institute, Khasra/Plot /Survey number and total land area and total built up area reserved for each course run in the locality and demarcated land and built-up area for teacher education programs including multi-disciplinary programmes. 4. TEI has uploaded fire safety certificate in the name of "Sunder TT College" valid up to 21.01.2028 with approved plot area 3995 sq. mt. in the online application, the institution has mentioned in the land details, in which the area of the land has been mentioned as 4350 sq. mt. Both land area mismatch. 5. TEI has uploaded fire safety certificate in the name of "Sunder TT College" valid up to 21.01.2028 with approved plot area 3995 sq. mt. in the online application, the institution has mentioned in the land details, in which the area of the land has been mentioned as 4350 square meters. Both land area mismatch. 6. The uploaded list of teaching staff is not duly countersigned by its affiliating body and is not in the prescribed format of NCTE and not as per NCTE Regulation 2014 and amendments time by time. 7. It cannot be ascertained from the bank statement uploaded by the institution that salary is being paid as per the Central/State Government pay scale. 8. The website <https://sundercollege.com/> of institution has NOT been updated and maintained in violation of 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. As per the uploaded Certified land document (Patta vilekh) in the name of the society and land area is mentioned 3995.84 sq. mt. whereas the mentioned land area in uploaded NEC is 4350 sq. mt. The land area mismatch for the support of this relevant documents are not attached. 10. The institution uploaded new geotagged photographs and uploaded photograph show that the seating capacity of reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. 11. The uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) is not as per Rajasthan Urban Areas (Permission for use of Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes and Allotment) Rules, 2012 in Form-11 of Rule 7(1) while mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey no. issued by Competent Government Authority. 12. In the Land Details, built up area mentioned in the Affidavit (in Sq mt.) is 4074. The institution is conducting degree courses B.A. 120 X3360, B.Com. 60x3180, combined intake of 540. The sufficiency of land and built -up area for 540 intake of multidisciplinary courses and intake for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (2 units), Middle (2 units) and 200x4800 intake course cannot be ascertained.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative from Sunder T. T. College, Khasra No. 1100, 1118, Village - Mahapura, Ajmer Road, Taluka/Mandal-Sanganer, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302026 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “We have all documents available in favour of our institute.” The institution has submitted documents vide letter dt. 06.05.2026 as under:- (i). Sunder Mahavidyalaya and Sunder T. T. College both are run by Sunder Public School Samiti. They have merger NOC from the state government and affiliating body (Rajasthan University). (ii). The multipurpose hall has a seating capacity of over 200 students with more than 200 chairs available. Geotagged Photo has been uploaded. (iii). The Building Plan has been Approved by the PWD. Block-A is reserved and marked for the B.A. B.Ed. course and Block-B is reserved for the Degree course. (iv). In Application form the land area is 4350 sq mtr is according to revenue records. and in Patta vilekh 3995 Sq mtr. Fire Safety Certificate has been issued in base on Patta vilekh. (v). The fifth point is the repetition of fourth point. (vi). All staff members have been approved by the Affiliating Body. Among then 13 staff members are newly approved. Three are previously approved members. Both lists are attached. (vii). Salary is being paid as per the state Government Pay scale. (viii). Website is updated under clause 7 (14)(i) 8(6), 8(14) and 10(03) of NCTE Regulation 2014. (ix). As per the revenue and khasra records the total land area is 4350 sq mtr when the land was surrendered to JDA for the patta vilakh, the JDA

issued a patta 3995.84 sq mtr. The remaining 355 sq. mtr. has been reserved for the Roadside area. NEC - Based on khasra and Revenue Record 4350 Sq mtr. (x). The seating capacity of the Reading Room is sufficient and a Geotagged photo has been uploaded. (xi). The CLU certificate is issued by the JDA in Hindi format ,as per rule 2012, form-11 of rule 7(1). The JDA does not issue CLU document in English format. (xii). That the Samiti is currently operating two units of B.A. (60+60 = 120 seats) and one unit of B.Com. (60 seats) at Sunder Mahavidyalaya. That the Samiti is also conducting a four year integrated B.A. B.Ed. course at Sunder T.T. College with two units comprising 50+50 = 100 seats. That both institutions—Sunder Mahavidyalaya, Mahapura, and Sunder T.T. College, Mahapura, Jaipur—have been duly merged by the University of Rajasthan and the Government of Rajasthan for the purpose of ITEP. That a total of five units (2 units of B.A., 1 unit of B.Com., and 2 units of B.A. B.Ed.) are being operational across both institutions. While submitting the application for the transition of the B.A. B.Ed. course into ITEP, a technical error occurred. As a result, 2 units of secondary and 2 unit of middle were incorrectly entered. This should be correctly read and interpreted as secondary 2 units only. The institution has applied for the transition of specifically two units of B.A. B.Ed. into ITEP Secondary 2 units only.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 07.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that all requisite documents are available in support of its case. The appellant institution further submitted documents vide letter dated 06.05.2026 and stated that Sunder Mahavidyalaya and Sunder T.T. College are being run by the same management, namely Sunder Public School Samiti, and that merger approval/NOC has been obtained from the Government of

Rajasthan and the affiliating body, namely the University of Rajasthan. The institution submitted that the multipurpose hall has seating capacity for more than 200 students and that geotagged photographs in support thereof have been uploaded. It was further submitted that the Building Plan has been approved by the PWD and that Block-A has been earmarked for the B.A. B.Ed. Programme, whereas Block-B has been earmarked for the Degree College. With regard to land-related deficiencies, the institution submitted that the land area reflected in the application form as 4350 sq. mtrs. is as per revenue records, whereas the Patta reflects an area of 3995.84 sq. mtrs., the difference of 355 sq. mtrs. having been reserved for roadside area by JDA. It was further submitted that the Fire Safety Certificate has been issued on the basis of the Patta and that the Non-Encumbrance Certificate is based upon khasra and revenue records. The institution also submitted that the CLU certificate has been issued by JDA in Hindi format in accordance with Rule 2012, Form-11 of Rule 7(1), and that JDA does not issue the same in English format. The appellant institution further submitted that all staff members have been approved by the affiliating body and furnished details indicating that 13 faculty members are newly approved and 3 faculty members were previously approved. It was also submitted that salary is being paid in accordance with the State Government pay scale and that the institutional website has been updated in compliance with the relevant provisions of the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The institution additionally submitted that the seating capacity of the reading room is adequate and that geotagged photographs have been uploaded in support thereof. With regard to the ITEP application, the institution submitted that Sunder Mahavidyalaya is presently conducting two units of B.A. Programme with intake of 120 seats and one unit of B.Com. Programme with intake of 60 seats, while Sunder T.T. College is conducting a four-year integrated B.A. B.Ed. Programme with two units comprising 100 seats. It was further submitted that both institutions have been merged by the University of Rajasthan and the Government of Rajasthan for the purpose of ITEP. The institution stated that, while submitting the application for transition of the B.A. B.Ed. Programme into ITEP, a technical error occurred due to which "2 units of Secondary and 2 units of Middle" were incorrectly entered, whereas the institution intended to apply only for transition of two units of B.A. B.Ed. into ITEP at the Secondary Stage.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be

established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 07.04.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for

Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 07.04.2026 and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, Sunder T. T. College, Khasra No. 1100, 1118, Village - Mahapura, Ajmer Road, Taluka/Mandal-Sanganer, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302026.
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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-139/E-406126/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615607 -

School of Teachers Education, RK University, Plot No. 277, Village - Kasturbadham, Bhavnagar Highway, District-Rajkot, Gujarat - 360020	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Sagar Patel, Registrar
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **School of Teachers Education, RK University, Plot No. 277, Village - Kasturbadham, Bhavnagar Highway, District-Rajkot, Gujarat -360020** dated 22.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. WRC/2627202505073777/GUJARAT/2025/REJC/1816** dated 13.01.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. With regard to the land is mortgaged, institution has a loan on the land. The institution has not uploaded the non-Encumbrance certificate issued by the competent Government of the State Government. 2. 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 area and built-up area for the Teacher Education programmes including multi-disciplinary programmes. 3. 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. 4. The institution has not uploaded the invoice/Bill in respect of purchase of journal and its entry in the stock/Accession Register. 5. The institution has not uploaded the invoice /Bill in respect of Purchase of Education encyclopedia and its entry in the stock/Accession-Register. 6. The institution has not uploaded the invoice/Bill in respect of purchase Electronics Publication and its entry in the stock/Accession Register. 7. The institution has not uploaded the Invoice/Bill in respect of purchase Digital or online Resources and its entry in the stock/Accession Register. 8. The institution has not uploaded the Invoice/Bill in respect of purchase Science Stream Laboratories and its entry in the Stock/Accession Register. 9. The institution has not purchased/installed Humanities Stream Laboratories. 10. The institution has not uploaded the Invoice/Bill in respect of purchase of Furniture, Fixture, Equipment for Activity Cum Resource Centre instruments and its entry in the stock/Accession Register. 11. The institution has not uploaded the Invoice/Bill in respect of purchase of Furniture, Fixture Equipment for Common Room and its entry in the stock/Accession Register. 12. The institution has

not uploaded the Invoice/Bill in respect of purchase of Equipment and apparatus for Labs, Library resources and its entry in the stock/Accession Register. 13. The institution has not uploaded the Invoice/Bill in respect of purchase of Library books, Journals, Encyclopedia. Digital and online resources facilities are not available. 14. Lift/Ramp facility resources and its entry in the stock/Accession Register is not uploaded. 15. 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.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Sagar Patel, Registrar from School of Teachers Education, RK University, Plot No. 277, Village - Kasturbadham, Bhavnagar Highway, District-Rajkot, Gujarat -360020 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The land was mortgaged only till 2022 as mentioned in the attached Encumbrance Certificate issued by Revenue Department- Government of Gujarat. Please check “Re - conveyance deed” (transfer of full ownership of property after loan repayment) on 02/07/2022 mentioned in the attached document and highlighted for your ready reference. The Bank has also issued certificate to that effect that loan got over in the year 2022 itself which is also attached herewith. 2. The land was mortgaged only till 2022 as mentioned in the attached Encumbrance Certificate issued by Revenue Department- Government of Gujarat. Please check “Re - conveyance deed” (transfer of full ownership of property after loan repayment) on 02/07/2022 mentioned in the attached document and highlighted for your ready reference. The Bank has also issued certificate to that effect that loan got over in the year 2022 itself which is also attached herewith. 3. we have attached the building plans duly approved by Architect- Pankaj Thakkar who is registered with the Council of Architecture. The plan is also updated with the specified room sizes for your reference. 4. We have attached the updated building plans with the specified room sizes for your reference. 5. We confirm that we have uploaded the revised Building Safety Certificate along with its validity date for your reference. We have also uploaded a copy of the license issued by the competent authority to the certifier for your reference. Photograph of Ramp is also attached as per Virtual Team Experts suggestion. 6. We have made the necessary improvements in our Library and Laboratories. They are now well-

equipped with all required books, instruments, and facilities. Photographs of the upgraded Library and Laboratories are attached for your reference. 7. We have purchased the required books for the library. The photographs of the library are attached for your reference. We have subscribed to DELNET to provide access to Professional Research Journals, and a screenshot of the same is attached for your reference. We have purchased the Educational Encyclopedia. Photograph of Educational Encyclopedia is attached for your reference. We are pleased to inform you that we have access to The National Digital Library and Project Gutenberg for Electronic Publications. Both platforms have been successfully integrated into our Digital Library to ensure that our students and staff can conveniently access a wide range of resources. Screenshots of the integration are attached for your reference. Bills are also attached for ready reference. 8. We have subscribed to DELNET to provide access to Digital or Online Resources, and a screenshot of the same is attached for your reference. 9. We have made the necessary improvements in our Science Stream Laboratories. They are now well-equipped with all required instruments, and facilities. Photographs of the upgraded Laboratories are attached for your reference. 10. As we have applied only for the Science Stream and Commerce Stream, and as per the NCTE guidelines, there is no requirement to establish Humanities Stream laboratories for these streams. Therefore, we have not made arrangements to set up Humanities Laboratories. 11. We have made the necessary improvements in our Activity Cum Resource Centre. Our Activity Cum Resource Centre is now well-equipped with all required instruments, and facilities. Photographs of the upgraded Activity Cum Resource Centre are attached for your reference. We have made the necessary improvements in our Common Room. Our Common Room is now well-equipped with all required facilities. Photographs of the upgraded Common Room is attached for your reference. As per valuable suggestions from the Virtual Team Experts, we have developed a kitchen garden. Photographs of the kitchen garden are attached for your reference. 12. We have made the necessary improvements in our Library and Laboratories. They are now well-equipped with all required books, instruments, and facilities. Photographs of the upgraded Library and Laboratories are attached for your reference. Furthermore, we have issued provisional offer letters to the faculty members, and the same are attached herewith. We assure you that once we receive the approval, we will proceed with the formal appointment of the faculty members as well. 13. As per valuable

suggestions from the Virtual Team Experts, we have made the necessary improvements in our Library and Laboratories. They are now well-equipped with all required books, instruments, and facilities. Photographs of the upgraded Library and Laboratories are attached for your reference. Furthermore, we have purchased an Educational Encyclopedia for our library, and the photograph is attached for your reference. We have also subscribed to DELNET to provide access to digital and online resources, and a screenshot of the same is attached for your reference. Bills and details of the same are also attached herewith. 14. We confirm that we have uploaded the revised Building Safety Certificate along with its validity date for your reference. We have also uploaded a copy of the license issued by the competent authority to the certifier for your reference. Photograph of Ramp is also attached. 15. We have attached the building plans approved by Architect- Pankaj Thakkar who is registered with the Council of Architecture. The plan is also updated with the specified room sizes for your reference. 16. The land was mortgaged only till 2022 as mentioned in the attached Encumbrance Certificate issued by Revenue Department- Government of Gujarat.. Please check "Re - conveyance deed" (transfer of full ownership of property after loan repayment) on 02/07/2022 mentioned in the attached document and highlighted for your ready reference. The Bank has also issued certificate to that effect that loan got over in the year 2022 itself which is also attached herewith."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 13.01.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that the deficiency regarding mortgaged land stands clarified, stating that the land was mortgaged only up to the year 2022 and that the loan has since been repaid. In support, the institution has furnished an Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Revenue Department, Government of Gujarat, reflecting execution of a re-conveyance deed dated 02.07.2022 restoring full ownership, along with a certificate issued by the concerned bank confirming closure of the loan. The appellant institution further submitted that duly approved building plans have been furnished, signed by a registered architect under the Council of Architecture, along with updated plans indicating specified room sizes. It has also submitted that a revised Building Safety Certificate, including validity details, has been uploaded along with the license of the certifying authority, and that requisite accessibility features such as ramps have been provided. It was submitted that deficiencies relating to infrastructure have been addressed, including improvements in the library, laboratories, Activity-cum-Resource Centre, and common room, and that the same are now equipped with requisite books, instruments, and facilities. The institution has stated that photographs evidencing such improvements have been furnished. It has further submitted that the library has been strengthened through procurement of books, educational encyclopedia, subscription to DELNET, and integration of digital resources including National Digital Library and Project Gutenberg, supported by screenshots and bills. The appellant institution also submitted that science stream laboratories have been upgraded with necessary equipment and that, as the application pertains only to Science and Commerce streams, no humanities laboratories are required as per applicable norms. It was further submitted that infrastructural improvements have been carried out in accordance with the suggestions of the Visiting Team, including development of a kitchen garden. Additionally, the institution submitted that provisional offer letters have been issued to faculty members, with an assurance that formal appointments shall be made upon grant of approval. It reiterated that all revised documents, including building plans, safety certificates, and supporting evidence relating to infrastructure and academic facilities, have been uploaded in support of its claim of compliance.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective

competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 13.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the

concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 13.01.2026 and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, School of Teachers Education, RK University, Plot No. 277, Village - Kasturbadham, Bhavnagar Highway, District-Rajkot, Gujarat -360020.

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.



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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-140/E-406090/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615600 -

School of Education, Jaipur National University, Khasra No. 108-115, 145, Village - Jagatpura, Jaipur Agra Bypass, Taluka/Mandal- Sanganer, PO. Malviya Nagar, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302017	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Prof. Rita Arora, Director
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **School of Education, Jaipur National University, Khasra No. 108-115, 145, Village - Jagatpura, Jaipur Agra Bypass, Taluka/Mandal-Sanganer, PO. Malviya Nagar, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302017** dated 18.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509202958/RAJASTHAN/REJC/1800** dated 07.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The website of the institution has not been maintained and updated 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. The institution has failed to maintain and update the website in violation of 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. The university uploaded the old documents in reply. The University has uploaded Building Safety Certificate No.139 Dated 27/02/2024 issued by Executive Engineer, P.W.D. Division Ghatol, but khasra no. 108-115,145,146/742,146/745,146/750,147,155-156,165- 169, 174-175,177,182 not reflected in the Building Safety Certificate. The University has not uploaded Building Safety Certificate in adherence of safety guidelines as prescribed by National/State Disaster Management Authority issued by Competent Government Authority. iii. The University has not uploaded proper 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 area and built-up area for the teacher education programmes including multi-disciplinary programmes. iv. The University has not uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) as per Rajasthan Urban Areas (Permission for use of Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes and Allotment) Rules, 2012 in Form-11 of Rule 7(1) while mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Government Authority. v. In the Land Details, University claimed that Built Up area mentioned in the Affidavit (in sq m) 78235, the University is conducting degree courses BBA/BBA (Honours) BBA (Honours with Research) BBA digital Marketing, BBA Fintech and Digital Banking, BCA-AIML, CYBER SECURITY,

B.Com, B.Com, (Honours), B.Com. (Honours with Research), B.A. in English, B.A. LLB, BBA LLB (Hons), LLB, B.Sc. Nursing), B.Tech (Blotechnology), B.Tech (Biomedical Engineering) B.Tech (Computer Science Engineering) B.Tech (Food Technology) B.Pharm. B.Sc. (Clinical Dietetics/B.Sc. (Hons) Clinical Dietetics B.Sc. (CD), Bachelor in Radiation Technology/Medical Imaging Technology BRT/B.Sc. MIT,, Bachelor in Operation Theatre Technology, B.Sc. OTT, Bachelor in Cardiovascular Technology/Cath Lab Technology B.Sc. -CVT, Bachelor in Ophthalmic Technology/Optomety. B.Sc. OPT, B.Sc. (Pass Course) PCM/CBZ,, B.Sc. (Hons) Mathematics, B.A. (Journalism & Mass Communication) BJMC, B.Sc. (Hospitality and Hotel Administration) B.Sc. HHA, BHNCT (Hotel Management and Catering Technology), B.Sc. (Hons) Agriculture, B.Sc. (Hons) Forensic Science,, Bachelor in Medical Laboratory Technology, B.Sc. MLT, Bachelor of Physiotherapy (BPT), B.A. (Pass Course) Integrated B.A. B.Ed., B.Sc. B.Ed., B.Ed. B.Sc. (Hons) Biotechnology, B.Sc. Microbiology, MBBS, Post Basic B.Sc. Nursing, B.Sc. Fashion Desing, Bachelor of Arts (Hos) Psychology/Bachelor of Science (Hons) Psychology, BCA Full Stack Development, B. Tech CS RPA (Robotic Process automation), B.Des, Gaming and Animation, Basic School Teaching Certificate (BSTC), General Nursing and Midwifery, PG MA English and Language, M.C.A, LLM, M.Sc. (Chemistry) M.Sc. (Mathematics), M.Sc. (Microbiology), M.Sc. (Physics), MBA (Dule Specialization), MBA (Hospital and Healthcare Management) M.A. (Journalism, and Mass Communication) Pharm. D (PB) Pharma D. (Post Baccaulaureate), Pharm. D. (Doctor of Pharmacy), M.Pharm (Pharmaceutics), M.Pharm (Pharmaceutics Chemistry), M.Pharm (Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance), M.Pharm (Pharmacology), M.Sc. Clinical Nutrition, Master of Physiotherapy, M.Ed., M.D. (Radio Diagnosis) M.D. (dermatology, Venereology & Leprosy) M.D. (General Medicine), M.S. (Obstetrics & Gynecology), M.D. (Pediatrics), M.S. (Ophthalmology), MS (General Surgery), MS (Orthopedics) MD (Psychiatry), M.Sc. (Botany), MD (Anesthesiology) MD (Pathology), MD (Microbiology), MD. (Pharmacology), MD (Forensic Medicine) MD (Community Medicine), MD (Anatomy), MD (Physiology), MD (Biochemistry), MS (Otorhinolaryngology), MD (Respiratory Medicine), MD (Emergency Medicine) M.Tech CSE (AIML), M.Tech in Electronics and Instrumentation Specialization Biomedical Engineering, M.S. (Bioinformatics & Data Science), MBA, in so many specialization, M.Sc. Forensic Science, MBA in Fashion Management, M.Sc. Biotechnology, M.Sc. Medical Microbiology, They are running Ph.D. Prgoramme. 8 Diploma Programmes. 6 Distance Learning Programmes and 3

online learning programmes. The sufficiency of land and built-up area for the above courses with multidisciplinary courses and intake for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), Middle (1 unit) B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), Middle (1 unit) course cannot be ascertained. vi. The University has not uploaded latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by Competent Authority of State Government indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances issued by Competent Government Authority. vii. The university has NOT uploaded mutation certificate obtained from Revenue Records of the State Govt. for khasra no. 108-115, 145, 146/742, 146/745, 146/750, 147, 155-156, 165-169, 174-175, 177 and 182 instead of that they uploaded notarized copy of Lease Deed with To Whom It May Concern Certificate dated 29.01.2025 on the basis of report of the Tehsildar regarding Kh. Nos. pertaining to land approved by Up-Zila Collector & Magistrate, Jaipur-II Sanganer, Jaipur. The University is required to upload Mutation Certificate mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government. viii. The University has not uploaded Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by government competent authority. ix. University has not uploaded specific documents. Kh. No. 108- 115,145,146/742,146/745, 146/750,147,155-156,165-169,174-175,177,182 mentioned in portal are NOT reflected in the registered land documents Lease Deed.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Prof. Rita Arora, Director of School of Education, Jaipur National University, Khasra No. 108-115, 145, Village - Jagatpura, Jaipur Agra Bypass, Taluka/Mandal- Sanganer, PO. Malviya Nagar, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302017 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. It is respectfully submitted that the website of the institution is designed and structured in accordance with the provisions laid down under the aforesaid clauses. The appellant enclosed the screenshots of the websites at the time of filling of reply. Irrespective of the above, the website was accessible on School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur mandatory disclosures. However, now the website can be accessed on Home Page of Jaipur National University, Jaipur. The institution have ensure that all mandatory disclosures, required information, and updates are incorporated on the website in compliance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The copy of the latest screenshot is enclosed Annexure-

3. 2. The University submitted the Building Safety Certificate bearing No. 139 duly issued by the Executive Engineer, Public Works Department (P.W.D.) Division certifying the structural safety of the buildings situated within the campus of Jaipur National University. It is established from the land related documents that the campus is situated on the above khasra numbers and the building of campus is situated on the aforesaid land. Thus, the building safety certificate refers to the building of the University. The existing Building Safety Certificate adequately covers the entire University campus. It is submitted that the aforesaid aspect has not been considered by the respondent while passing the impugned order. Irrespective of the above, the appellant has now got the latest certificate dated 17.04.2026 issued by the authority which refers to the khasra numbers. The copy of the certificate dated 17.04.2026 is filed herewith and marked as Annexure-4. 3. It is submitted that the land forming part of the campus of Jaipur National University was allotted by the Jaipur Development Authority. The land was lawfully allotted by the Jaipur Development Authority to Mahima Shiksha Samiti, the sponsoring body of Jaipur National University for institutional purposes. The relevant notification dated 1.08.2001 and State Government letter dated 20.08.2001 were enclosed. The said submission of the appellant was not considered by the respondent. Irrespective of the above, the appellant submits the land use certificate dated 12.12.2008 issued by the authority refers to all Khasra numbers. Further, the letter dated 20.08.2001 was issued by the JDA clearly mentioning that the land is converted for institutional purposes. The appellant is also submitting the notification dated 01.08.2001 published in the Rajasthan official Gazette. The letters dated 12.12.2008 and 20.08.2001 as well as notification dated 01.08.2001 are enclosed and collectively referred to as Annexure-5. 4. The appellant submitted the Non-Encumbrance certificate issued by the competent authority however, the same was not considered by the respondent. Irrespective of the same, the newly issued NEC dated 4.03.2026 by the competent authority is enclosed as Annexure-6. 5. It is most respectfully submitted that the University has duly submitted its Registration Certificate bearing date 30.09.2009, issued under the provisions of Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (as amended), by the Principal Commissioner or Commissioner of Income Tax, being the designated jurisdictional authority under the said Act. This certificate establishes the University's exclusive not-for-profit character and status as a charitable institution devoted to educational objects. Section 12A registration is a statutory precondition

available only to trusts, societies, or entities demonstrably established “for charitable purposes” as defined under Section 2(15) of the Act. The appellant in regulatory filings before UGC, AICTE, or NAAC accreditation processes submitted the 12A certificates as standalone validation of non-profit operations for universities and colleges. Irrespective of the above, it is submitted that the duly notarized affidavit of the President of the University alongwith the certificate of the CA which are enclosed as Annexure-7. The said affidavit is a sufficient compliance as the same has been considered by the NCTE in relation to the other institutions. 6. The University has already uploaded the registered and notarized Lease Deed along with the “To Whom It May Concern” certificate dated 29.01.2025, issued on the basis of the Tehsildars report confirming the relevant Khasra numbers. Thus, the certificate issued by the concerned Tehsildar of the Revenue Department who is the competent person to carry out the mutation in the revenue records. Irrespective of the above, the appellant is filing the ‘Khasra Girdawari’ as well as the Jamabandi which refers to the khasra numbers and the same is enclosed as Annexure-8. It is submitted that after the conversion of the agricultural land to institutional use, the land is vested with the JDA and the revenue records refers to the JDA as the owner of the land. The land is allotted by the JDA through lease deeds however, the name of JDA will always be shown as the Khatedar in the revenue records. 7. It is submitted that the appellant submitted the documents which refers to the khasra numbers. The certificate dated 24.08.2001 referring to the Khasra No. 108-115. Further, the lease deed issued by the JDA refers to the Khasra No. 108-115 in the deed itself. The copy of the certificate, lease deed is enclosed as Annexure-9. With respect to Khasra No.145, 146/742, 146/745,146/750,147, 155-156, 165-169,174-175,177,182, it is submitted that the certificate dated 28.05.2009 issued by the JDA refers to Bhagwana Nanda, Tehsil Sanganer, Jaipur in which the above khasra numbers falls and the area of the land is also mentioned as 91147.27 Sq. Mtr. Further the lease deed also refers to the area of the land and the specific Khasra no. 145, 146/742, 146/745,146/750,147, 155-156, 165-169,174-175,177,182 are mentioned in the site plan (Kindly see right-hand side top) issued by the JDA which is the part of the lease deed. The copies of the certificate, lease deed and the site plan is enclosed as Annexure-10. 8. It is respectfully submitted that the uploaded sanctioned Building Plan approved by the competent authority mentions the name of the University and specifics the total land area and total built-up area, along with the demarcated built-up area earmarked for

each programme being conducted on the campus, including the exclusive allocation for the Teacher Education Programme. The sanctioned Building Plan issued by the Jaipur Development Authority does not reflect individual Khasra numbers on the face of the plan, as per their standard approval format. The copy of the layout/site plans referring to Khasra No along with building plans is enclosed as Annexure-11. 9. The programmes conducted by Jaipur National University have been duly approved by the respective competent statutory and regulatory authorities after detailed inspection of the availability of requisite infrastructure, land area, academic facilities, and other prescribed resources in accordance with applicable regulatory norms and standards. The other courses are being run in terms of the regulatory norms of the respective bodies. The University in its reply has specifically enclosed the earmarked area for the purposes of running the Teacher Education Programme which shows that the University fulfils the required infrastructural requirement so far as NCTE is concerned. The appellant has submitted the detailed floor wise building carpet area with regard to the each of the courses. The copy of the earmarked area along with floor wise carpet area is enclosed as Annexure-12. There is no allegation that the earmarked area falls short of the NCTE requirements. Thus, the apprehension raised in the notice regarding sufficiency of the infrastructure relating to NCTE programme is unwarranted. It is submitted that the respondent while considering the said application has not at all considered the response submitted by the appellant. It is submitted that so far as land documents relating to the title, ownership and institutional use of land relating to the appellant institution are concerned, the same were duly verified way back in the year 2016 by NCTE when the approval was granted for running the B.A. B.ED and B.SC B.ED courses. The appellant is running the courses from last 10 years without there being any issue ever raised by any competent authority regarding the title, ownership and institutional use pertaining to the land of the appellant. The impugned order merely refers that the deficiency pointed out still persists without referring to the documents and the explanation submitted by the appellant. It is submitted that WRC being a statutory body was required to provide reasons in the order for rejecting the explanation submitted by the appellant institution. The impugned order merely copy-paste the statements of the show-cause notice and does not deal at all with the reply. There is no adjudication done by the respondent while passing the order. The order being without any

application of mind and is absolutely unreasoned order which is required to be set aside on this ground alone.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Western Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 04.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 07.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein it has submitted that the website of the institution has been developed and maintained in compliance with the provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and that mandatory disclosures were available at the time of submission, with updated access now provided through the University homepage along with supporting screenshots. The appellant further submitted that the Building Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority (PWD) covers the entire University campus situated on the relevant khasra numbers and that a revised certificate dated 17.04.2026 explicitly mentioning the khasra details has also been obtained and placed on record. It was also submitted that the land forming part of the University campus was lawfully allotted by the Jaipur Development Authority for institutional purposes, supported by Government letters, Gazette notification, and Land Use Certificate, all indicating conversion for institutional use. The institution submitted that the Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent authority had already been furnished and that a latest NEC dated 04.03.2026 has also been submitted. It was further submitted that the institution holds registration under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, evidencing its not-for-profit character, and has additionally furnished a notarized affidavit and Chartered Accountant certificate in support of the same. The appellant

stated that it had submitted registered lease deeds, Tehsildar certificates, Jamabandi and Khasra Girdawari records establishing land particulars, and clarified that the land, having been allotted by JDA, reflects JDA as khatedar in revenue records. It further submitted that relevant certificates, lease deeds, and site plans clearly indicate the applicable khasra numbers and land area. It was also submitted that the sanctioned building plan approved by the competent authority reflects the name of the University, total land area, built-up area, and programme-wise earmarked areas, and that supporting layout/site plans indicating khasra numbers have been provided. The institution further submitted that infrastructure and academic facilities have been duly approved by respective regulatory authorities and that detailed floor-wise and programme-wise earmarked area statements have been furnished to demonstrate compliance with NCTE norms. The appellant institution further submitted that land ownership, title, and institutional use had been duly verified at the time of grant of recognition for integrated programmes in 2016 and that the institution has been functioning for several years without any objection from any authority in this regard. It has also contended that the reply and documents submitted in response to the Show Cause Notice were not adequately considered and that the impugned order does not reflect examination of such submissions.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The

Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution In accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may

appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 07.04.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand

is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 07.04.2026 and remands the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, School of Education, Jaipur National University, Khasra No. 108-115, 145, Village - Jagatpura, Jaipur Agra Bypass, Taluka/Mandal-Sanganer, PO. Malviya Nagar, District-Jaipur, Rajasthan-302017.
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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-4/E-326554/2024 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLNRC202314730

Aryans College of Education, 330(7-0), 332/1(3-12), 329(6-5), Chandigarh-Patiala Highway, Chamaru, Tehsil Rajpura, Patiala, Punjab-147001	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Aryans College of Education, 330(7-0), 332/1(3-12), 329(6-5), Chandigarh-Patiala Highway, Chamaru, Tehsil Rajpura, Patiala, Punjab-147001** dated 02.11.2023 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. NRC/NCTE/PB-604, B.Ed./410th Meeting/2023/223365** dated 22.09.2023 of the Northern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has not submitted non-encumbrance certificate issued by the Competent Government Authority. 2. The institution has not submitted building safety Certificate issued by the Competent Government Authority. 3. Certificate to the effect that the building is differently abled friendly from the Competent Government Authority. 4. The institution has submitted photocopy of Building Plan signed by the Private Architects. The building plan is not approved by the Competent Authority and also not legible. 5. The institution has submitted Building Completion Certificate but Competent Authority is not clear/legible. 6. The institution submitted a staff list but the same is not in the prescribed format. 7. The staff list is not approved by the Affiliating body as required under NCTE Regulations, 2014. 8. As per the Affidavit, the staff appointed is not qualified as per Appendix 4 of NCTE Regulations, 2014. 9. No proof of payment of salary for the last six months through bank account is submitted. 10. Photocopies of all FDRs submitted by the institution shows that the same are expired on 24.12.2013 and 24.12.2014, which needs renewal. 11. Form 'A' issued by the concerned bank regarding FDRs towards Endowment and Reserved Funds not submitted. 12. Website of the institution is not updated as required under NCTE Regulations, 2014. 13. The institution did not submit proof/evidence to prove that it is a Multi-disciplinary institution as per clause 2(b) of NCTE, Regulations, 2014."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative from Aryans College of Education, 330(7-0), 332/1(3-12), 329(6-5), Chandigarh-Patiala Highway, Chamaru, Tehsil Rajpura, Patiala, Punjab-147001 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. Have both FDR (7,00,000 & 5,00,000. 2. Issued by Sub-Registrar on 14/7/2010. 3. Both

approved by Sarpanch of Village and Architect. 4. Approved by Punjabi University Patiala”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 09.07.2010. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 30.05.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 22.09.2023.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the instant matter was earlier placed before the Appeal Committee in its 4th Meeting, 2024 held on 23.02.2024 and the appeal of the appellant institution was rejected vide order dated 01.04.2024. The operative part of the order is as under:-

“... the Appeal Committee observed that the documents submitted by the Appellant Institution are not as per the NCTE Norms and Standards such as:

- (i) Building Completion Certificate is not duly approved by the Competent Authority**
- (ii) The institution has submitted two faculty list:-**
 - (a) First staff list is dated 27.10.2023 in which there are total 5 faculty members and out of which Sl. No. 4 & 5 i.e. Mrs. Usha Rani and Mrs. Naresh Devi were not approved by the Punjabi University as they had to undergo Punjabi Exam within one year from the selection date.**
 - (b) Second staff list is dated 17.02.2024 which is not duly approved by the Competent Authority of the Affiliating Body.**

In view of above, Appeal Committee concluded that the NRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 22.09.2023 issued by NRC is confirmed.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded that the NRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 22.09.2023 issued by NRC is confirmed.

The appellant institution filed a Court case. The Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh vide order dated 12.03.2026 passed CWP – 4969-2026 (O & M) directed the following: -

- “1. In such view of the matter, we are of the opinion that the ends of justice would be better met if the appellate authority is requested to re-consider the matter in the light of the above referred facts placed on record. In order to facilitate such fresh consideration, we permit the petitioner to appear before the appellate authority along with a certified copy of this order within two weeks from today. The appellate authority is requested to afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass a fresh order after taking into consideration the relevant materials and documents brought on record.***
- 2. The orders impugned in the writ petition shall abide by the fresh order to be passed by the appellate authority, as indicated above. The requisite decision shall be taken by the appellate authority within a period of six weeks.***
- 3. The instant writ petition is accordingly disposed of.***
- 4. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.”***

The Appeal Committee noted that, at the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution vide letter dated 22.04.2026 has placed on record a compliance report along with supporting documents purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies forming the basis of the withdrawal order. The Committee further observed that a substantial portion of the material so relied upon was either not available before the concerned Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in the manner contemplated under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. Under the statutory scheme of the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the applicable Regulations, compliance with prescribed recognition norms is required to be established through duly verified and authenticated records. Consequently, the material now placed on record necessitates factual scrutiny and regulatory examination by the competent Regional Committee before any conclusive determination regarding compliance can be arrived at. The Appeal Committee further observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication and in light

of the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016]***, subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasised that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having

regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 22.09.2023 warrants interference to the limited extent that subsequent material placed on record by the appellant institution has not been subjected to verification and consideration by the competent Regional Committee. The Committee is further of the view that the ends of justice would be met by remanding the matter for limited factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims. Accordingly, without diluting the statutory authority of the Northern Regional Committee and without creating any equity in favour of the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned withdrawal order dated 22.09.2023 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 the 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, concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 22.09.2023 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Aryans College of Education, 330(7-0), 332/1(3-12), 329(6-5), Chandigarh-Patiala Highway, Chamaru, Tehsil Rajpura, Patiala, Punjab-147001.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Block E, 5th Floor, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali)-Punjab-160062.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-95/E-399943/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615542

Seth Gyaniram Bansidhar Podar College, 1541, Rambilas Podar Road, Nawalgrah, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan-333042	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Satyendra Singh, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Seth Gyaniram Bansidhar Podar College, 1541, Rambilas Podar Road, Nawalgrah, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan-333042** dated 14.02.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202505265378/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/599** dated 13.01.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The Committee noted that the institution has not uploaded reply of Show Cause Notice dated 04.12.2025 post inspection and the following deficiencies mentioned in SCN are still persisting: (i) The institution is running so many courses and the approved intake of institution is i.e. B.A. 240x3=720, B.Com.240x3=720, B.Sc. 420x3=1260, BCA150x3=450, BBA 150x3=450, M.Sc. Physics 40x2=80, M.Sc. Chemistry 45x3=135, M.Sc. (Zoology) 40x2=80, M.Sc. Botany 40x2=80, M.Sc. Mathematics 40x2=80, M.A. (Political Science)40x2=80, M.A. (English) 40x2=80, M.Com. (EAFM) 40x2=80, MA (Geography)40x2=80 total approved intake is 4375. The sufficiency of land and built-up area for 4375 of approved intake of multidisciplinary courses intake for B.A.B.Ed Secondary (2 unit), Middle (2 unit), Foundational (2 unit), Preparatory (2 unit) B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (2 unit), Middle (2 unit), Foundational (2 unit), Preparatory (2 unit) B.Com. B.Ed. Secondary (2 unit), Middle (2 unit), Foundational (2 unit), Preparatory (2 unit) course cannot be ascertained. (ii) The institution has uploaded an affidavit and requested Committee to consider the effective intake capacity of 1300 students only in place of 4330 while assessing the sufficiency of land and built-up area and approve a total intake of 500 seats under ITEP in place of 1200 seats. This affidavit also cannot be ascertained. (iii) The institution has uploaded FORM NO. 10A issued by Income Tax Department and registration date is 04.04.2022. This is not the "Not for Profit" certificate. (iv) The link of website: - <https://podarcollege.com/ncteitep/> provided by the institution checked and found that is not functional. (v) In addition, the institution has uploaded Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Fire Safety Department, Nagar Palika, Nawalgarh, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan, vide reference number 2023-24-10537, dated 17/02/2023, valid until 17/02/2026. The institution has also applied for renewal through the Rajasthan Fire Safety Portal, and the updated certificate is awaited."

Point No. 8 , 9 ,19,20 , 29, 30) (Annexure - 7). 9. Total Books available in Central Lib is 82,178 and 9236 Titles and out of these the institution has earmarked 4,070 books comprising 1,000 titles exclusively for the ITEP programme from the existing central library. (Same as Point No. 8 , 9 ,19,20 , 29, 30) (Annexure - 8). 10. The institution is fully equipped with adequate Science Stream laboratories, The details of the laboratories available in the institution are as under: 1. Physics Laboratories: 05, 2. Chemistry Laboratories: 05 3. Mathematical / Computational & C-Programming Laboratories: 02 4. Zoology Laboratories: 05, 5. Botany Laboratories: 05, 6. Computer Laboratories: 05 TOTAL 27 Lab the institution has earmarked two (02) laboratories in each Science stream exclusively for the ITEP programme. Geotagged photographs of the laboratories earmarked for ITEP have been enclosed/uploaded. (Same as Point No. 10 , 21 , 28) (Annexure - 9). 11. The college has the following laboratories relevant to the Humanities stream: 1. Geography Laboratories: 02, 2. Language Laboratory: 01 (Annexure - 10). 12. The institution has a well-established Auditorium having a total area of 326.99 sq. meters, which is being utilized as an Activity Cum Resource Centre. The said facility is adequately equipped and is regularly used for academic activities, seminars, workshops, teaching-learning activities, group discussions, micro-teaching, and other pedagogical practices relevant to teacher education programmes. (Annexure - 11). 13. The institution has separate common rooms for boys and girls, which are adequately furnished and regularly used by students. (Annexure - 12). 14. The institution already has a well-maintained Botanical Garden within the campus, which is used for academic and practical learning purposes. In addition to this, the college has adequate vacant space earmarked within the campus where a Kitchen Garden is being developed specifically for ITEP students. Photographs of the existing Botanical Garden and the earmarked space for the Kitchen Garden are enclosed (Annexure - 13). 15. The signage has been provided in compliance with NCTE norms, and to avoid any ambiguity regarding the location and identity of the ITEP programme within the campus. (Annexure - 14). 16. All classrooms earmarked for academic use, including those for the ITEP programme, were properly arranged and organized at the time of the Visiting Team (VT) inspection. The furniture in these classrooms was placed systematically to ensure a conducive teaching-learning environment. However one room contained excess furniture, which had been temporarily stored there and was not intended for academic use or inspection. (Same as Point no. 16, 27) (Annexure

- 15). 17. All classrooms and academic facilities earmarked for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) are clearly identified with proper signage bearing the name "ITEP (Integrated Teacher Education Programme)". The signage has been prominently displayed inside the classrooms and in relevant academic spaces in compliance with NCTE norms. (Annexure - 16). 18. The College has four (04) fully functional computer laboratories with a total of 107 computers. These laboratories are not exclusively assigned to any single programme. including BCA and ITEP. (Annexure - 17). 19. Total Books available in Central Lib is 82,178 and 9236 Titles and out of these the institution has earmarked 4,070 books comprising 1,000 titles exclusively for the ITEP programme from the existing central library. (Same as Point No. 8, 9 ,19,20, 29, 30) (Annexure - 7). 20. Total Books available in Central Lib is 82,178 and 9236 Titles and out of these the institution has earmarked 4,070 books comprising 1,000 titles exclusively for the ITEP programme from the existing central library. (Same as Point No. 8, 9 ,19,20, 29, 30) (Annexure - 8). 21. The institution is fully equipped with adequate Science Stream laboratories, The details of the laboratories available in the institution are as under: 1. Physics Laboratories: 05, 2. Chemistry Laboratories: 05 3. Mathematical / Computational & C-Programming Laboratories: 02 4. Zoology Laboratories: 05, 5. Botany Laboratories: 05, 6. Computer Laboratories: 05 TOTAL 27 Lab the institution has earmarked two (02) laboratories in each Science stream exclusively for the ITEP programme. Geotagged photographs of the laboratories earmarked for ITEP have been enclosed/uploaded. (Same as Point No. 10 ,21, 28) (Annexure - 18). 22. The institution has already applied for issuance of the No Objection Certificate (NOC) to the concerned affiliating University, namely Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Shekhawati University, Sikar, for running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). (Same as Point no. 22, 32) (Annexure - 19). 23. The ramps for Divyang students is already available, Geotagged photographs are enclosed Further, accessible toilet facilities for both boys and girls with relevant Geotagged photographs are enclosed. (same as Point No. 5, 23, 33) (Annexure - 5). 24. The institution has a separate and dedicated toilet facility exclusively for female staff members, which is functional, well-maintained, and in regular use. The facility has been provided in accordance with workplace safety, hygiene, and comfort norms. (Same as point no 24, 34) (Annexure - 20). 25. The institution has provided accessible (Divyang-friendly) toilet facilities for both boys and girls within the campus,

which are designed and maintained in accordance with the prescribed accessibility norms. These facilities are equally available for use by Male Divyang students and are functional, hygienic, and regularly maintained. (Annexure - 21). 26. The institution has separate and dedicated common rooms for boys and girls, which are adequately furnished and regularly used by students. (Same as Point No. 26, 35) (Annexure - 12). 27. All classrooms earmarked for academic use, including those for the ITEP programme, were properly arranged and organized at the time of the Visiting Team (VT) inspection. The furniture in these classrooms was placed systematically to ensure a conducive teaching-learning environment. However one room contained excess furniture, which had been temporarily stored there and was not intended for academic use or inspection. (Same as Point no. 16 ,27) (Annexure - 15). 28. The institution is fully equipped with adequate Science Stream laboratories, The details of the laboratories available in the institution are as under: 1. Physics Laboratories: 05, 2. Chemistry Laboratories: 05 3. Mathematical / Computational & C-Programming Laboratories: 02 4. Zoology Laboratories: 05, 5. Botany Laboratories: 05, 6. Computer Laboratories: 05 TOTAL 27 Lab the institution has earmarked two (02) laboratories in each Science stream exclusively for the ITEP programme. Geotagged photographs of the laboratories earmarked for ITEP have been enclosed/uploaded. (Same as Point No. 10 ,21 , 28 , 31) (Annexure - 18). 29. Total Books available in Central Lib is 82,178 and 9236 Titles and out of these the institution has earmarked 4,070 books comprising 1,000 titles exclusively for the ITEP programme from the existing central library. (Same as Point No. 8 , 9 ,19,20 , 29, 30) (Annexure - 7). 30. Total Books available in Central Lib is 82,178 and 9236 Titles and out of these the institution has earmarked 4,070 books comprising 1,000 titles exclusively for the ITEP programme from the existing central library. (Same as Point No. 8 , 9 ,19,20 , 29, 30) (Annexure - 8). 31. The institution is fully equipped with adequate Science Stream laboratories, The details of the laboratories available in the institution are as under: 1. Physics Laboratories: 05, 2. Chemistry Laboratories: 05 3. Mathematical / Computational & C-Programming Laboratories: 02 4. Zoology Laboratories: 05, 5. Botany Laboratories: 05, 6. Computer Laboratories: 05 TOTAL 27 Lab (Same as Point No. 10 ,21, 28, 31) (Annexure - 18). 32. The institution has already applied for issuance of the No Objection Certificate (NOC) to the concerned affiliating University, namely Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Shekhawati University, Sikar, for running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). (Same as Point no. 22, 32)

(Annexure - 19). 33. The ramps for Divyang students is already available , Geotagged photographs are enclosed Further, accessible toilet facilities for both boys and girls with relevant Geotagged photographs are enclosed. (same as Point No. 5, 23 , 33, 36) (Annexure - 5). 34. The institution has a separate and dedicated toilet facility exclusively for female staff members, which is functional, well-maintained, and in regular use. The facility has been provided in accordance with workplace safety, hygiene, and comfort norms. (Same as point no 24, 34) (Annexure - 20). 35. The institution has separate and dedicated common rooms for boys and girls, which are adequately furnished and regularly used by students. (Same as Point No. 26 , 35) (Annexure - 12). 36. The ramps for Divyang students is already available, Geotagged photographs are enclosed Further, accessible toilet facilities for both boys and girls with relevant Geotagged photographs are enclosed. (same as Point No. 5, 23, 33, 36) (Annexure - 5). 37. The institution did not receive the Show Cause Notice dated 04/12/2025 on its official communication channels on official email principal@podarcollege.com. Even in Inbox, Spam, Junk, and Archive . b) Due to non-receipt of the notice, the institution was unaware of the requirement to submit a reply within 15 days. (Annexure - 22). 38. The institution has requested approval for only 500 seats under the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) based on actual academic and infrastructural planning. • The proposed distribution of ITEP seats is as follows: B.A. B.Ed. Programme : Secondary Level (2 Units), Middle Level (2 Units) (50+50+50+50) 200 B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme : Secondary Level (2 Units), Middle Level (2 Units) (50+50+50+50) 200 B.Com. B.Ed. Programme: Secondary Level (1 Unit), Middle Level (1 Unit) (50+50) 100 • The application regarding the same has been submitted to " Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhyay Shekhawati University, Sikar" for reduction of the sanctioned intake of First Year students from 1525 to 1280. A copy of the letter submitted to the University is enclosed (Annexure - 23). 39. This institute is managed by The Anandilal Podar Trust. It is a charitable trust started in 1921 before Independence. The trust Forms 10AC Section 12A from the Income Tax Department are attached. (Annexure - 24). 40. The official college website is fully functional and accessible. The webpage dedicated to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) has been properly created on the institutional website, All mandatory documents and information have been uploaded on the website. (Annexure - 25). 41. The institution had obtained a Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Fire Safety Department, Nagar Palika, Nawalgarh, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan, vide

reference number 2023-24-10537, dated 17/02/2023, which is valid up to 17/02/2026. b) The institution has all fire safety measures, equipment, and emergency protocols c) A copy of the renewal application acknowledgment is enclosed for kind reference. (Annexure - 26)" Subsequent the appellant also submitted before Appeal Committee. That The Anandilal Podar Trust, Nawalgarh is the sponsoring body of Seth Gyaniram Bansidhar Podar College, Nawalgarh, Jhunjhunu (Rajasthan). That the Institution is desirous of running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) from the Academic Session 2026-27 onwards. That the institution humbly submits before the Hon'ble Appeal Committee of NCTE that, if permissible, approval may kindly be granted for ITEP Programme for 4 Units as per details given here under: - B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme Secondary Stage – 01 points, Middle Stage – 01 points, B.A. B.Ed. Programme, Secondary Stage – 01 points, Middle Stage – 01 points. That it is respectfully submitted that the institution has already reduced its sanctioned intake capacity in various programme from 4330 seats (session 2025-26) to 4005 seats (reduction of 325 seats) for the Academic Session 2026-27. The Affiliation application submitted in this regard to Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Shekhawati University, Sikar has already been submitted to NCTE vide our officer letter no. GBPC/2025-26/268 dated 08.12.2025 enclosed herewith as Annexure – 1. That in case the Hon'ble Appeal Committee finds that it is not feasible to grant approval for 4 units as requested under point 3 above, the Institution humbly prays that approval may kindly granted at least for the following ITEP Programmes. B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme (Secondary Stage) – 01 points, B.A. B.Ed. Programme (Secondary Stage) – 01 points. That the Institution shall strictly adhere to all norms, standards, guidelines, and regulations prescribed by NCTE from time to time, as applicable in our case. That the Institution has adequate infrastructure, financial resource, and other required facilities to run the above-mentioned programmes as per NCTE norms. That this affidavit is being submitted before the Appeal Committee of NCTE for consideration and approval of the above-mentioned ITEP Programme.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 13.01.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 & 4th Meeting, 2026 held on 19.02.2026 & 26.02.2026 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, namely Seth Gyaniram Bansidhar Podar College, Nawalgarh, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan, sponsored by The Anandilal Podar Trust, Nawalgarh, in respect of its application relating to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The appellant institution submitted that Rashtrapita Mahatma Gandhi was the Founder Chairman of the Trust and Shri Madan Mohan Malaviya was the second Chairman of the Trust. The institution submitted that the discrepancy relating to Khasra No. 1541 was only a typographical error and relied upon official land documents in support thereof. It further submitted that the Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Executive Officer, Nagar Palika, Nawalgarh dated 06.10.2025 had already been uploaded in response to the Final Show Cause Notice. The appellant institution submitted that a total built-up area of 2214.18 sq. metres had been exclusively earmarked for the ITEP programme on ground, first, and second floors, along with an additional sharing area of 2006.22 sq. metres claimed to be permissible under Clause 6.3 of the ITEP Norms and Standards. It was further stated that land admeasuring 10,011 sq. yards covered under Patta No. 115 had been formally earmarked by the Trust for the ITEP programme. The institution further

submitted that ramps and accessible toilet facilities for Divyang students were available in the campus and geotagged photographs had been enclosed/uploaded. It was also stated that the Building Completion Certificate had been updated with the date of inspection and uploaded on the NCTE portal in response to the Final Show Cause Notice. The appellant institution submitted that the central library contains 82,178 books and 9,236 titles, out of which 4,070 books comprising 1,000 titles had been earmarked exclusively for ITEP. It further submitted that the institution possesses multiple science laboratories, including Physics, Chemistry, Zoology, Botany, Mathematical/Computational and Computer Laboratories, and that two laboratories in each science stream had been earmarked exclusively for ITEP. The institution also stated that Geography and Language Laboratories were available for Humanities stream programmes. The institution further submitted that it has a well-established auditorium/activity-cum-resource centre, separate common rooms for boys and girls, botanical garden, proposed kitchen garden space, proper signage for ITEP facilities, dedicated and accessible toilet facilities, and computer laboratories containing 107 computers shared across programmes including ITEP. It was also submitted that all classrooms and academic facilities earmarked for ITEP were properly arranged at the time of the Visiting Team inspection and that excess furniture in one room had only been temporarily stored. The appellant institution further submitted that it had already applied to Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Shekhawati University, Sikar for issuance of No Objection Certificate for running ITEP. It was also stated that the institution did not receive the Show Cause Notice dated 04.12.2025 on its official e-mail ID and, therefore, remained unaware of the requirement to submit reply within the stipulated time. The institution submitted that approval had been sought for 500 seats under ITEP, comprising B.A. B.Ed., B.Sc. B.Ed., and B.Com. B.Ed. programmes at Secondary and Middle Stages, and that an application for reduction of sanctioned intake from 1525 to 1280 seats had already been submitted to the affiliating University. The institution further submitted that The Anandilal Podar Trust is a charitable trust established in 1921 and relied upon documents under Section 12A/10AC of the Income Tax Act. The institution also submitted that its official website is functional and that a dedicated webpage for ITEP had been created with all mandatory disclosures/documents uploaded thereon. It further submitted that a valid Fire Safety Certificate dated 17.02.2023 issued by Nagar Palika, Nawalgarh, -valid up to 17.02.2026, had been obtained and that all fire safety measures and protocols were

in place. The appellant institution further submitted an affidavit before the Appeal Committee stating that The Anandilal Podar Trust, Nawalgarh is the sponsoring body of the institution and that the institution intends to commence ITEP from the Academic Session 2026-27 onwards. The institution requested grant of approval for four units, namely B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary Stage – 01 Unit; Middle Stage – 01 Unit) and B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary Stage – 01 Unit; Middle Stage – 01 Unit). It was further submitted that the sanctioned intake capacity of various programmes had already been reduced from 4330 seats for Academic Session 2025-26 to 4005 seats for Academic Session 2026-27 and that the relevant affiliation application submitted to the affiliating University had already been forwarded to NCTE vide letter dated 08.12.2025. The institution further prayed that, in the alternative, approval may be granted at least for B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary Stage – 01 Unit) and B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary Stage – 01 Unit). The institution also undertook to comply with all applicable NCTE norms, standards, guidelines, and regulations and claimed that adequate infrastructure, financial resources, and other requisite facilities are available for conduct of the proposed programmes.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found on findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including compliance with the prescribed shortlisting criteria, and are neither procedural nor technical in nature. At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents and a compliance report purporting to rectify the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not been subjected to verification, authentication, or scrutiny by the competent authority in accordance with the procedure prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure)

Regulations, 2014, as amended. It is a settled position under the statutory framework that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and such compliance is necessarily to be assessed by the competent Regional Committee, being the statutory authority entrusted with such examination under the Act. The Appeal Committee further reiterates that the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance with the statutory norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory in character and remains conditional upon demonstrable adherence to the prescribed norms at the relevant point of time; it does not confer any vested, accrued, or equitable right in favour of the applicant institution in the absence of such compliance. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies, which are essentially factual and capable of objective verification, and bearing in mind the limited scope of appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of enabling a factual re-examination of the material now placed on record, without expressing any opinion on merits and without diluting the statutory requirements. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the 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 13.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Western 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, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. 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 Regional Committee concerned, 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 13.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Western 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, Seth Gyaniram Bansidhar Podar College, 1541, Rambilas Podar Road, Nawalgrah, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan-333042.**
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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-96/E-399944/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLERC202615549

Debraj Roy College, Plot no. Ward No. 9, Near Circuit House Road, Moukhowa, Golaghat, Assam - 785621	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Jayanta Barukial, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF ORDER

The appeal of **Debraj Roy College, Plot no. Ward No. 9, Near Circuit House Road, Moukhowa, Golaghat, Assam - 785621** dated 19.02.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2526202404272420/ASSAM/2024/RECOGNITION ORDER** dated 29.01.2026 of the Eastern Regional Committee, granting recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "As per Appeal Report:- We applied for recognition of two units :1 B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary). 2. B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary). However, we have received final recognition for only one unit of B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary). We were expecting recognition for the B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) unit as well."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Jayanta Barukial, Principal of Debraj Roy College, Plot no. Ward No. 9, Near Circuit House Road, Moukhowa, Golaghat, Assam - 785621 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "To the Regional Director NCTE (ERC) Subject: Memorandum of Appeal Regarding Recognition of B.A. B.Ed. Unit Respected Sir/Madam, With due respect, we wish to submit that Debraj Roy College (Autonomous), Golaghat applied for recognition of one unit each of B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. under Application No. 2526202404272420. However, we have received recognition only for one unit of B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) vide Order No. NCTE/ERC/2526202404272420/Assam/2024/Recognition Order. We humbly request you to kindly review the matter, as the omission of the B.A. B.Ed. unit may have occurred due to a technical error. Our institution, having completed 75 years of distinguished service, possesses adequate infrastructure, qualified faculty, and sufficient funds to effectively run both programmes. We shall be grateful for your kind consideration and necessary action. Yours faithfully, Dr. Jayanta Barukial Principal Debraj Roy College (Autonomous) Golaghat." The appellant also submitted before the Appeal Committee that the institution had applied for recognition for both the Integrated B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme and the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. Programme in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the applicable NCTE Regulations. It is respectfully submitted that the ERC has granted recognition for only

one unit of the Integrated B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme, whereas recognition for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. Programme has not been granted. The institution humbly submits that before refusal/non-grant of recognition for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. Programme, no adequate opportunity has been provided to the institution for fulfillment of any additional faculty requirement, if required under the Regulations. The institution further submits that it already possesses sufficient teaching staff and academic infrastructure for conducting the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), including faculty relating to Performing Arts and Physical Education. The faculty list is also submitted before Appeal Division for 2 units of ITEP programme. However, if any additional faculty or compliance is specifically required for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. Programme, the institution is fully ready and willing to appoint such faculty immediately in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, 2021 and other applicable norms. In the interest of justice and fair opportunity, it is therefore humbly requested that the institution may kindly be afforded an opportunity to remove/fulfill any deficiency before any final adverse decision is taken with respect to the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. Programme. It is further prayed that a fresh Letter of Intent (LOI) for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. Programme may kindly be issued in terms of the provisions of the NCTE Act and Regulations, thereby enabling the institution to complete all requisite appointments and compliance formalities within the stipulated timeframe. The institution assures the Hon'ble Council that any requirement or deficiency pointed out by the ERC/NCTE shall be complied with promptly and strictly in accordance with the prescribed norms. In view of the above facts and circumstances, the institution humbly requests the Hon'ble Appellate Authority to consider the matter sympathetically and grant an opportunity to the institution before refusal of recognition for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. Programme.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 31.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme (B.Sc. B.Ed. for 1 unit) has been granted by the ERC vide order dated 29.01.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 4th Meeting, 2026 held online on 26th 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, namely Debraj Roy College (Autonomous), Golaghat, Assam, in respect of its application for recognition of Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) courses under Application No. 2526202404272420. The institution submitted that it had applied for recognition for one unit each of Integrated B.A. B.Ed. and Integrated B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the applicable NCTE Regulations. The appellant institution submitted that recognition was granted only for one unit of Integrated B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary Stage) vide recognition order issued by the Eastern Regional Committee, whereas recognition for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. programme was not granted. The institution stated that the non-grant of recognition for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. programme may have occurred due to a technical error. The institution further submitted that it possesses adequate infrastructure, financial resources, and qualified faculty for conduct of both programmes and stated that it has completed 75 years of academic service. It was also submitted that the institution already has sufficient teaching staff and academic infrastructure for conduct of the ITEP programme, including faculty relating to Performing Arts and Physical Education, and that the faculty list for two units of ITEP had been submitted before the Appeal Division. The appellant institution further submitted that no adequate opportunity had been provided prior to non-grant/refusal of recognition for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. programme for fulfillment of any additional faculty requirement, if required under the applicable Regulations. The institution stated that, in the event any additional faculty or compliance is required for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. programme, it is ready and

willing to make such appointments and fulfill the requisite requirements immediately in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, 2021 and other applicable norms. The institution requested that an opportunity be granted to remove or fulfill any deficiency before any final adverse decision is taken in respect of the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. programme. The institution further prayed for issuance of a fresh Letter of Intent (LOI) for the Integrated B.A. B.Ed. programme to enable completion of requisite appointments and compliance formalities within the stipulated timeframe. The institution also undertook to comply with all requirements and deficiencies, if any, pointed out by the ERC/NCTE in accordance with the prescribed norms and regulations.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found on findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including compliance with the prescribed shortlisting criteria, and are neither procedural nor technical in nature. At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents and a compliance report purporting to rectify the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not been subjected to verification, authentication, or scrutiny by the competent authority in accordance with the procedure prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. It is a settled position under the statutory framework that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and such compliance is necessarily to be assessed by the competent Regional Committee, being the statutory authority entrusted with such examination under the Act. The

Appeal Committee further reiterates that the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance with the statutory norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory in character and remains conditional upon demonstrable adherence to the prescribed norms at the relevant point of time; it does not confer any vested, accrued, or equitable right in favour of the applicant institution in the absence of such compliance. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies, which are essentially factual and capable of objective verification, and bearing in mind the limited scope of appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of enabling a factual re-examination of the material now placed on record, without expressing any opinion on merits and without diluting the statutory requirements. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case and

having regard to the limited issue concerning compliance with Appendix-15 of the NCTE (Recognition, Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended in 2021, the Appeal Committee, strictly for the limited purpose of ensuring procedural fairness, regulatory consistency, and faithful adherence to the statutory framework - without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant's claim and without in any manner diluting the mandatory standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder - hereby, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the Act, remands the matter to the concerned Regional Committee solely to the limited extent of re-examining the issue relating to non-grant of recognition for the B.Sc. B.Ed. discipline under ITEP programme, in accordance with law. The matter is remanded to the Eastern Regional Committee for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with law and the applicable regulatory framework. The Eastern Regional Committee shall: (a) Afford the appellant institution a personal or virtual hearing and grant one final and non-extendable opportunity of fifteen (15) days from receipt of this order to submit a comprehensive, documentary explanation establishing strict and contemporaneous compliance with Appendix-15, including a detailed faculty matrix specifying qualifications, subject specializations, stage-wise deployment, unit-wise allocation, and proof of approval by the competent affiliating authority; (b) Independently and objectively verify all documents and explanations submitted, and apply the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition, Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended in 2021) in their true letter and spirit, uninfluenced by prior proceedings but confined to the statutory parameters governing programme-specific recognition; (c) Record clear, reasoned, and item-wise findings on each regulatory requirement, particularly those arising under Appendix-15, and pass a reasoned and speaking order within thirty (30) days from receipt of the appellant's submissions. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to regulatory re-examination of compliance under Appendix-15 and does not create any presumption, equity, legitimate expectation, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. Recognition under the NCTE framework is conditional, programme-specific, and contingent upon strict, demonstrable, and verifiable compliance with statutory norms. Failure to establish such compliance upon remand shall entail rejection of the claim for recognition without any further opportunity. The appellant institution is directed to forward, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents relied upon in the appeal to the Northern Regional Committee. The

Regional Committee shall thereafter proceed strictly in accordance with law and in light of the directions contained herein, ensuring time-bound disposal of the matter.

IV. DECISION: -

After 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 to remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) for fresh consideration in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Debraj Roy College, Plot no. Ward No. 9, Near Circuit House Road, Moukhowa, Golaghat, Assam - 785621.**
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', 3rd 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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-89/E-399316/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLSRC202615546 ✓

SRM Institute of Science and Technology, 128/1, SRM Nagar, Pother, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu-603203	<u>Vs</u>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. A. Rajkamal, Assistant Professor
Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **SRM Institute of Science and Technology, 128/1, SRM Nagar, Pother, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu-603203** dated 16.02.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/SRC/2526202404272431/TAMIL NADU/2024/REJC/778** dated 29.01.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The land is neither in the name of applicant society / trust, as mentioned in the application form, nor the proposed institution."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. A. Rajkamal, Assistant Professor from SRM Institute of Science and Technology, 128/1, SRM Nagar, Pother, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu-603203 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "The land is duly registered in the name of Valliammai Education Society, which is the sponsoring and parent society of SRM Institute of Science and Technology. Relevant ownership documents evidencing the same relationship have been uploaded for verification. 2. The entire land that has been earmarked and shown for the purpose of conducting ITEP, entirely comes under the Valliammai Society which is sole trust of SRM Institute of Science and Technology (SRMIST). 3. The English version of the Change of Land Use Certificate is available and has been uploaded for kind perusal. 4. The land is free from all encumbrances. The Non-Encumbrance Certificate clearly confirms that there are no legal, financial, or other liabilities attached to the said land. 5. SRM Institute of Science and Technology functions under the aegis of Valliammai Education Society, which is the Mother Institution / Sponsoring Society. 6. SRM Institute of Science and Technology (SRMIST) is a Deemed to be University, notified by the Government of India under Section 3 of the UGC Act, 1956, and is not merely a department of any other university. 7. The demarcated site plan, clearly indicating the plot / Khasra numbers and earmarked area for the Teacher Education Programmes, has been duly uploaded."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 17.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the SRC vide order dated 29.01.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 & 4th Meeting, 2026 held on 19.02.2026 & 26.02.2026 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, wherein it has submitted that the land in question is duly registered in the name of Valliammai Education Society, which is the sponsoring society of SRM Institute of Science and Technology (SRMIST), and that relevant ownership documents establishing such relationship have been placed on record. It has further been submitted that the entire land earmarked for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) forms part of the land held by the said society. The appellant institution has submitted that the Change of Land Use Certificate, including its English version, has been furnished and that the land is free from encumbrances as evidenced by the Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent authority. It has also been submitted that SRM Institute of Science and Technology functions under the aegis of Valliammai Education Society and that SRMIST is a "Deemed to be University" notified under Section 3 of the UGC Act, 1956. The appellant has further submitted that a demarcated site plan indicating the relevant plot/Khasra numbers and earmarked area for the teacher education programme has been duly uploaded in support of its claim of compliance.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found on findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including compliance with the prescribed shortlisting criteria, and are neither procedural nor technical in nature. At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents and a compliance report purporting to rectify the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not been subjected to verification, authentication, or scrutiny by the competent authority in accordance with the procedure prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. It is a settled position under the statutory framework that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and such compliance is necessarily to be assessed by the competent Regional Committee, being the statutory authority entrusted with such examination under the Act. The Appeal Committee further reiterates that the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance with the statutory norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory in character and remains conditional upon demonstrable adherence to the prescribed norms at the relevant point of time; it does not confer any vested, accrued, or equitable right in favour of the applicant institution in the absence of such compliance. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies, which are essentially factual and capable of objective verification, and bearing in mind the limited scope of appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose

of enabling a factual re-examination of the material now placed on record, without expressing any opinion on merits and without diluting the statutory requirements. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, the Appeal Committee deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 29.01.2025 and remand the matter to the Southern Regional Committee (SRC) strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution is directed to submit, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of this order, complete, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence in support of its claims before the Regional Committee concerned. Upon receipt thereof, the Southern Regional Committee shall examine the submissions strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, verify the authenticity and adequacy of the documents, and

afford reasonable opportunity of hearing, if deemed necessary, before passing a reasoned and speaking order. The Regional Committee shall ensure strict adherence to the statutory framework, including the provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), which mandate submission and verification of complete and authentic records as a condition precedent for grant or continuation of recognition. The decision shall be taken strictly on merits, in accordance with law, and uninfluenced by any observations made herein, which are confined solely to the question of remand for factual verification. It is expressly clarified that this remand is limited in scope and does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. In the event of failure to establish strict and verifiable compliance with the prescribed norms and standards upon re-examination, the application shall be liable to be rejected in accordance with law. The Regional Committee, being the custodian of the statutory record, shall ensure authenticity, completeness, and proper verification of all documents and shall dispose of the matter expeditiously within the prescribed timeframe.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 29.01.2025 and remands the matter to the Southern Regional Committee (SRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, 128/1, SRM Nagar, Pother, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu-603203.

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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-23/E-395680/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026

APPLERC202615505 ✓

School of Education, Adamas University, Plot No. 457, 458, 459, 465, 458/496, Sadarpur, Jagannathpur, Barasat-Barrackpore Road, North 24-Pargana, West Bengal – 700126	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Mr. Nirmalya Chakraborty, Law Officer
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **School of Education, Adamas University, Plot No. 457, 458, 459, 465, 458/496, Sadarpur, Jagannathpur, Barasat-Barrackpore Road, North 24-Pargana, West Bengal - 700126** dated 02.01.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202505073842/WEST BENGAL/2025/REJC/1824** dated 17.11.2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has submitted documents of two trusts, namely Adamas Teacher Education Trust and Sachis Kiron Roy Memorial Trust. An institution cannot have more than one trust at a time for running a particular Programme. 2. The institution has not submitted Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Government Competent Authority."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Mr. Nirmalya Chakraborty, Law Officer of School of Education, Adamas University, Plot No. 457, 458, 459, 465, 458/496, Sadarpur, Jagannathpur, Barasat-Barrackpore Road, North 24-Pargana, West Bengal - 700126 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. Sachis Kiron Roy Memorial Trust was the initial promoting trust of The Adamas Institute of Teacher Education which is presently known as School of Education under Adsamas University. Presently, there is no existence of Adamas Institute of Teacher Education Trust after transfer of land to Adamas Institute of Teacher Education. 2. The Fire Safety Recommendation has been issued by the Director, Fire Prevention Wing, West Bengal Fire & Emergency Services on 12.11.2025."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 23.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 17.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 1st Meeting, 2026, 2nd Meeting, 2026 & 4th Meeting, 2026 held on 12.01.2026, 29.01.2026 & 26.02.2026 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 another 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, wherein it has submitted that Sachis Kiron Roy Memorial Trust was the original promoting trust of Adamas Institute of Teacher Education, which is presently functioning as the School of Education under Adamas University. It was stated that the earlier trust no longer exists following transfer of land and assets to Adamas Institute of Teacher Education/Adamas University. The institution further submitted that a Fire Safety Recommendation Certificate dated 12.11.2025 has been issued by the Director, Fire Prevention Wing, West Bengal Fire & Emergency Services, in respect of the institution.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and

are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and

developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 17.11.2025 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms

prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 17.11.2025 and remands the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, School of Education, Adamas University, Plot No. 457, 458, 459, 465, 458/496, Sadarpur, Jagannathpur, Barasat-Barrackpore Road, North 24-Pargana, West Bengal - 700126.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of West Bengal, Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake City, (5th, 6th, 8th, 10th Floor) Kolkata, West Bengal-700 091.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-100/E-401206/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615557 -

Parul University, Khasra No. 1361, P. O. – Limda, Waghodia, Vadodra (Baroda), Gujarat - 391760	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Manish Pandya, Registrar
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Parul University, Khasra No. 1361, P. O. – Limda, Waghodia, Vadodra (Baroda), Gujarat - 391760** dated 03.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2526202404272430/GUJARAT/2024/REJC/777** dated 05.02.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "In response to SCN Post LOI regarding point no. 1, the university has replied that "Parul University, Vadodara, Gujarat has applied to NCTE, New Delhi for the first time seeking its permission to offer ITEP programmes. As the University has not yet received the final approval / Letter of Permission from the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), New Delhi, the requirement relating to additional infrastructural facilities added during the last quarter is not applicable to Parul University. It is further stated that the University already possesses adequate infrastructural facilities within its campus, in accordance with the norms and standards prescribed by the NCTE for the conduct of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). Screenshots of the infrastructural facilities available for the proposed programme, including classrooms, laboratories, seminar halls, administrative and faculty offices, sports facilities, library facilities, and other allied academic infrastructure, have been uploaded on the University website. The relevant information and screenshots of the existing infrastructural facilities for ITEP programme shall be accessed at the following official web link of the University:<https://paruluniversity.ac.in/faculty/faculty-of-education-proposed/>. The University further assures that upon receipt of the Letter of Permission from the NCTE, New Delhi, any additional infrastructural facilities, if required in compliance with NCTE norms, regulations, or directives, will be duly made available, and the information on additions made to infrastructural facilities thereto will also be uploaded on the University website and communicated to the NCTE." The Committee noted that the applicant University has stated that first the recognition is required to be granted by NCTE by issuing Final Approval/Letter of Permission thereafter, it will meet the requirement related to additional infrastructural and instructional facilities as per the NCTE Norms & Standards. As the University is not in adherence of the Norms &

Standards of NCTE as on date, therefore not eligible for grant of recognition to ITEP Programme.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Manish Pandya, Registrar of Parul University, Khasra No. 1361, P. O. – Limda, Waghodia, Vadodra (Baroda), Gujarat - 391760 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “Appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 against the Order dated 05/02/2026 issued by WRC regarding ITEP Programme Sub: - Your Refusal Order No: NCTE/WRC/2526202404272430/GUJARAT/2024/REJC/777 dated February 5, 2026 Respected Sir/Madam, The Registrar, Parul University, Vadodara, Gujarat, most respectfully submits this Appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 against the order issued by the Regional Director, Western Regional Committee (WRC), NCTE, vide Letter No. NCTE /WRC /2526202404272430 /GUJARAT /2024 /REJC /777 dated 05/02/2026, whereby the University has been declared not eligible for grant of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The WRC, upon consideration of the response submitted by the University to the Show Cause Notice (Post-LOI), recorded that the University is not in adherence to the Norms and Standards of NCTE as on date and, therefore, is not eligible for grant of recognition for the ITEP Programme. The Show Cause Notice dated 16/01/2026 had raised three grounds. However, the Regional Committee found deficiency only in respect of Point No. (1), and on that basis conveyed the decision regarding ineligibility. Ground Raised in SCN (Point No. 1) Point No. 1 of the SCN stated as under: “The Applicant University is required to upload Screenshot of facilities added during the last quarter uploaded on website with the evidence of facilities avail/purchases for ITEP with seal and signature of competent authority.” In its earlier reply, the University had stated that “Parul University, Vadodara, Gujarat had applied to NCTE, New Delhi for the first time for seeking its permission to offer ITEP programmes. As the University had not yet received the final approval / Letter of Permission from the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), New Delhi, the requirement relating to additional infrastructural facilities added during the last quarter was not applicable to Parul University. It was further stated that the University already possesses adequate infrastructural facilities within its campus, in accordance with the norms and standards prescribed by the NCTE for the conduct of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). Screenshots of the infrastructural facilities available for the proposed programme, including classrooms, laboratories, seminar halls,

administrative and faculty offices, sports facilities, library facilities, and other allied academic infrastructure, have been uploaded on the University website. The relevant information and screenshots of the existing infrastructural facilities for ITEP programme shall be accessed at the following official web link of the University: <https://paruluniversity.ac.in/faculty/faculty-of-education-proposed/> The University further assured that upon receipt of the Letter of Permission from the NCTE, New Delhi, any additional infrastructural facilities, if required in compliance with NCTE norms, regulations, or directives, would be duly made available, and the information on additions made to infrastructural facilities thereto would also be uploaded on the University website and communicated to the NCTE." While preparing its response to the aforesaid query, the University had understood that the requirement regarding "facilities added during the last quarter" was applicable to institutions already conducting NCTE-recognized programmes. Since Parul University had applied for recognition of the ITEP Programme for the first time and is not running any previously approved NCTE programme, it was under the bona fide impression that the said requirement would not apply in its case. Accordingly, the response was submitted in that context, which occurred due to an inadvertent oversight. The University hereby respectfully clarifies that it already possesses adequate infrastructural facilities within its campus in strict conformity with the Norms and Standards prescribed by NCTE for conducting the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). Screenshots and relevant details of the existing infrastructural facilities for the proposed ITEP Programme have been duly uploaded on the official website of the University. These include: a) Classrooms b) Laboratories c) Seminar Halls d) Administrative and Faculty Offices e) Sports Facilities f) Library Facilities g) Other allied academic infrastructure The same may be accessed at the following official web link: <https://paruluniversity.ac.in/faculty/faculty-of-education-proposed/> In view of the above, the University respectfully submits that adequate infrastructural facilities are already in place and fully compliant with the applicable NCTE norms and standards. Prayer In light of the above clarification and submission, the University most respectfully requests the Hon'ble Appellate Authority to: a) Take into consideration the clarification furnished herein b) Re-examine the finding recorded in respect of Point No. (1) of the SCN and c) Reconsider the decision declaring the University ineligible for grant of recognition for the ITEP Programme. We humbly pray that this Appeal be kindly allowed in the interest of justice." The institution has submitted

documents vide letter dt. 06.05.2026 as under:- The other following documents sought vide your communication cited at ref.(i) are enclosed for kind consideration:

(i) Discipline-wise and stage-wise details of the ITEP Programme applied for A detailed note prepared by the Office of the Registrar outlining the status of the ITEP recognition application and the appeal proceedings is enclosed as Annexure-I. (ii). Programme-wise Faculty Lists (as per NCTE format) Separate faculty lists for each programme, in the prescribed format, duly approved and signed by the Registrar, along with the affidavits-executed in this regard and copies of the respective educational credentials, are enclosed as Annexure-II. It is further submitted that the University has already furnished, both in hard copy and soft copy vide R/Correspondence-1129/2025-26 dated March 31, 2026, the requisite affidavits and educational credentials of the following faculty members: (a) B.A. B.Ed.: Ms. Pratima Chaudhari, Dr. Khushali Jani, Dr. Vijayalaxmi Vajinath Dhanure, and Ms. Hetanshi Tmir Bhatt. (b). B.Com. B.Ed.: Dr. Snehal Patanwadia, Ms. Preeti Satishbhai Bhargav, and Ms. Nidhi Shantilal Nalwaya. (c). B.Sc. B.Ed.: Dr. Pallavi Khedkar, Mr. Neelkumar Thakor, Dr. Trilok Akhani, Dr. Chintan Somaiya, Dr. Manisha Pathak, Ms. Megha Patel, Ms. Sonal Pujara, Dr. Indrani Bhattacharya, and Ms. Krishna Gohil. 3. Approval of faculty: The latest final approval letter issued by the University approving the faculty is enclosed as Annexure-III. 4. Proceedings of the Selection Committee Proceedings of the duly constituted Selection Committee, approved by the Competent Authority, are enclosed as Annexure-IV. 5. Principal's Qualifications and Experience Authenticated copies of academic and professional qualifications along with the experience certificate of the Principal are enclosed as Annexure-V. 6 Approved Building Plan A duly approved and authenticated copy of the building plan issued by the Competent Authority is enclosed as Annexure-VI. 7. Programme-wise and Floor-wise Area Statements Earmarked area statements clearly demarcating land and built-up area for each programme, supported by certified documentary evidence of compliance with prescribed norms, are enclosed as Annexure-VII. All the above documents are submitted in faithful compliance with the directions issued by the Hon'ble Appellate Authority during the online hearing held on April 24, 2026, and in continuation of the appeal proceedings before the Council, for the kind consideration of the Hon'ble Appellate Authority.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 05.02.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 5th Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th March, 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, namely Parul University, Vadodara, Gujarat, against the refusal order dated 05.02.2026 issued by the Western Regional Committee under File No. NCTE/WRC/2526202404272430/GUJARAT/2024/REJC/777, whereby the institution was declared not eligible for grant of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The appellant institution submitted that it had applied for recognition for the ITEP Programme for the first time and that the Show Cause Notice dated 16.01.2026 had raised three grounds, out of which the Regional Committee found deficiency only with respect to Point No. (1) relating to uploading of screenshots of facilities added during the last quarter along with supporting evidence. The institution submitted that, while replying to the Show Cause Notice, it was under a bona fide understanding that the requirement regarding "facilities added during the last quarter" was applicable only to institutions already conducting NCTE-recognized programmes and not to first-time applicants. It was further submitted that the omission

occurred due to inadvertent oversight. The institution submitted that it already possesses adequate infrastructural facilities within the University campus in conformity with the norms and standards prescribed by NCTE for conduct of the ITEP Programme. The institution stated that details and screenshots relating to classrooms, laboratories, seminar halls, administrative and faculty offices, sports facilities, library facilities, and allied academic infrastructure had been uploaded on the official website of the University. The appellant institution further submitted additional documents vide letter dated 06.05.2026 in continuation of the appeal proceedings and pursuant to the directions issued during the online hearing held on 24.04.2026. The documents submitted included: discipline-wise and stage-wise details of the ITEP Programme applied for; programme-wise faculty lists in the prescribed format along with affidavits and educational credentials of faculty members; approval letter issued by the University approving the faculty; proceedings of the duly constituted Selection Committee; authenticated copies of the Principal's qualifications and experience certificates; approved building plan issued by the competent authority; and programme-wise and floor-wise earmarked area statements supported by documentary evidence regarding conformity with the prescribed norms. The institution also submitted that affidavits and educational credentials of faculty members relating to B.A. B.Ed., B.Com. B.Ed., and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes had already been furnished before the Appeal Division through both hard copy and soft copy vide correspondence dated 31.03.2026. The appellant institution requested reconsideration of the finding recorded in respect of the Show Cause Notice and grant of recognition for the ITEP Programme in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the applicable Regulations.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed

shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it

has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso-facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 05.02.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the

undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

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 for fresh consideration and re-examination in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), subject to the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite 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, of Parul University, Khasra No. 1361, P. O. – Limda, Waghodia, Vadodra (Baroda), Gujarat - 391760.
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.



एनसीटीई अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-105/E-402563/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLNRC202615561 -

Doaba College, Khasra No. 11247-11252, Tanda Road, Jullundur, Jhalandhar, Punjab - 144004	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Doaba College, Khasra No. 11247-11252, Tanda Road, Jullundur, Jhalandhar, Punjab - 144004** dated 07.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2526202402151343/PUNJAB/2024/REJC/343** dated 10.01.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution has uploaded a list of faculty members appointed for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit) having 1 Principal, 8 Assistant Professors and 3 Assistant Professors for Health and Physical Education, Arts Education and Career Guidance and Counselling. The institution has not appointed 1 Assistant Professor for History, and an advertisement has been issued by the institution in this regard. Further, the Principal is not having M.Ed. hence not qualified. Also, the institution has uploaded a list of faculty members appointed for B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit) having 1 Principal, 5 Assistant Professors and 3 Assistant Professors for Health and Physical Education, Arts Education and Career Guidance and Counselling. The institution has not appointed 4 Assistant Professor(s) for Physics, Chemistry and Educational Studies (2) and an advertisement has been issued in this regard. Further, the Principal is not having M.Ed., hence not qualified. The institution was required to appoint requisite number of faculty for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit) and B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit) course(s) duly approved by the university concerned as per norms and standard for ITEP as per NCTE Regulations 2014."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from Doaba College, Khasra No. 11247-11252, Tanda Road, Jullundur, Jhalandhar, Punjab - 144004 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "The faculty selection/appointment are done by duly constituted selection committee of affiliating university (gndu, Amritsar). the college was in process of recruitment of the required faculty for B.A. B.Ed. secondary (1 unit) and for B.Sc. B.Ed. secondary (1 unit). the recruitment process has been completed and required number of faculty members for both the above said courses have been appointed. the complete program wise list of faculty as per norms and standard for

ITEP as per NCTE regulations 2014 duly forwarded by dean, college development council, gndu, Amritsar, along with affidavits of all the faculty members, are attached.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 02.03.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 10.01.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 5th Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th March, 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, wherein it has submitted that faculty selection and appointment have been carried out through a duly constituted Selection Committee of the affiliating university, namely Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU), Amritsar. It has been submitted that the institution was in the process of recruitment of the required faculty for B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) programmes and that the recruitment process has since been completed. The appellant institution has further submitted that the requisite number of faculty members for both programmes has been appointed and that the programme-wise faculty list, in accordance with the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014, duly forwarded by the Dean, College Development Council, GNDU, Amritsar,

along with affidavits of the faculty members, has been furnished in support of compliance.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found on findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including compliance with the prescribed shortlisting criteria, and are neither procedural nor technical in nature. At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents and a compliance report purporting to rectify the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not been subjected to verification, authentication, or scrutiny by the competent authority in accordance with the procedure prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. It is a settled position under the statutory framework that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and such compliance is necessarily to be assessed by the competent Regional Committee, being the statutory authority entrusted with such examination under the Act. The Appeal Committee further reiterates that the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance with the statutory norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory in character and remains conditional upon demonstrable adherence to the prescribed norms at the relevant point of time; it does not confer any vested, accrued, or equitable right in favour of the applicant institution in the absence of such compliance. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies, which are essentially factual and capable of objective verification, and bearing in mind the limited scope of appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of enabling a factual re-

examination of the material now placed on record, without expressing any opinion on merits and without diluting the statutory requirements. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, the Appeal Committee deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 10.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution is directed to submit, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of this order, complete, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence in support of its claims before the Regional Committee concerned. Upon receipt thereof, the Northern Regional Committee shall examine the submissions strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, verify the authenticity and adequacy of the documents, and afford reasonable opportunity of hearing, if deemed necessary, before passing a reasoned and speaking order. The Regional Committee shall ensure strict adherence to the

statutory framework, including the provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), which mandate submission and verification of complete and authentic records as a condition precedent for grant or continuation of recognition. The decision shall be taken strictly on merits, in accordance with law, and uninfluenced by any observations made herein, which are confined solely to the question of remand for factual verification. It is expressly clarified that this remand is limited in scope and does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. In the event of failure to establish strict and verifiable compliance with the prescribed norms and standards upon re-examination, the application shall be liable to be rejected in accordance with law. The Regional Committee, being the custodian of the statutory record, shall ensure authenticity, completeness, and proper verification of all documents and shall dispose of the matter expeditiously within the prescribed timeframe.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 10.01.2026 and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, of Doaba College, Khasra No. 11247-11252, Tanda Road, Jullundur, Jhalandhar, Punjab - 144004.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.

4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Block E, 5th Floor, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali)-Punjab-160062.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-108/E-403046/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLNRC202615566-

S. G. G. S. Khalsa College, Khasra No. 33//9/2 (2-8), 33//11/2(0-8), 33//1/1(1-2), Block -3, Mahilpur, Hoshiarpur, Jaijon Road, Punjab – 146105	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **S. G. G. S. Khalsa College, Khasra No. 33//9/2(2-8), 33//11/2(0-8), 33//1/1(1-2), Block -3, Mahilpur, Hoshiarpur, Jaijon Road, Punjab – 146105** dated 18.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2627202505154535/PUNJAB/2025/REJC/1897** dated 24.01.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP course on the grounds that "The institution has not uploaded the copy of Blueprint of Building Plan duly approved by the Competent Govt. Authority indicating the name of the course, name of the institution, Khasra No. /Plot No. Total land area and total built-up area with the measurements of the Multi-purpose Hall as well as other infrastructure facilities such Authority. The institution has not submitted the Building Completion Certificate duly countersigned by the Competent Authority in prescribed format of NCTE. The BCC submitted by the institution is issued by a Private Engineer. The building is accessible for the differently abled persons only on the ground floor and not on the upper floors due to lack of lift or ramp connectively. The institution, in their reply has admitted the same and further stated that the tender for this work has been issued, and the Completion Certificate will be submitted shortly upon completion of the work. The as 31264 sq. mts. however, the drawings of the institution do not reveal the floor-wise break-up of the earmarked built-up area for ITEP. Also, the submitted Building Plan and Building Completion Certificate are not issued by the Competent Government Authority. The institution has uploaded the Registration Certificate of the Society issued on 07.07.1951 which is quite old and the institution has not uploaded the Renewed Certificate of the Society."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative from **S. G. G. S. Khalsa College, Khasra No. 33//9/2(2-8), 33//11/2(0-8), 33//1/1(1-2), Block -3, Mahilpur, Hoshiarpur, Jaijon Road, Punjab – 146105** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The institution respectfully submits that the revised approved Building Plan, containing all requisite details such as the name of the institution, name of the course, Khasra No./Plot No., total land area, total built-up area, floor-wise details, and measurements of the Multi-purpose Hall, classrooms, and other infrastructural facilities, is being obtained from the Nagar Panchayat, Mahilpur. 2. The revised Building Completion

Certificate in the prescribed NCTE format, duly countersigned by the Competent Government Authority is being uploaded for your reference. 3. The institution acknowledges the deficiency and respectfully submits that necessary measures have been taken to ensure barrier-free access to upper floors. The construction of ramp connectivity has been successfully completed in compliance with accessibility norms. The completion certificate, along with photographic evidence and supporting documents, is being uploaded herewith for your kind consideration and record. 4. The institution respectfully submits that the revised building drawings have been prepared, clearly indicating the floor-wise break-up of the built-up area specifically earmarked for the proposed ITEP course. The revised plans distinctly show the allocation of classrooms, laboratories, multipurpose hall, library, staff rooms, toilets, and other required infrastructural facilities. Further, the Building Completion Certificate have been obtained duly approved and issued by the Competent Local Government Authority. The same are being uploaded for compliance. 5. The institution respectfully submits that the Society is a long-established registered body. The latest renewed Registration Certificate of the Society has now been duly obtained from the Competent Authority and is being uploaded herewith for your kind reference.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 24.01.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 5th Meeting, 2026 held online on 30th March, 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 considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein the appellant has preferred the appeal against the impugned order issued by the concerned Regional Committee in respect of deficiencies relating to building plan, building completion certificate, accessibility provisions, infrastructural demarcation, and society registration. The appellant institution submitted that the revised building plan, duly approved by the competent authority i.e., Nagar Panchayat, Mahilpur, is being obtained, incorporating requisite particulars including the name of the institution, course details, Khasra/Plot numbers, total land area, total built-up area, floor-wise distribution, and measurements of classrooms, multipurpose hall, and other infrastructural facilities. It has further submitted that the revised Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed NCTE format, duly countersigned by the competent Government authority, has been obtained and is being uploaded. With regard to accessibility requirements, the appellant submitted that the deficiency has been addressed and necessary measures have been undertaken to ensure barrier-free access, including construction of ramp connectivity to upper floors, and that completion certificate along with photographic evidence is being submitted. The institution further submitted that revised building drawings have been prepared clearly indicating floor-wise earmarking of built-up area for the proposed ITEP programme, including allocation of classrooms, laboratories, library, multipurpose hall, staff rooms, toilets and other facilities, and that the same have been duly approved by the competent local authority. The appellant also submitted that the sponsoring society is a duly registered body and that the latest renewed registration certificate issued by the competent authority has been obtained and is being uploaded in compliance.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as

amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or

invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 24.01.2026 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated

Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 24.01.2026 and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, of S. G. G. S. Khalsa College, Khasra No. 33//9/2(2-8), 33//11/2(0-8), 33//1/1(1-2), Block -3, Mahilpur, Hoshiarpur, Jaijon Road, Punjab – 146105.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Block E, 5th Floor, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali)-Punjab-16006



एनसीटीई अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-110/E-403226/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLERC202615569 -

L. N. Mishra College of Business Management, Khatat No. 1301, 1302, Bhagwanpur Chowk, NH-28, Mushari, Muzaffarpur, Bihar – 842001 APPELLANT	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 RESPONDENT
---	------------------	--

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Manish Kumar, Director
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **L. N. Mishra College of Business Management, Khatat No. 1301, 1302, Bhagwanpur Chowk, NH-28, Mushari, Muzaffarpur, Bihar – 842001** dated 21.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202505204836/BIHAR/2025/REJC/1965** dated 02.02.2026 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP course on the grounds that “1. The institution has not produced/submitted a certificate from the concerned State Government justifying the need for teacher education programme in that area/region. 2. The institution has submitted building completion certificate which is not issued from Govt. competent authority. 3. The institution has not submitted CLU issued from Govt. Competent authority.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Manish Kumar, Director of L. N. Mishra College of Business Management, Khatat No. 1301, 1302, Bhagwanpur Chowk, NH-28, Mushari, Muzaffarpur, Bihar – 842001 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The institution has obtained the required certificate from the concerned State Government authority justifying the need for Teacher Education Programme in the region. The Need Certificate has been duly issued by the District Education Officer, Muzaffarpur, Government of Bihar, who is a competent district-level authority under the State Government. Further, the said certificate has been duly countersigned and verified by the Deputy Director, Directorate of Higher Education, Government of Bihar, Patna, thereby confirming its authenticity and approval at the State level. Hence, the deficiency regarding submission of State Government Need Certificate stands fully complied with. 2. The Building Completion Certificate is attached herewith from the Chief Engineer, Building Division, Muzaffarpur which is the District level Office of Building Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar is in Hindi Language which in English Language may be read as “With reference to the above mentioned subject the ITEP buildings of L. N. Mishra College of Business Management, At NH-122, Bhagwanpur, Muzaffarpur, was physically inspected by the undersigned on 6.12.2025 in presence

of Assistant Engineer and Junior Engineer, Building Division, Muzaffarpur. After inspection the building has been found complete which is technically strong, safe, accessible for persons with Disabilities and fit for educational purposes.” Thus Building Completion Certificate may be considered to be fulfilled. [Note : NH122 is the new number for NH28]. 3. The land of this College had been acquired by the State Government in the year 1976-77 vide District Gazette (copy attached) in the name of Lalit Narayan Mishra College of Business Management, Muzaffarpur which in itself implies that the land was for the use of educational purposes. Further there was no such rule for Conversion of Land Usage during the year 1976-77, when the land was acquired by the State Government for the purpose of this College. Again as per Gazette of Bihar dated 16.04.2010 the para 8 under the heading “Permission for conversion not required in respect of certain land and land use” part (c) read as “land used for religious, social or charitable purposes so long as the land is not used for commercial purpose.” (Copy attached) and the College runs under the Society, registered under Society Registration Act 1860 hence no CLU is required for the College. The appellant institution further vide letter dated 06.05.2026 submitted a land acquisition declaration issued by Govt. of Bihar under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and the Bihar Amendment Act, concerning acquisition of land situated at Village Bhagwanpur, P.S. Muzaffarpur, District Muzaffarpur for a public purpose, namely establishment/use for Lalit Narayan Mishra College of Business Management, Muzaffarpur. The notification specifies the concerned Khasra/Survey Nos. (1301 and 1302), approximate land area, and boundary details, and records that the land stands acquired for the aforesaid institutional/public purpose.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 27.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 02.02.2026.

The instant matter placed before the Appeal Committee in its 5th Meeting, 2026 held on 30th March, 2026. The Committee, after perusal of the available records and submissions, observed that certain aspects require further clarification and supporting documentary evidence to enable proper examination of compliance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended from time to time).

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, namely Lalit Narayan Mishra College of Business Management, Muzaffarpur, wherein the appeal has been preferred against the impugned order issued by the concerned Regional Committee in respect of deficiencies relating to submission of Need Certificate, Building Completion Certificate, and land use/CLU. The appellant institution submitted that the requisite Need Certificate justifying the requirement of the Teacher Education Programme has been obtained from the competent State Government authority, issued by the District Education Officer, Muzaffarpur and duly countersigned by the Deputy Director, Directorate of Higher Education, Government of Bihar, thereby establishing compliance at the State level. With regard to infrastructure, the appellant submitted that the Building Completion Certificate has been issued by the Chief Engineer, Building Division, Muzaffarpur (Government of Bihar), certifying that the building was physically inspected on 06.12.2025 in the presence of concerned engineers and found to be complete, structurally safe, accessible to persons with disabilities, and fit for educational purposes. In respect of land use, the appellant submitted that the land of the institution was acquired by the State Government in 1976–77 in the name of the institution for educational purposes, and at that time there was no requirement for conversion of land use. It has further been submitted that as per Bihar Gazette dated 16.04.2010, land used for charitable and educational purposes does not require conversion, and the institution being run by a society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, no separate CLU is required. The appellant

institution further vide letter dated 06.05.2026 submitted a land acquisition declaration issued by Govt. of Bihar under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and the Bihar Amendment Act, concerning acquisition of land situated at Village Bhagwanpur, P.S. Muzaffarpur, District Muzaffarpur for a public purpose, namely establishment/use for Lalit Narayan Mishra College of Business Management, Muzaffarpur. The notification specifies the concerned Khasra/Survey Nos. (1301 and 1302), approximate land area, and boundary details, and records that the land stands acquired for the aforesaid institutional/public purpose.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance

with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon

such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Appeal Committee also took note of the issue relating to the nomenclature/name of the institution and is of the considered view that the same shall be examined by the concerned Regional Committee in accordance with the extant provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, and other applicable guidelines/regulatory requirements.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 02.02.2026 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level

programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 02.02.2026 and remands the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, of L. N. Mishra College of Business Management, Khatat No. 1301, 1302, Bhagwanpur Chowk, NH-28, Mushari, Muzaffarpur, Bihar – 842001.**
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 अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-113/E-403466/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026

APPLNRC202615555 -

R. K. S. D. College of Education, Khasra No. 443, Kaithal, Haryana - 136027	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Deepak Saini, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF MINUTES

The appeal of **R. K. S. D. College of Education, Khasra No. 443, Kaithal, Haryana - 136027** dated **25.02.2026** filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2627202505164646/HARYANA/2025/REJC/1919** dated **22.08.2025** of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP course on the grounds that "1. As per the Public Notice F. No. NCTE/Regl012/1/2025-Reg Section-HQ dated 06.05.2025 and 27.05.2025 issued by NCTE (Hqrs.), the institutions which obtained the minimum 10 points will be shortlisted for processing on the basis of extant norms and standards prescribed by NCTE. The detail of points obtained by this institution is tabulated as under:- Criteria Status Points awarded NAAC accreditation Yes Grade "A" 06 NIRF Ranking No. 00 **Multidisciplinary institution (Whether programme(s) other than Teacher Education Programme(s) is being offered by the institution) Yes (30 years & above) But no documentary evidence uploaded by the institution) 00 Institution running NCTE recognized course(s) Yes 02 Total 08 points **The institution has mentioned in the application that it is a multidisciplinary institution. However, no documentary proof has been uploaded regarding the details of the programmes other than Teacher Education Programme being offered by the institution, hence, no point is awarded. 2. The committee noted that the institution is obtaining only 08 points whereas a minimum of 10 points is required to be obtained for short listing of application of ITEP for processing as per Public Notice No. Regl011/3/2025-Reg.Sec-HQ dated 06.05.2025."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Deepak Saini, Principal of R. K. S. D. College of Education, Khasra No. 443, Kaithal, Haryana - 136027 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "Along with B.Ed. Course other graduate and postgraduate level courses are also running in the institute. All courses are recognized and affiliated. The institute has dedicated blocks for different courses within its campus it is our sincere gratitude to inform you that due to technical problem at the time of online application the documents of other running courses could not be uploaded tried

several times to upload, but NCTE site did not open. After it NCTE not to notify the institute related to deficiencies. After this in the 444th meeting on the dated 24.07.2025 my application was rejected without any notice. Upon receiving the information of rejection, the institute sent a letter to NCTE on 07.08.2025 and received a hard copy on 13.08.2025 related to multidisciplinary institute documents. Information was also provided six times via email. But NCTE did not respond. After this a letter was sent on 21 January 2026 and hard copy was submitted to the NCTE office with related documents, however no response was received. You are requested that other undergraduate and postgraduate courses are running in the institute (documents are attached), hence considering the institute as a multidisciplinary institute please take necessary action for providing ITEP course.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 22.08.2025

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 5th Meeting, 2026 held on 30th March, 2026. The Committee, after perusal of the available records and submissions, observed that certain aspects require further clarification and supporting documentary evidence to enable proper examination of compliance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended from time to time).

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein the appellant has preferred the appeal against the rejection of its application in respect of grant of recognition for the

ITEP programme. The appellant institution submitted that, in addition to the B.Ed. course, it is running various undergraduate and postgraduate programmes which are duly recognized and affiliated, and that the institution has separate blocks within the campus for different courses. It has been stated that at the time of submission of the online application, due to technical issues on the NCTE portal, the documents relating to other running courses could not be uploaded despite multiple attempts. The appellant further submitted that the application was rejected in the 444th meeting dated 24.07.2025 without prior notice regarding such deficiency. Upon receiving information of rejection, the institution submitted representations to NCTE, including a letter dated 07.08.2025 and subsequent submission of hard copy on 13.08.2025 along with documents relating to its multidisciplinary status. It has also been stated that the institution furnished information through multiple emails and subsequently submitted another representation dated 21.01.2026 along with supporting documents; however, no response was received. The appellant institution has submitted that it is a multidisciplinary institution with existing undergraduate and postgraduate programmes and has requested consideration of its case for grant of recognition for the ITEP programme on that basis.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found on findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including compliance with the prescribed shortlisting criteria, and are neither procedural nor technical in nature. At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents and a compliance report purporting to rectify the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional

Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not been subjected to verification, authentication, or scrutiny by the competent authority in accordance with the procedure prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. It is a settled position under the statutory framework that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and such compliance is necessarily to be assessed by the competent Regional Committee, being the statutory authority entrusted with such examination under the Act. The Appeal Committee further reiterates that the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance with the statutory norms and standards rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory in character and remains conditional upon demonstrable adherence to the prescribed norms at the relevant point of time; it does not confer any vested, accrued, or equitable right in favour of the applicant institution in the absence of such compliance. Having regard to the nature of the deficiencies, which are essentially factual and capable of objective verification, and bearing in mind the limited scope of appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that limited interference is warranted solely for the purpose of enabling a factual re-examination of the material now placed on record, without expressing any opinion on merits and without diluting the statutory requirements. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny

in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, the Appeal Committee deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution is directed to submit, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of this order, complete, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence in support of its claims before the Regional Committee concerned. Upon receipt thereof, the Northern Regional Committee shall examine the submissions strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, verify the authenticity and adequacy of the documents, and afford reasonable opportunity of hearing, if deemed necessary, before passing a reasoned and speaking order. The Regional Committee shall ensure strict adherence to the statutory framework, including the provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), which mandate submission and verification of complete and authentic records as a condition precedent for grant or continuation of recognition. The decision shall be taken strictly on merits, in accordance with law, and uninfluenced by any observations made herein, which are confined solely to the question of remand for factual verification. It is expressly clarified that this remand is limited in scope and does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. In the event of failure to establish strict and verifiable compliance with the prescribed norms and standards upon re-examination, the application shall be liable to be rejected in accordance with law. The Regional Committee, being the custodian of the statutory record, shall ensure

authenticity, completeness, and proper verification of all documents and shall dispose of the matter expeditiously within the prescribed timeframe.

IV. DECISION

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, of R. K. S. D. College of Education, Khasra No. 443, Kaithal, Haryana - 136027.
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 अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

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

दिनांक/ Date - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-302/E-373773/2025 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLNRC202515252 -

Vishwa Bharati College of Education, Akulpur,847/102,843/99,408,409,846/100, Udheywalla, North Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir, Jammu-180018	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Prof. Bharti Bhat, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Vishwa Bharati College of Education, Akalpur,847/102,843/99,408,409,846/100, Udheywalla, North Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir, Jammu-180018** dated 18.07.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-NRC-811980173/JAMMU AND KASHMIR/2021/REJC/126** dated 15.07.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting B.Ed. course on the grounds that "The Committee concluded that the application of the institution is still deficient on the following grounds: -. The institution was required to upload certified land documents issued by the Sub-registrar along with translated English version of the same duly notarized and demarcation to each course/ School being run on the same land. The institution was required to upload the building plan approved by Competent Government Authority indicating the name of institution, name of course, khasra/plot No., total land area, total built-up area and earmarked land and built-up area for all the courses/school/other institutions being run on the above land along with approval letter for the same. The institution was required to upload the Land Use certificate issued by the Revenue Department, Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir, Govt. Order No. 138- Rev(S) of 2016 dated 07/10/2016 & Notification dated 24/10/2021 & Notification No. 01-J&K (BoR) of 2022 dated 14/01/2022. The institution has not presented an affidavit on non-judicial stamp paper of Rs.100/- duly attested by Notary Public/Oath Commissioner in respect of land and built-up area to the VT members for verification. On the Mutation Certificate No.TJN/02/MISC/23-24/120 dated 01-11-2023, the details of the land area are not mentioned. The building plan has to be prepared by an architect registered with the Council of Architecture, New-Delhi and duly approved by the Municipal Authority/Revenue Authority. There should be building floor plans, elevations, sections, area statement, FSI/FAR details etc. which are mandatorily required for approval from any authority. Also, the name of the course, name of the institution, Khasra No./Plot No., total land area, total built-up area with the measurements of the Multi-purpose Hall as well as other infrastructural facilities such as classrooms etc. should be depicted thereon. The site plan showing the location of the building as per the land & revenue records of the concerned authority is not attached in the portal. The Building Completion Certificate duly filled in and proved by

the Competent Government Authority and was not shown to the VI members. Rear view of the building and physical infrastructure is not matching with the drawing. The V members have noted the deviation. The institution campus does not have accessible feature like functional ramp, barrier free environment & toilet for differently abled persons. There is provision for lift/ramp to access to upper floors of the building by differently abled persons. STP/WTP is not available in the building campus. Water harvesting pit is not available in I building campus. Genset for power back up is not available in the institution. There is no proper internet/wi-fi facility on the campus. It was observed during the online VT. The institution should maintain the Multipurpose Hall as per the NCTE Regulations 2014. There audio video system in the multipurpose hall. The number of computers is inadequate in computer lab. There is no provision of fire escape staircase in the building”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Prof. Bharti Bhat, Principal of Vishwa Bharati College of Education, Akalpur,847/102,843/99,408,409,846/100, Udheywalla, North Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir, Jammu-180018 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “Respected Sir, We have replied to your first show cause Notice Post inspection on 14/05/2025 through E.mail. On that day the link for submission of post inspection reply was not available on the NCTE portal. During this period all the Govt. Websites were not working properly in the J&K State. So we could not upload the SNC Post Inspection Reply on the NCTE application portal in the due time. we request to kindly accept our reply. It will not be out of place to mention here that we have already sent the hard copy of the reply through Speed Post on 14/5/2025. It is further requested to your kindness to kindly open the link so that we can upload the reply of SCN Post inspection on the portal.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 03.02.2021. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 15.07.2025.

The Appeal Committee noted that the instant matter was earlier placed in its 13th Meeting, 2025 held on 24.09.2025 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee vide order dated 10.11.2025 rejected the appeal. The operative part of the order is as under:-

"...The Appeal Committee considered the appeal, the appeal report, and the submissions of the appellant institution. The Committee examined the appeal, the impugned order of the NRC, the appeal report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced by the appellant institution.

The Committee noted that the NRC, after giving the institution multiple opportunities to submit its reply to the Show Cause Notices, concluded that the application remained deficient in essential respects. The deficiencies primarily related to the absence of certified land ownership documents issued by the competent revenue authority, non-submission of an approved building plan duly sanctioned by the competent government authority, and failure to provide mandatory certificates such as the Land Use Certificate, Mutation Certificate, and Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed format. The NRC had also recorded several deficiencies noted by the Visiting Team, including inadequacies in the built-up area, absence of functional STP/WTP facilities, and lack of barrier-free infrastructure, in contravention of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014.

The Appeal Committee took note of the submissions made by the appellant institution, which stated that it had sent its reply to the post-inspection Show Cause Notice by email on 14.05.2025 but could not upload the same online due to technical issues with the NCTE portal and government websites in the Union Territory of Jammu & Kashmir. The appellant requested acceptance of the reply sent offline and prayed for reconsideration of its case.

The Appeal Committee on examination of the records and documents submitted before the Appeal Committee observed that several substantive deficiencies continue to persist. The Committee noted that:

- (i) The institution has not submitted certified copies of land ownership documents issued by the competent revenue authority to substantiate the authenticity of the title claimed.*
- (ii) As per the certificate of land submitted, the title is vested in the name of "Vishwa Bharati School + College," which does not establish exclusive ownership in favour of the appellant teacher education institution as required under Clause 8(4) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended 2017).*
- (iii) The building plan submitted by the institution is not approved by any competent government authority and lacks requisite architectural authentication and sanction.*
- (iv) Most of the land and building documents submitted before the Appeal Committee are photocopies and not certified by the issuing authorities, thereby lacking evidentiary value.*

- (v) *Additionally, the deficiencies observed by the Visiting Team, such as absence of STP/WTP, inadequate multipurpose hall facilities, and lack of accessibility infrastructure, remain unaddressed in the documents placed before the Appeal Committee.*

In light of the above, the Committee observed that the appellant has failed to rectify the critical infrastructural and documentary deficiencies which were the basis of the NRC's refusal of recognition. The Committee also observed that the explanation regarding technical issues with online submission, even if accepted, does not address the core deficiencies pertaining to statutory compliance. Recognition cannot be granted or restored in the absence of clear, certified, and lawful ownership and infrastructural compliance as mandated under the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

Accordingly, after careful deliberation, the Appeal Committee concluded that the appellant institution has failed to fulfil the essential infrastructural and regulatory requirements under the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended in 2017). The deficiencies identified by the NRC are substantive and go to the root of the institution's eligibility for recognition. Therefore, the Northern Regional Committee was justified in refusing recognition for the B.Ed. programme. The deficiencies identified are substantive, affect fundamental eligibility criteria (title, land use, minimum built-up area, safety and accessibility) and have not been remedied by certified, authenticated documentation acceptable under the Regulations.

Noting the submission made in the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council holds that the institution is still lacking inter alia on the above grounds and continues to be non-compliant with the mandatory infrastructure (land & building) requirements as stipulated under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The NRC was justified in passing the order dated 15.07.2025 thereby refusing to grant recognition for B.Ed. course. The Appeal Committee further decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore the impugned order dated 15.07.2025 issued by NRC is confirmed.

Aggrieved with the decision of the Appeal Committee the appellant institution filed a Court case. The Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh at Jammu in WP (C)No. 143/2026 CM No. 347/2026 vide order dated 31.01.2026 order the following: -

- 1. Petitioners, through the medium of this petition, seek quashment of order no. F. No. NCTE/NRC/FR/2122-NRC-811980173/JAMMU and KASHMIR/2021-REJC-/126 dated 15.07.2025 passed by respondent no. 4 and order no. 89-302/E-373773/2025 Appeal/13th Meeting, 2025/133714 APPLNRC202515252/E-88393 dated 10.11.2025 passed by respondent no. 3 with direction to respondent Nos. 3 & 5 to consider the review/representation being no. VB/CJ/1993/B.Ed. dated 01.12.2025, filed by the petitioners will further direction to respondent No. 4 to accord recognition to the petitioner – Institute.*
- 2. After arguing for while, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners would feel satisfied in case the present petition be treated as representation and the respondents be directed to accord consideration to the same by a speaking order within some reasonable time frame.*
- 3. In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the present writ petition is taken up for final disposal at its threshold and is disposed of by directing the respondents to accord consideration to the representation of the petitioners expeditiously, preferably within two months from the date a copy of this*

order alongwith copy of writ petition and its annexures are made available to the respondents. The decision taken by the respondents on the representation shall be communicated to the petitioners.

*Petition is thus, '**disposed of**' along with all connected application(s).*

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in the 5th Meeting held on 30th March, 2026. The Committee, after perusal of the available records and submissions, observed that certain aspects require further clarification and supporting documentary evidence to enable proper examination of compliance with the provisions of the NGTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended from time to time).

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, wherein the appellant has preferred the appeal against the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee in respect of non-submission of reply to the Show Cause Notice issued post inspection. The appellant institution submitted that it had responded to the First Show Cause Notice (post inspection) on 14.05.2025 through email; however, the link for submission of the reply was not available on the NCTE portal on that date. It has been further submitted that during the relevant period, Government websites in the Union Territory of Jammu & Kashmir were not functioning properly, due to which the institution was unable to upload the reply on the portal within the stipulated time. The appellant also submitted that, in addition to the email submission, a hard copy of the reply was dispatched through Speed Post on 14.05.2025. It has been stated that the institution has requested that the reply already submitted be taken on record and that an opportunity be provided to upload the same on the NCTE portal. The appellant institution vide letter dated 25.04.2026 has submitted an affidavit sworn by Shri Surinder Krishen Kaul, stated to be the competent authority of Vishwa Bharati College of Education, Akalpur Road, Muthi, Jammu. Through the affidavit, it has been declared that the institution has submitted certified land ownership/title documents issued by the competent authority, duly approved building plan with necessary architectural sanction, and original/certified land and building documents before the concerned authority. The affidavit further states that the institutional infrastructure is equipped with STP/WTP and multipurpose hall facilities, and certifies that the documents submitted are true, duly authenticated, and that necessary approvals have been

obtained in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended).

The Appeal Committee noted that, at the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with supporting documents purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies forming the basis of the withdrawal order. The Committee further observed that a substantial portion of the material so relied upon was either not available before the concerned Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in the manner contemplated under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. Under the statutory scheme of the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the applicable Regulations, compliance with prescribed recognition norms is required to be established through duly verified and authenticated records. Consequently, the material now placed on record necessitates factual scrutiny and regulatory examination by the competent Regional Committee before any conclusive determination regarding compliance can be arrived at. The Appeal Committee further observed that, in the interest of fair adjudication and in light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016]***, subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasised that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, and the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful,

independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 15.07.2025 warrants interference to the limited extent that subsequent material placed on record by the appellant institution has not been subjected to verification and consideration by the competent Regional Committee. The Committee is further of the view that the ends of justice would be met by remanding the matter for limited factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims. Accordingly, without diluting the statutory authority of the Northern Regional Committee and without creating any equity in favour of the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned withdrawal order dated 15.07.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh factual verification and regulatory reassessment. The Northern Regional Committee is directed to re-examine the case of the appellant institution afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted, afford reasonable opportunity of hearing to the institution, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the guidelines issued by the Council from time to time, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined only to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish full compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with law. The Regional Committee concerned, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is directed to forward all documents relied upon in the 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, concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 15.07.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove.

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

उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)



Copy to :-

1. The Principal, of Vishwa Bharati College of Education, Akalpur, 847/102, 843/99, 408, 409, 846/100, Udheywalla, North Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir, Jammu-180018.
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 - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-60/E-397046/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202515422 -

Mahatma Gandhi Education College, Khasra No. 591/24, 591/32, 591/36, 591/26, 564/1, Ravi Nagar, Athnder, Betul, Madhya Pradesh - 460110	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Mahatma Gandhi Education College, Khasra No. 591/24, 591/32, 591/36, 591/26, 564/1, Ravi Nagar, Athnder, Betul, Madhya Pradesh - 460110** dated 31.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202505315922/MADHYA PRADESH/2025/REJC/2448** dated 01.09.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP course on the grounds that "1. The institution has not uploaded any document in support of its claim filled in online application as 'Institutes of Eminence (IoE)'. 2. The institution has not uploaded recommendation of the State Government / UT Administration. 3. The institution has not uploaded Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 4. The institution has not uploaded Exemption Certificate (12A) issued by Competent Government Authority. 5. The institution has not uploaded the details of all the Society / Trust Members. 6. The institution has not uploaded initial and latest affiliation orders issued by the Affiliating University for all multi-disciplinary programmes. 7. The institution has not uploaded certified land documents clearly mentioning all the Khasra/Survey/Plot Nos. issued by Competent Authority of State Government and the building is situated on a single plot. 8. The institution has not uploaded Mutation Certificate mentioning Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 9. The institution has not uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Government Authority. 10. The institution has not uploaded latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by Competent Authority of State Government indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances issued by Competent Government Authority. 11. The institution has not uploaded Building Plan approved by the Competent Authority of State Government mentioning the name of institution, Khasra/Plot/Survey No., 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. 12. 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. 13. 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. 14. 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. 15. The institution has not uploaded geotag photos with different angles of Lift, Ramp, Electricity, Safe Drinking Water and Accessible Toilet indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph. 16. The institution has not uploaded geotag photos with different angles of front view, rear view, multipurpose hall, library, lab 1, lab 2, lab 3 and playground indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative from Mahatma Gandhi Education College, Khasra No. 591/24, 591/32, 591/36, 591/26, 564/1, Ravi Nagar, Athnder, Betul, Madhya Pradesh - 460110 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The institution had no Institutes of Eminence in current year. The institution had selected no option on Institutes of Eminence while filling application apologies for the mistake. 2. Recommendation application had been apply and soon will be recommended. 3. Applied for certificate and will be available soon. 4. The institution has not uploaded the details of all the Society / Trust Members. 5. The latest affiliation paper is not provided by university of affiliated college. 6. Will be uploaded and shown on record. 7. Explained and provided in appeal.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 01.09.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 & 5th Meeting, 2026 held on 19.02.2026 & 30.03.2026 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, wherein the appellant has preferred the appeal against the impugned order issued by the concerned Regional Committee in respect of deficiencies relating to institutional disclosures, statutory documents, and affiliation records. The appellant institution submitted that it does not fall under the category of "Institutes of Eminence" and had accordingly not selected the option in the application, while expressing that any discrepancy in this regard was inadvertent. It has further submitted that the recommendation application has been applied for and is under process, and that the requisite certificate has also been applied for and will be made available. The appellant also submitted that details of all Society/Trust members had not been uploaded earlier and that the same would be uploaded and placed on record. It has further submitted that the latest affiliation order has not yet been provided by the affiliating university, and that the same shall be submitted upon receipt. The appellant stated that the remaining deficiencies have been explained and supporting documents have been furnished along with the appeal.

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

(Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the material placed on record is deficient, inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings:—

- (i) The institution has failed to place on record any cogent and substantive material demonstrating that it satisfies the prescribed shortlisting criteria applicable for processing of ITEP applications from Multidisciplinary Institutions. Thus the institution does not meet the threshold eligibility conditions under the notified shortlisting framework.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that 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 appellat 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 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 01.09.2025 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 appellat 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 01.09.2025 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, of Mahatma Gandhi Education College, Khasra No. 591/24, 591/32, 591/36, 591/26, 564/1, Ravi Nagar, Athnder, Betul, Madhya Pradesh - 460110.**

2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, 2nd floor, Annex-3, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh-462004.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-61/E-397041/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202515411 -

Mahatma Gandhi Education College, Khasra No. 597/19, 591/29 564/5, 591/39, 591/29, Ravi Nagar, Athnder, Betul, Madhya Pradesh - 460110	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Mahatma Gandhi Education College, Khasra No. 597/19, 591/29 564/5, 591/39, 591/29, Ravi Nagar, Athnder, Betul, Madhya Pradesh - 460110** dated 10.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202505315922/MADHYA PRADESH/2025/REJC/2448** dated 01.09.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP course on the grounds that "1. The institution has not uploaded any document in support of its claim filled in online application as 'Institutes of Eminence (IoE)'. 2. The institution has not uploaded recommendation of the State Government / UT Administration. 3. The institution has not uploaded Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 4. The institution has not uploaded Exemption Certificate (12A) issued by Competent Government Authority. 5. The institution has not uploaded the details of all the Society / Trust Members. 6. The institution has not uploaded initial and latest affiliation orders issued by the Affiliating University for all multi-disciplinary programmes. 7. The institution has not uploaded certified land documents clearly mentioning all the Khasra/Survey/Plot Nos. issued by Competent Authority of State Government and the building is situated on a single plot. 8. The institution has not uploaded Mutation Certificate mentioning Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 9. The institution has not uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Government Authority. 10. The institution has not uploaded latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by Competent Authority of State Government indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances issued by Competent Government Authority. 11. The institution has not uploaded Building Plan approved by the Competent Authority of State Government mentioning the name of institution, Khasra/Plot/Survey No., 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. 12. 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. 13. 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. 14. 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. 15. The institution has not uploaded geotag photos with different angles of Lift, Ramp, Electricity, Safe Drinking Water and Accessible Toilet indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph. 16. The institution has not uploaded geotag photos with different angles of front view, rear view, multipurpose hall, library, lab 1, lab 2, lab 3 and playground indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative from Mahatma Gandhi Education College, Khasra No. 597/19, 591/29 564/5, 591/39, 591/29, Ravi Nagar, Athnder, Betul, Madhya Pradesh - 460110 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The institution had no Institutes of Eminence in current year. The institution had selected no option on Institutes of Eminence while filling application apologies for the mistake. 2. Recommendation application had been apply and soon will be recommended. 3. Applied for certificate and will be available soon. 4. The institution has not uploaded the details of all the Society / Trust Members. 5. The latest affiliation paper is not provided by university of affiliated college. 6. Will be uploaded and shown on record. 7. Explained and provided in appeal.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 01.09.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 & 5th Meeting, 2026 held on 19.02.2026 & 30.03.2026 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, wherein the appellant has preferred the appeal against the impugned order issued by the concerned Regional Committee in respect of deficiencies relating to institutional disclosures, statutory information, and affiliation documents. The appellant institution submitted that it does not fall under the category of "Institutes of Eminence" and had not selected the said option at the time of submission of the application, while stating that any discrepancy in this regard was inadvertent. It has further submitted that the recommendation application has been submitted and is under process, and that the requisite certificate has been applied for and shall be made available. The appellant also submitted that details of all Society/Trust members were not uploaded earlier and that the same will be uploaded and placed on record. It has further been stated that the latest affiliation order has not been issued by the affiliating university and shall be submitted upon receipt. The appellant submitted that the remaining deficiencies have been explained and supporting documents have been provided along with the appeal.

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

threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the material placed on record is deficient, inadequate, and incapable of demonstrating substantive compliance with the binding statutory framework governing grant of recognition. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings:—

- (i) The institution has failed to place on record any cogent and substantive material demonstrating that it satisfies the prescribed shortlisting criteria applicable for processing of ITEP applications from Multidisciplinary Institutions. Thus the institution does not meet the threshold eligibility conditions under the notified shortlisting framework.

The Appeal Committee, also upon comprehensive and independent consideration of the material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that 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 appellatant 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 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 01.09.2025 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 appellatant 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 01.09.2025 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, of Mahatma Gandhi Education College, Khasra No. 597/19, 591/29 564/5, 591/39, 591/29, Ravi Nagar, Athnder, Betul, Madhya Pradesh - 460110.**

2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, 2nd floor, Annex-3, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh-462004.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 14.05.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-79/E-398799/2026 Appeal/6th Meeting, 2026

APPLNRC202615539 -

Bhagwan Aadinath College of Education, Khasra No. 33m, 36/3, 37, 38, 31m, 32m, 37m, 38m, 34, 35, 36m, 36/2m, 38m, Mahara, Ronda, Rakhpanchampur Road, Lalitpur, Uttar Pradesh - 284403	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Pradeep Kumar, Chairperson
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	24.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement	14.05.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Bhagwan Aadinath College of Education, Khasra No. 33m, 36/3, 37, 38, 31m, 32m, 37m, 38m, 34, 35, 36m, 36/2m, 38m, Mahara, Ronda, Rakhpanchampur Road, Lalitpur, Uttar Pradesh - 284403** dated 12.02.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2627202505144474/UTTAR PRADESH/2025/REJC/1885** dated 10.02.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP course on the grounds that "The institution has applied for eight units of ITEP; however, the number of classrooms is not sufficient as per NCTE Regulations 2014. The library and reading rooms are not up to the mark as per NCTE regulations 2014 and Norms & Standards of ITEP. The institution has not submitted the Building Plan duly approved by the Competent Government Authority with demarcation of the building the proposed ITEP out of the total built-up area of 7532.23 sq. mt. Also, the Multipurpose Hall is not clearly depicted on the Building Plan. Facilities available in the various laboratories are grossly inadequate to offer eight units of the ITEP. Apart from the above, the Committee observed that the institution has earlier applied for 2 units of ITEP with application number 2526202405112783 for the academic session 2025-2026 which is also at the stage of reply of Letter of Intent. The institution has submitted the reply thereof which is also considered at Sl. No. 11 of these minutes. In view of the above, the Committee decided that this application be closed in view of the deficiencies mentioned above and the application be filed."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Pradeep Kumar, Chairperson of Bhagwan Aadinath College of Education, Khasra No. 33m, 36/3, 37, 38, 31m, 32m, 37m, 38m, 34, 35, 36m, 36/2m, 38m, Mahara, Ronda, Rakhpanchampur Road, Lalitpur, Uttar Pradesh - 284403 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 24.04.2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "The institution has earmarked and made available classrooms exclusively for the proposed ITEP to ensure full compliance with the prescribed teacher-students. The classrooms are well-ventilated. adequately furnished, and meet the required size specifications as laid down in the NCTE Regulations, 2014. 32 Class rooms are

available for 4 units of ITEP in place of 8 unit of Itep and extra class rooms are 13. 2. In the response of this point -The Institution state that Library and reading rooms are upto marks as per NCTE Regulation 2014 and norm and standard of ITEP In this regards The Institution submitted approved building plan indication library and reading room. 3. In the response of this point -The Institution state that the building plan of the institution is approved by Mukhaya Adhikari Jila Chanchayat Lalitpur. The Total Built up area is 7532.23 sq.m. and earmarked area for ITEP program is 3500 Sq. m. for exiting two unit-B.A. B.Ed.(Secondary), B.Ed. B.Ed. (Secondary) 1+1 Unit and proposed four unit- B.A. B.Ed.-Preparatory 1 Unit + Middle I Unit + Secondary Unit and B.Sc. B.Ed. I Unit of Middle. 4. In the response of this point -The Institution state that the Multipurpose of the institution area is 2014 sq. feets clearly indicated in the approved building plan. In this regard the institution submitted copy of approved building plan. 5. In the response of this point -The Institution state that the facility of the various laboratory are adequate to offer ITEP Program 4 Units (four units)- B.A. B.Ed.-Preparatory 1 Unit + Middle 1Unit + Secondary Unit and B.Sc. B.Ed. 1 Unit of Middle .A part from the above the institution wants 4 Units (four Units) that is In place of 8 units (Eight Units) of ITEP.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 6th Meeting, 2026 held online on 24th April, 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 10.02.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 3rd Meeting, 2026 & 5th Meeting, 2026 held on 19.02.2026 & 30.03.2026 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, wherein the appellant has preferred the appeal against the impugned order issued by the concerned Regional Committee in respect of deficiencies relating to availability of classrooms, library and reading room facilities, building plan, multipurpose hall, and laboratory facilities for the proposed ITEP programme. The appellant institution submitted that it has earmarked and made available adequate classrooms exclusively for the proposed ITEP programme, which are well-ventilated, furnished, and in conformity with the size specifications prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. It has been stated that 32 classrooms are available for the proposed four units of ITEP, along with additional classrooms. The appellant further submitted that the library and reading room facilities are adequate and in compliance with the norms and standards of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, and that the approved building plan indicating the library and reading room has been submitted. It has also been submitted that the building plan of the institution has been duly approved by the competent authority, i.e., Mukhya Adhikari, Zila Panchayat, Lalitpur, and that the total built-up area is 7532.23 sq. meters, with approximately 3500 sq. meters earmarked for the teacher education programmes, including existing and proposed ITEP units. The appellant further submitted that the multipurpose hall measuring approximately 2014 sq. feet is indicated in the approved building plan and that the same has been submitted. It has also been stated that the institution has adequate laboratory facilities to run the proposed four units of ITEP (B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. at preparatory, middle, and secondary levels). The appellant institution vide letter dated 15.04.2026 has submitted an affidavit sworn by Shri Pradeep Kumar, President of Digambar Jain Education Welfare Society, Lalitpur, stating that he is the authorised signatory/competent representative of the institution and is competent to depose on behalf of the institution. It has been submitted that the affidavit has been filed before the Hon'ble Appeal Committee in support of the appeal against the refusal order passed by the NRC in respect of the ITEP application bearing No. NCTE/NRC/2627202505144474/Uttar Pradesh/2025/REJC/1885 for the academic session 2025–26. The deponent has further stated that the institution had initially

applied for ITEP pursuant to the NCTE Public Notice (2024–25), pursuant to which recognition for 2 units, namely B.A.B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit) and B.Sc.B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), for the academic session 2026–27 was granted by the NRC, with adequate land and built-up area stated to be available and earmarked for the programme. It has also been represented that a subsequent application seeking recognition for 8 units under the NCTE Public Notice (2025–26) was declined by the NRC vide refusal order dated 10.02.2026 on the ground of insufficient land and built-up area. Through the affidavit, the institution has requested that, notwithstanding the application for 8 units, recognition for at least 2 units of ITEP may be considered under the application submitted pursuant to the NCTE Public Notice (2025–26).

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the impugned order, the Appeal Report, the records available on file, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, observes that the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is found upon findings of non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, read with the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The deficiencies recorded therein pertain to core statutory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status, and are foundational to consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). At the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain additional documents along with a compliance report purportedly in rectification of the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee notes that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended. The Committee is further of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution being a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the provisions and norms prescribed by the NCTE. Further, while processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the

infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms and regulations prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability and adequacy of land area and built-up area of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 10.02.2026 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of the prescribed shortlisting criteria for Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI) status and other deficiencies identified in the impugned order. The appellant institution shall submit complete, duly authenticated, contemporaneous, and verifiable documentary evidence before the concerned Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days from the date of issuance of this order. Upon receipt thereof, the Regional Committee shall examine the matter strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, including verification of the institution's eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and ensuring that infrastructure facilities, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, 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 sets aside the impugned order dated 10.02.2026 and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable 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, of Bhagwan Aadinath College of Education, Khasra No. 33m, 36/3, 37, 38, 31m, 32m, 37m, 38m, 34, 35, 36m, 36/2m, 38m, Mahara, Ronda, Rakhpanchampur Road, Lalitpur, Uttar Pradesh - 284403.
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.