



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 – 16.06.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/  
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT  
89-217/E-410937/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026  
APPLWRC202615623 / E-90207

Shekhawati Teacher Training Institute, Khasra No. 799/560, Jaipur Road Behind Circuit House, District- Sikar, Rajasthan-332001	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G- 7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Registrar</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, WRC</b>
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026</b>
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	<b>16.06.2026</b>

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Shekhawati Teacher Training Institute, Khasra No. 799/560, Jaipur Road Behind Circuit House, District- Sikar, Rajasthan-332001** dated 28.05.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509263359/RAJASTHAN/ 2025/REJC/1721** dated 09.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "i. The proposal for collaboration between the institutions has not been approved by their affiliating university, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. ii. 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. iii. Committee noted that, the No-Encumbrance-Certificate issued by the Sub Registrar and Tehsildar has no outward number. iv. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the Ramp is not proper. v. Collaboration college and applicant institution has a distance between 0.35 kilometres is equal to approximately 1148 feet means both institution is running in the same premises. In the Land Details Built Up area mentioned in the Affidavit (in sq m) is 7152. If the institution is running various teacher education programme/courses in the same campus/premises i.e. the institution is running multidisciplinary and teacher education programme/ courses in the same campus/premises i.e. BBA 180x3=540, B.Sc. 720x3=2160, M.Sc. 80x2=160, M.A/M.Sc. math 40x2=80, B.A. 420x3=1260 B.Com 420x3=1260, M.A. 40x2=80 M.Sc. 80x160, BA 180x3=540, M.Sc. (IT) 40x2=80, B.SC. 60x3=180, M.A. 120x2=240, M.Com 120x2=240 The sufficiency of land and built-up area for the above courses along with the multidisciplinary courses and intake for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1unit), course cannot be ascertained. vi. Committee noted that, College Khasra Numbers/plot numbers and other things are not mentioned in Building Safety AA/2023-24/D-525 issued on Dated: 30/5/2023. institution has not upload Building Safety Certificate in adherence of safety guidelines as prescribed by National/State Disaster Management Authority issued by Competent Government Authority. vii. The website of the institution is not in compliance with NCTE Regulations, 2014 of para 7(14) (i), 8(6), 8(14) Siner The 10(3) as amended from time to time. viii. 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. ix. A board with the name of the

college is seen to be put up temporarily. This board can be removed at any time. x. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of Library reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. xi. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the Multipurpose/Seminar Hall is not as per NCTE norms. furniture in the multipurpose hall is inadequate. xii. ICT related facilities are not visible in the uploaded geotagged photographs. xiii. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the college does not have adequate playgrounds and sports facility. xiv. Committee noted that the institution has upload Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department valid upto 06.03.2026 (Expired) mentioning total plot area is 9700 sq. mt. xv. The institution has not uploaded 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. xvi. The institution has not uploaded the list of teaching staff in the prescribed format of NCTE duly approved by the concerned Registrar affiliated university and teaching staff should be as per NCTE norms. xvii. Bank statement has not been uploaded by the institution. It cannot be ascertained whether the Institute teachers are being paid the salary as per Central/State Govt.”

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

**Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Registrar of Shekhawati Teacher Training Institute, Khasra No. 799/560, Jaipur Road Behind Circuit House, District- Sikar, Rajasthan-332001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The institution has submitted collaboration with Shekhawati Institute Behind Circuit House, Sikar, Distt- Sikar, Rajasthan which is issued from Aayuktalaya College Shiksha, Rajasthan Jaipur i.e. Govt. of Rajasthan vide letter dated 13.03.2026. The institution has also submitted collaboration as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions with Shekhawati Institute Behind Circuit House, Sikar, Distt- Sikar, Rajasthan issued from Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhaya Shekhawati University, Sikar, Rajasthan dated 07.02.2026. (Annexure-1). 2. The institution has submitted collaboration with Shekhawati Institute Behind Circuit House, Sikar, Distt- Sikar, Rajasthan which is issued from Aayuktalaya College Shiksha, Rajasthan Jaipur i.e. Govt. of Rajasthan vide letter dated 13.03.2026. The institution has also submitted collaboration as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions with Shekhawati Institute Behind Circuit House, Sikar, Distt- Sikar, Rajasthan issued from Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhaya Shekhawati University, Sikar, Rajasthan dated 07.02.2026. (Annexure-2). 3. The institution has submitted Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by Tahsildar, Sikar, Rajasthan vide Ref. No. 1186 dated 24.04.2026. (Annexure-3). 4. The institution has installed lift for used as provision for the respective students / staffs. In this regard necessary bills and geotag photograph is attached.

(Annexure-4). 5. The institution has submitted building plan approved by Junior Engineer, Nagar Vikash Nays, Sikar, Rajasthan and countersigned by Sachiv, Nagar Vikash Nayash, Sikar, Rajasthan (Govt. Authority). The Earmarked land area and earmarked built up are as under:- Land Area for Teacher Education Programme (5058 Sq. Mtrs) and Multidisciplinary Programme (5100 Sq. Mtrs.) Total Land area 10158 Sq. Mtrs. Built-up Area for Teacher Education Programme (7152 Sq. Mtrs) and Multidisciplinary Programme (6850 Sq. Mtrs.) Total Built-up Area 14002 Sq. Mtrs. both institutions are running and situated in one campus at separate building which is affiliated by Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhaya Shekhawati University, Sikar, Rajasthan. (Annexure-5). 6. The institution has submitted Building Safety Certificate wherein all khasra numbers are mentioned the same is issued by Executive Engineer, PWD, Div-1, Sikar, Rajasthan vide No. 7209 dated 28.04.2026. (Annexure-6). 7. The details of the website of the institution now updated in compliance with NCTE Regulations, 2014 of para 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) as amended from time to time. (Annexure-7). 8. The institution has submitted building plan approved by Junior Engineer, Nagar Vikash Nays, Sikar, Rajasthan and countersigned by Sachiv, Nagar Vikash Nayash, Sikar, Rajasthan (Govt. Authority). The Earmarked land area and earmarked built up are as under:- Land Area for Teacher Education Programme (5058 Sq. Mtrs) and Multidisciplinary Programme (5100 Sq. Mtrs.) Total Land area 10158 Sq. Mtrs. Built-up Area for Teacher Education Programme (7152 Sq. Mtrs) and Multidisciplinary Programme (6850 Sq. Mtrs.) Total Built-up Area 14002 Sq. Mtrs. both institutions are running and situated in one campus at separate building which is affiliated by Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhaya Shekhawati University, Sikar, Rajasthan. (Annexure-8). 9. The institution has installed permanent board. In this regard Necessary bills algorithm geotag is uploaded. (Annexure-9). 10. The institution has developed adequate seating capacity of Library reading room as per NCTE. In this regard Geotagged photograph of the same is uploaded. (Annexure-10). 11. The institution has developed multipurpose hall with adequate furniture as per NCTE norms. In this regard necessary bills and Geotag photograph of the same is uploaded. (Annexure-11). 12. The institution has developed ICT facilities in all respect. In this regard necessary bills and Geotag photograph of the same is uploaded. (Annexure-12). 13. The institution has developed adequate playgrounds and sports facility. In this regard geotagged photographs of the same is submitted. (Annexure-13). 14. The institution has uploaded fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department; Government of Rajasthan vide no. LSG/ SIKAR/FIRENOC/ 2025/26/66323 dated 30.04.2026 which is valid up to 29.04.2028. (Annexure-14). 15. The institution is having Educational Patta which is issued by Secretary Nagar Sudhar Nays Sikar, Rajasthan (Govt. of Rajasthan) used for Educational Purpose. Hence CLU is not required from Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes. (Annexure-15). 16. The institution has uploaded the list of teaching staff in the prescribed format developed by NCTE duly approved by the Deputy Registrar Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhaya Shekhawati University, Sikar, Rajasthan. (Annexure-16). 17. The institution has

uploaded Bank Statement of the teaching faculty issued 25.05.2026 (Annexure-17)". The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and in compliance with the deficiencies communicated through the impugned order dated 09.04.2026. In the affidavit, the institution undertook/submitted that it complies with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, and that all documents furnished are genuine and verifiable. The institution submitted that collaboration approvals issued by the Government of Rajasthan and Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Shekhawati University have been furnished, along with the Non-Encumbrance Certificate, Educational Patta and approved building plan indicating earmarked land and built-up area for teacher education and multidisciplinary programmes conducted in separate buildings within the same campus. It further stated that revised Building Safety and Fire Safety Certificates, updated website disclosures, teaching staff list approved by the affiliating university and bank statements evidencing salary payments through banking channels have been placed on record. The institution also furnished geo-tagged photographs and supporting documents relating to barrier-free access, permanent name board, library, multipurpose hall, ICT facilities and playground infrastructure, stating that the requisite instructional and infrastructural facilities are available in accordance with the prescribed norms.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 09.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that the appeal pertained to the refusal of its transition application on account of deficiencies relating to multidisciplinary collaboration, land and building documents, infrastructural facilities, website disclosures and staff-related requirements. The appellant institution submitted that it had entered into collaboration with Shekhawati Institute, Behind Circuit House, Sikar, Rajasthan, and had furnished approvals issued by the Commissionerate of College Education, Government of Rajasthan vide letter dated 13.03.2026

and by Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Shekhawati University, Sikar vide letter dated 07.02.2026, in compliance with Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transformation into a multidisciplinary institution. The institution further submitted that it had furnished a Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Tehsildar, Sikar vide Ref. No. 1186 dated 24.04.2026. It was stated that lift facilities had been installed for use by students and staff, and supporting bills and geo-tagged photographs had been submitted. The institution also submitted an approved building plan issued by the Junior Engineer, Nagar Vikas Nyas, Sikar and countersigned by the Secretary, Nagar Vikas Nyas, Sikar, indicating earmarked land area of 5,058 sq. mtrs. for Teacher Education Programmes and 5,100 sq. mtrs. for multidisciplinary programmes, aggregating to a total land area of 10,158 sq. mtrs., and earmarked built-up area of 7,152 sq. mtrs. for Teacher Education Programmes and 6,850 sq. mtrs. for multidisciplinary programmes, aggregating to a total built-up area of 14,002 sq. mtrs. It was submitted that both institutions were functioning in separate buildings within the same campus and were affiliated to Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Shekhawati University, Sikar. The appellant further submitted that a revised Building Safety Certificate mentioning all relevant Khasra numbers had been issued by the Executive Engineer, PWD Division-I, Sikar vide No. 7209 dated 28.04.2026. It was also submitted that the institutional website had been updated and maintained in compliance with Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The institution stated that a permanent institutional name board had been installed and supporting bills and geo-tagged photographs had been uploaded. With regard to infrastructural deficiencies, the institution submitted that adequate seating capacity had been provided in the library reading room in accordance with NCTE norms and geo-tagged photographs had been furnished. It was further submitted that the Multipurpose Hall had been developed with adequate furniture as per NCTE norms and that supporting bills and geo-tagged photographs had been uploaded. The institution also submitted that ICT facilities had been developed in all respects and supported by bills and geo-tagged photographs, and that adequate playground and sports facilities were available, evidenced through geo-tagged photographs. The appellant further submitted that a Fire Safety Certificate had been issued by the Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan vide No. LSG/SIKAR/FIRENOC/ 2025-26/66323 dated 30.04.2026, valid up to 29.04.2028. It was stated that the institution possessed an Educational Patta issued by the Secretary, Nagar Sudhar Nyas, Sikar for educational purposes and, therefore, according to the institution, a CLU for conversion of agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes was not required. The institution also submitted that the list of teaching staff in the prescribed NCTE format, duly approved by the Deputy Registrar, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Shekhawati University, Sikar, had been uploaded, along with bank statements of the teaching faculty issued on 25.05.2026 reflecting salary transactions. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had filed an affidavit in support of the appeal and had produced certain documents purporting to address the deficiencies

communicated through the impugned order dated 09.04.2026. The institution submitted that approvals relating to collaboration/transition into a multidisciplinary institution issued by the Government of Rajasthan and Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Shekhawati University, along with the Non-Encumbrance Certificate, Educational Patta and an approved building plan indicating the earmarked land and built-up area for the teacher education and multidisciplinary programmes, had been placed on record. The institution further stated that revised Building Safety and Fire Safety Certificates, updated website disclosures, the teaching staff list approved by the affiliating university, and bank statements relating to salary disbursement through banking channels had also been furnished. It was additionally submitted that geo-tagged photographs and supporting documents pertaining to barrier-free access, permanent name board, library, multipurpose hall, ICT facilities and playground infrastructure had been produced for consideration. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without prejudice to the requirement of independent verification and subject to the authenticity and validity of the documents furnished by 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 founded 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 09.04.2026 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 09.04.2026 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, Shekhawati Teacher Training Institute, Khasra No. 799/560, Jaipur Road Behind Circuit House, District- Sikar, Rajasthan-332001.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The 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 – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-218/E-410958/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLWRC202615594 -**

Dr. Ambedkar B.A. B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 520/3, Village – Wazeerpura, Diet Road, Tonk, Rajasthan-304001	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G- 7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Mr. Sunil Bansal, Director</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, WRC</b>
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026</b>
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	<b>16.06.2026</b>

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Dr. Ambedkar B.A.B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 520/3, Village – Wazeerpura, Diet Road, Tonk, Rajasthan-304001** dated 19.05.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509253262/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/1811** Dt.18.11.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “i. The institution has expressed its intention to become a multidisciplinary institution through collaboration, as stipulated in the NCTE Guidelines for transforming NCTE recognized stand-alone teacher education institutions into multidisciplinary higher education institutions. However, the institution has not uploaded any Memorandum of Collaboration (MoC). ii. 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. iii. The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence that both institutions proposed for collaboration are affiliated with the same university. iv. The proposal for collaboration between the institutions has not been approved by their affiliating university, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. v. The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence confirming that 'Dr Ambedkar B.A. B.Ed College' and Institution Proposed to be collaborated, are situated within the radius of 10 Kilometres, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Mr. Sunil Bansal, Director of Dr. Ambedkar B.A.B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 520/3, Village – Wazeerpura, Diet Road, Tonk, Rajasthan-304001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The society of the institution already running a degree College in the name "Dr. Ambedkar Mahavidyalaya". 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. Copy of Memorandum of Merger is annexed with this Appeal as Annexure-1. 2. The institution uploaded a certificate or approval of Merger dated 21.04.2026 issued by the Aayuktayalaya College Shiksha Rajasthan Jaipur 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. Copy of Certificate or approval dt. 21.04.2023 is annexed with this appeal as Annexure-2. 3.The institution uploaded documentary evidence that both institutions proposed for Merger are affiliated with the same university. Copy of Affiliation letters of both the institution are annexed with this appeal as Annexure-3. 4.The proposal for Merger 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. Copy of Approval from Affiliating University is annexed with this appeal as Annexure-4. 5.The institution uploaded documentary evidence i.e. Distance Certificate issued by Tehsildar as per report of Patwari to confirming that 'Dr Ambedkar B.A. B.Ed. College' and Merged Institution, are situated within the radius of 10 Kilometers, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. Copy of Distance Certificate issued by Tehsildar is annexed as Annexure-5". The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and in compliance with the deficiencies communicated through the impugned order dated 18.11.2025. In the affidavit, the institution undertook/submitted that it complies with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, and that all documents furnished are genuine and verifiable. The institution stated that, instead of collaboration, it had proposed merger with Dr. Ambedkar Mahavidyalaya and placed on record the Memorandum of Merger, approval of the Commissionerate of College Education, Rajasthan, and the approval of the affiliating university in support of the proposed multidisciplinary transition. It further submitted documentary evidence indicating that both institutions are affiliated to the same university and furnished a distance certificate issued by the competent revenue authority evidencing that the institutions are situated within the prescribed radius under the applicable Guidelines. The institution also stated that the application had been rejected without affording an opportunity to rectify the deficiencies through issuance of a show cause notice and placed the aforesaid documents and clarifications on record in support of the appeal.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 18.11.2025.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that the appeal pertained to deficiencies relating to its eligibility for transformation into a multidisciplinary higher education institution through merger under the applicable NCTE Guidelines. The appellant institution submitted that the society was already running a degree college in the name of "Dr. Ambedkar Mahavidyalaya" and had expressed its intention to attain multidisciplinary status through merger with the said institution, for which a Memorandum of Merger had been placed on record. It was further submitted that approval dated 21.04.2026 issued by the Aayuktalaya College Shiksha, Rajasthan, Jaipur, justifying the requirement of a teacher education programme in the area, had been furnished. The institution also stated that documentary evidence had been submitted to establish that both institutions proposed for merger were affiliated with the same university and that the proposal for merger had been approved by the affiliating university in terms of Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines. The appellant further placed on record a Distance Certificate issued by the Tehsildar, based on the Patwari's report, certifying that Dr. Ambedkar B.A. B.Ed. College and the merged institution were situated within a radius of 10 kilometres as prescribed under the Guidelines. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and in response to the deficiencies communicated through the impugned order dated 18.11.2025. The institution submitted that it complies with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions and affirmed that the documents furnished are genuine and capable of verification by the competent authorities. The institution clarified that, instead of collaboration, it had proposed merger with Dr. Ambedkar Mahavidyalaya and placed on record the Memorandum of Merger, the approval of the Commissionerate of College Education, Rajasthan, and the approval of the affiliating university in support of the proposed multidisciplinary transition. It further submitted documentary evidence indicating that both institutions are affiliated to the same university and furnished a distance certificate issued by the competent revenue authority indicating that the institutions are situated within the prescribed radius under the applicable Guidelines. The institution also stated that the application had been rejected without affording an opportunity to rectify the deficiencies through issuance of a show cause notice and placed the aforesaid documents and clarifications on record in support of the appeal. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value and subject to their authenticity, validity, legal

admissibility and such verification as may be undertaken by the competent authority in accordance with law.

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 founded 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 18.11.2025 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 18.11.2025 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, Dr. Ambedkar B.A.B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 520/3, Village – Wazeerpura, Diet Road, Tonk, Rajasthan-304001.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The 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 – 16.06.2026

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

**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**

**89-144/E-406557/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**

**APPLNRC202615604 -**

K.C. College of Education, Khasra No. 1338, Village-Paloura, Street/Road - Akhnoor Road, PO. Muthi, District-Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir-181205	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Sanjay Tickoo, Principal</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF ORDER

The appeal of **K.C. College of Education, Khasra No. 1338, Village-Paloura, Street/Road - Akhnoor Road, PO. Muthi, District- Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir-181205** dated 21.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no **F.No.NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-NRC-27852733/JAMMU AND KASHMIR/ 2020/RECOGNITION ORDER** dated 26.02.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that the appellant institution has been granted one unit of B.Ed. programme vide order dated 26.02.2026. The appellant institution also placed a copy of the minutes of the NRC and as per the decision of NRC 454<sup>th</sup> meeting, Letter of Intent (LOI) was issued to the institution on 07/01/2026. The institution has uploaded a reply to Letter of Intent (LOI) on 28.01.2026. The Committee Noted that the Institution has uploaded a list of 18 faculty members duly approved/signed by Director College Development, University of Jammu, Jammu. However, the staff faculty members at Sl. No. 9, 11, 12, 13, are not having NET/Ph.D. & Sl. No. 15 is not having M.Ed. & NET/Ph.D degree, as per NCTE Regulation 2017. On careful perusal of reply of Letter of Intent (LOI) submitted by the institution, the Committee decided that the institution be allowed to continue to offer its B.Ed. course of two -year duration with an annual intake of 50 students (1 unit) under sub-regulation 7(16) of the NCTE Regulations 2014.”

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Sanjay Tickoo, Principal of K.C. College of Education, Khasra No. 1338, Village-Paloura, Street/Road - Akhnoor Road, PO. Muthi, District- Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir-181205** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “The institution has proposed an enhancement in the intake capacity of B.Ed. Programme from 50 to 100 seats in order to meet the growing demand of teachers in the region. Presently the NCTE has sanctioned one unit (50 seats). The NRC had issued Letter of Intent (LOI) to the college on 28-01-2026. In reply to that the college uploaded a list of 18 faculty members duly approved/signed by College Development Council, University of Jammu. The NRC found that out of 18 faculty members, 5 were not eligible for the said course as per NCTE regulations 2017. In perusal of the decision of NRC and consequent compliance, eleven more faculty members have been selected through University Selection Committee. Now a list of 24 faculty members duly approved/signed by Director, College Development Council, University of Jammu is being uploaded for your kind perusal. Moreover, the college possesses all the required infrastructural facilities, institutional resources, financial resources and qualified faculty members as per the norms prescribed by NCTE for 100 seats intake. Further the college

encompasses adequate number of classrooms, well equipped laboratories (Psychology lab, ICT lab, curriculum lab, art and craft lab, health and physical education resource centre), a spacious library with sufficient no. of books and journals and other necessary amenities to support the enhanced intake capacity. The college has also maintained required teacher – student ratio and qualified teaching staff duly approved by competent authority. In view of the above, it is submitted that the institution is fully fit to accommodate 100 seats in B.Ed. course without any compromise regarding the quality of teacher education. Therefore, it is requested that approval for the enhancement of intake from 50 to 100 seats may kindly be granted.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 years duration with an annual intake of 50 students (one unit) vide order no. F.No.NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-NRC-27852733/ JAMMU AND KASHMIR/2020/Recognition order dated 26.02.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that it had sought enhancement of intake in the B.Ed. programme from 50 seats to 100 seats in view of the growing demand for trained teachers in the region. The institution submitted that, pursuant to the Letter of Intent issued by the NRC on 28.01.2026, it had initially uploaded a list of 18 faculty members duly approved by the College Development Council, University of Jammu; however, the NRC observed that 5 of the said faculty members were not eligible in terms of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, as amended in 2017. It was further stated that, thereafter, eleven additional faculty members had been selected through the University Selection Committee and that a revised list comprising 24 faculty members, duly approved and signed by the Director, College Development Council, University of Jammu, had been placed on record. The appellant further submitted that the institution possessed the requisite infrastructural, institutional and

financial resources prescribed for an intake of 100 seats, including adequate classrooms, Psychology Laboratory, ICT Laboratory, Curriculum Laboratory, Art and Craft Laboratory, Health and Physical Education Resource Centre, library facilities with sufficient books and journals, and other essential amenities. The institution also stated that the prescribed teacher-student ratio and the requirement of qualified teaching staff approved by the competent authority had been maintained in accordance with the applicable NCTE norms.

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

- (i) The institution's own representation indicates that only 10 faculty members are presently working in the college. In the absence of complete and verifiable evidence establishing availability and continuation of the requisite additional duly qualified and affiliating University-approved faculty for the proposed enhancement of intake to 100 seats, compliance with the mandatory faculty requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014, as amended, remains unsubstantiated.
- (ii) Thus, the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended) for restoration of intake capacity of 100 seats (2 units) The faculty list submitted is deficient, not in conformity with prescribed qualifications, unsupported by requisite documents, and not approved by the affiliating University. No complete and verifiable evidence of duly qualified, full-time, and approved faculty commensurate with 100 intake has been furnished.

The Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive examination of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, records available on file, documents placed on record, and submissions advanced during the hearing, is satisfied that the impugned order is legally sound, reasoned, and in conformity with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The same does not suffer from any procedural irregularity, perversity, arbitrariness, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that adequate, effective, and meaningful opportunity of hearing was afforded to the appellant institution. The grounds for non-grant/restoration of additional intake pertain to core statutory requirements, including adequacy of infrastructure, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, instructional facilities, and overall regulatory compliance. The deficiencies identified are substantive, fundamental, and go to the root of eligibility, and cannot be treated as minor or curable irregularities in absence of contemporaneous, credible, and verifiable documentary compliance.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee holds that recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon strict and continuous compliance with the prescribed norms. No institution can claim any vested or accrued right to recognition or intake capacity in absence of demonstrable compliance at the time of consideration. Past status or assertions unsupported by legally admissible evidence cannot override the statutory framework. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities, the appellant institution has failed to discharge the statutory burden of establishing compliance with the mandatory provisions of the Act and Regulations. The action of the Regional Committee is thus lawful, justified, and in accordance with the regulatory framework, warranting no appellate interference. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity in the impugned order dated 26.02.2026, and the same is hereby affirmed.

**IV. DECISION: -**

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, concluded that instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 26.02.2026 issued by NRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.

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



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

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, K.C. College of Education, Khasra No. 1338, Village-Paloura, Street/Road - Akhnoor Road, PO. Muthi, District- Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir-181205.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The 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 – 16.06.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-146/E-406589/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLNRC202615593 ✓**

Hi-Tech Institute of Engineering and Technology, Village - 26th KM Stone, NH-9, Plot no. 766, PO. Adhyatmik Nagar, Taluka/Mandal-Sadar Ghaziabad, UP-201015	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OFS WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Hi-Tech Institute of Engineering and Technology, Village - 26th KM Stone, NH-9, Plot no. 766, PO. Adhyatmik Nagar, Taluka/Mandal-Sadar Ghaziabad, UP-201015** dated 16.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no F. No. NRC/NCTE/UP-1220-B.Ed./454th Meeting (Vol-1)/S. No. 26/UP/2026 Computer No. 43765 (236021-236027) dated 27.02.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that **“As per the decision of NRC taken in its 337<sup>th</sup> (Virtual) meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> & 09<sup>th</sup> July 2021, Final Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 19.07.2021 on the grounds mentioned therein. The institution has not submitted the reply of the Final Show Cause Notice.”**

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Representative of Hi-Tech Institute of Engineering and Technology, Village - 26th KM Stone, NH-9, Plot no. 766, PO. Adhyatmik Nagar, Taluka/Mandal-Sadar Ghaziabad, UP-201015** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that **“Reply to Withdrawal Order and Request for Reconsideration Respected Sir/Madam, With due respect, we would like to submit this representation in response to the Withdrawal Order issued by NCTE bearing F. No. NRC/NCTE/UP-1220-B.Ed./454th Meeting (Vol-1)/ SI. No. 26/UP/2026 dated 27/02/2026, regarding withdrawal of recognition of our institution, Hi-Tech Institute of Technology, Ghaziabad, for conducting the B.Ed. programme. We sincerely regret the non-submission of compliance and required documents within the stipulated time. The delay was unintentional and occurred due to unavoidable circumstances. We assure you that the institution has always been committed to maintaining the norms and standards prescribed by NCTE. We respectfully submit that the deficiencies pointed out in the order are now being complied with, and the required documents are either ready or in the final stage of completion. The details are as follows: Certified registered land documents - Prepared and ready for submission. Approved building plan duly signed by the competent authority - Obtained. Infrastructure details including built-up area, multipurpose hall, and classrooms -Completed and documented. Reply to Show Cause Notice -Prepared and enclosed herewith. In light of the above, we humbly request your good office to kindly reconsider the withdrawal order and grant us an opportunity to submit the complete compliance. We assure full cooperation and adherence to all NCTE norms in future. We shall be highly obliged for your kind consideration and a chance to continue serving in the field of Teacher Education.”**

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 12.10.2004. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students one basic from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 31.05.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 27.02.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, namely Hi-Tech Institute of Technology, Ghaziabad, that it had preferred the present appeal against the withdrawal order bearing F. No. NRC/NCTE/UP-1220-B.Ed./454th Meeting (Vol.-I)/Sl. No. 26/UP/2026 dated 27.02.2026 withdrawing recognition for the B.Ed. programme. The institution submitted that the non-submission of compliance and requisite documents within the stipulated period was unintentional and attributable to unavoidable circumstances and expressed regret for the delay. The appellant further stated that it had remained committed to adherence to the norms and standards prescribed by NCTE and that the deficiencies pointed out in the withdrawal order were in the process of being addressed. In this regard, it was submitted that certified registered land documents had been prepared and were ready for submission, the approved building plan duly signed by the competent authority had been obtained, infrastructure details including built-up area, multipurpose hall and classrooms had been completed and documented, and the reply to the Show Cause Notice had been prepared and enclosed 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 conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally

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

- (i) The record indicates that, despite being specifically called upon by the Appeal Committee to furnish complete documentary evidence in support of faculty, land, infrastructure and salary-related compliances, the institution has not submitted the requisite details in the manner sought. In particular, the material placed on record does not establish availability of duly qualified, full-time and affiliating body-approved faculty in conformity with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The institution has also not furnished complete and verifiable documentary evidence relating to faculty qualifications, eligibility, approval and salary disbursement as required. Consequently, compliance with the mandatory norms and standards governing the teacher education programme remains unsubstantiated.
- (ii) The Appeal Committee observes that the appellant institution failed to submit a proper and substantive reply to the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice issued by the Northern Regional Committee within the stipulated period, as required under the applicable Regulations. No cogent or legally tenable explanation has been furnished for such persistent default. Even at the appellate stage, despite being afforded adequate opportunity under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the institution has failed to place on record complete, authentic, and legally sustainable evidence demonstrating compliance with the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. The material submitted remains fragmented and deficient and does not discharge the statutory burden cast upon the institution to establish strict adherence to the mandatory norms.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the Show Cause Notice and the Final Show Cause Notice were duly issued; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The grounds of withdrawal pertain to essential and mandatory statutory requirements governing infrastructural adequacy, instructional sufficiency, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, and overall regulatory compliance under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material, substantive, and continuing non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in character and go to the very threshold of eligibility for restoration and continuation of recognition. Such non-fulfilment of essential statutory conditions cannot be construed as technical, procedural, or rectifiable irregularities; rather, they constitute failure to satisfy the binding and non-derogable regulatory framework governing grant and continuation of recognition for teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Northern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 27.02.2026 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, concluded that the NRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 27.02.2026 issued by NRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील)/ Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Hi-Tech Institute of Engineering and Technology, Village - 26th KM Stone, NH-9, Plot no. 766, PO. Adhyatmik Nagar, Taluka/Mandal-Sadar Ghaziabad, UP-201015.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The 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 – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**

**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**

**89-148/E-407508/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**

**APPLWRC202615614 -**

Vivekanand Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidhyalaya, Khasra No. 2160/1, Village - Suroth, Street/Road-Bayana Road, District-Karauli, Rajasthan-322252	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Dr. Premshankar Gauttam, Principal</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, WRC</b>
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026</b>
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	<b>16.06.2026</b>

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Vivekanand Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 2160/1, Village - Suroth, Street/Road-Bayana Road, District-Karauli, Rajasthan-322252** dated 24.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no **F. No. NCTE/WRC/ 2627202509162492/Rajasthan/2025/Rejc/199** dated 27.02.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has not uploaded document that both institutions proposed for collaboration affiliated with the same university. 2. The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence confirming that Vivekanand Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya and Govt. P.G. College, are situated within the radius of 10 Kilometers, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transform into Multidisciplinary Institutions issued by government competent authority on their proper letter head. 3. For confirming the institutions eligible for transition into ITEP course as it is Collaboration institution is required to upload the affiliation order of liberal arts, science and commerce all programmes run by them with intake capacity as a multi-disciplinary institution. 4. The website of institution has NOT been updated and maintained in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time. 5. The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree. 2 Units, 4-Year Integrated programme leading to B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. degree 2 Units and D.El.Ed.1 Unit (as per their website the institute is running D.El.Ed. course). The sufficiency of land and built -up area for the above courses course cannot be ascertained. 6. In the column of Society/Trust/Company me information, the institution has filled Informa Chairman/president/Secretary and treasurer v & Aadhar no. only. It is required to mention a members with PAN & Aadhar No. 7. The institution is required to upload the admitted students list countersigned by affiliating University. 8. The institution has not uploaded to provide proof that all khasra numbers i.e., 2159/2, 2160/1, 3212/2160, 3746 are in a single plot. 9. Regarding land documents, the institution has uploaded the lease deed with Gram Panchayat for only 2125 sq. ft. of land, which is less than required as per NCTE Regulations. 20. The institution has not uploaded the proper documents of land as per NCTE Norms. 21. The institute has not uploaded the proper Mutation Certificate issued by Government competent authority. 22. 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. 23. 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. 24. 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. But 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. 25. The institution has not uploaded the list of teaching staff of all Education Faculty Programmes duly approved and countersigned by its affiliating body. The institution is required to upload the bank statement of last six months indicating the transaction of the salary/remuneration to its teaching staff. 26. 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. 27. As per the land details column is mentioned in land area is 7400sq.mts. Whereas the plot area is mentioned in the Fire NOC portal is 3600 sq. mts. The land area is mismatched. The institution has not uploaded Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL [https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track\\_application.aspx](https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx). 28. 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. 29. 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. 30. The institution has not uploaded the Building Disabled Friendly Certificate issued by the Competent Authority of the State Government. 31. As per the uploaded BCC is not mentioned earmarked area for Teacher education programme and multi-disciplinary programme 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. 32. In the application form, the institution has mentioned the proposed ITEP course to be started in Khasra Nos. 2159/2,2160/1,3212/2160, whereas the building plan makes a mention of Khasra Nos. 2159/2,2160/1,3212/2160, 2144, 2145. The land documents 2159/2, 3212/2160, 2144, 2145 not uploaded. 33. 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. 34. The institution has not uploaded a certificate 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.”

## II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Dr. Premshankar Gauttam, Principal of Vivekanand Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 2160/1, Village - Suroth, Street/Road-Bayana Road, District-Karauli, Rajasthan-322252** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 01<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. In this regard, we would like to humbly inform you that Vivekanand Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya and Government Post Graduate College are both duly affiliated with Kota University. It is an established administrative fact that the entire Karauli district falls under the legal jurisdiction of Kota University, and all colleges in the district operate under affiliation with the same university. (Copies of the affiliation orders are attached). Additionally, it is submitted that the necessary documents regarding affiliation and university jurisdiction have already been uploaded on the portal as per the rules. The affiliation-related documents are once again enclosed with this letter. 2. The appellant institution, Vivekanand Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Suroth, Tehsil Suroth (District Karauli, Rajasthan), is the only prominent teacher education institution located in this rural and semi-urban area. The NCTE has mandated a condition for transitioning into a multi-disciplinary institution, requiring the availability of a collaborating institution within a 10-kilometer radius. The actual geographical and academic reality is such that there is no multi-disciplinary institution (Liberal Arts/Science/Commerce) available within a 10-kilometer radius of Vivekananda Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya with which formal collaboration can be established. This situation has not arisen due to any error or negligence on the part of the institution, but rather due to the regional academic structure and geographical limitations. • Suroth Tehsil and its surrounding areas are academically underprivileged, and there is a dire need for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) here. If the 10-km condition is strictly enforced, the students of this entire region will be deprived of an important program like ITEP. • In accordance with the Principles of Natural Justice and the constitutional principles of equality, it would be fair and just to grant reasonable relaxation in regulatory conditions for such specific geographical areas. The appellant institution is prepared to establish collaboration with a multi-disciplinary institution located beyond the 10-kilometer distance and is committed to fully complying with the necessary academic standards. In view of regional requirements, the objectives of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, and the expansion of teacher education, it would be in the public interest to treat this institution as a "Special Academic Zone" and grant relaxation regarding the 10-km radius condition. 3. The Affiliation Orders and Intake Capacity details for the Liberal Arts, Science, and Commerce faculties, certifying the status as a Multi-disciplinary Institution, are attached herewith. 4. The institutions website has been fully updated in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Regulations, 2014. 5. Sir, with reference to the aforementioned objection, it is most respectfully submitted that: • The institution possesses the total required land and Built-up Area for its running courses (B.Ed. -- 2 Units, 4-Year Integrated Programme - 2 Units, and D.El.Ed. - 1 Unit), which is fully in accordance with the NCTE

Regulations, 2014. The institution has a total land area of 12,500 square meters and approximately 6,183.34 square meters of built-up area, which is sufficient for the operation of all the above-mentioned courses. The display of the D.El.Ed. course on the website is for informational purposes only. If the proper details of the land and built-up area are not clearly displayed on the website, it is merely a Presentation or Technical Issue. It would be more appropriate to determine the adequacy of the land and built-up area based on the original documents and inspection reports submitted by the institution, rather than solely on the basis of the website. The institution fully assures that it complies with the prescribed Norms & Standards for all courses and is ready to present all relevant documents for verification as and when required. Therefore, it is humbly requested that: This objection be dismissed after clarifying the factual status. The latest blueprint is attached herewith. 6. Complete information of all members of the Society/Trust (including PAN and [Aadhaar Redacted] details) is attached herewith. 7. The college has been getting the list of its admitted students certified by Kota University, Kota every year, and this information is regularly uploaded to the college website. The list of students, duly countersigned by the University, is attached herewith to this application. 8. The revenue record evidence (Jamabandi, Map Trace, and Patwari Report) and the certificate issued by the Tehsildar, confirming that all Khasra numbers are part of a single consolidated plot, are attached herewith. 9. This objection is factually incorrect and entirely baseless. The college neither entered into any lease deed for 2,125 square feet of land with the Gram Panchayat, nor has any such document been uploaded to the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) portal. Since the college does not possess any such document, the question of uploading it does not even arise. It is probable that this objection has arisen due to a clerical error in the records, a technical glitch, or a case of Mistaken Identity/Incorrect Mapping with the documents of another institution. The land available to the college and its legal documents (such as the 12,500 sqm certificate issued by the Tehsildar, Khasra, Jamabandi, etc.) are strictly in accordance with the rules. Therefore, it is most humbly requested that: This objection be considered baseless and be dismissed/annulled immediately. re-verification of the colleges records be conducted. 10. The institution possesses all necessary and valid land-related documents, which are in full compliance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014. There has been no intention on the part of the institution to conceal any information or violate any rules all actions have been carried out in good faith (Bonafide). The institution has all required land documents duly available, including Khasra, Jamabandi, Sale Deed (Registry), Map, Conversion, and Mutation certificates, along with other records issued by the competent authority. These are ready to be presented immediately for verification. The aforementioned documents clearly certify that the institutions entire land is being utilized for educational purposes in a lawful manner. The ownership and usage of the land are entirely in accordance with the regulations, and there is no legal or factual deficiency. If all land-related documents were not properly uploaded to the portal, it is merely a technical or procedural error

and not due to the non-availability of the documents. 11. The Mutation Certificates for all relevant Khasra numbers have been duly obtained from the competent revenue authority. These certificates record the lawful ownership and title entries in the name of the institution. A certified copy of the certificate including the QR code) is being attached as an Annexure to this appeal. 12. The latest Land Use Conversion Certificates (CLU) are attached herewith. 13. The latest Non-Encumbrance Certificates (NEC) are attached herewith. 14. The latest Building Plan (blue Print) are attached herewith. 15. The duly approved and countersigned list of the teaching staff is attached In herewith. Additionally, the bank statements for salary payments made over the last six months are also enclosed. 16. The latest geo-tagged photographs of the campus, laboratories, library, playground, etc., are attached herewith. 17. Sir, it is most respectfully submitted that the total land area of the petitioner college is 12,500 square meters, of which the college is operated on 7,400 square meters. The remaining land has been reserved for n the sports complex, multi-disciplinary institution, etc., wherein the built-up area is only 6,183.34 square meters. In accordance with the prevailing rules and available guidelines, a formal Fire Safety Certificate has been duly obtained from the competent authority for the 6,183.34 square meters of built-up area. The latest Fire Safety Certificates are attached herewith. 18. The latest Building Safety Certificate are attached herewith. 19. Building Geo Tag Photo are attached herewith. 20. The Building Disabled Friendly Certificates are attached herewith. 21. The latest Building Completion Certificates (BCC) are attached herewith. The 17-point format certificates are also enclosed. 22. The Khasra Mapping/Matching Certificate and the land documents for Khasra numbers 3221/2159 (Old khasra No. 2159/2), 3212/2160, 2144, and 2145 are attached herewith. 23. The institution is taking the necessary actions for transitioning into a multi-disciplinary institution in accordance with Clause 4.3.1 of the NCTTE National Council for Teacher Education) guidelines. Under the said provisions, a formal application has been submitted to the concerned office of the Government of Rajasthan to obtain the certificate regarding regional legal/educational requirements. As soon as the said certificate is received, a copy of the same will be immediately submitted to the NCTE. The copy of the application is attached herewith. 24. In this regard, it is submitted that the draft of the proposed collaboration between the two institutions has been prepared and submitted to the concerned University for approval. As soon as formal approval is received from the University, a copy of the approval letter will be immediately submitted to the NCTE office. A copy of the application submitted to the University is attached herewith.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 27.02.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit required documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, namely Vivekanand Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Suroth, District Karauli, Rajasthan, that the institution and Government Post Graduate College are both affiliated to the University of Kota and that the relevant affiliation orders, intake details and documents evidencing the multidisciplinary status of the collaborating institution had been placed on record. The appellant further submitted that no multidisciplinary institution offering Liberal Arts, Science or Commerce programmes exists within a radius of 10 kilometres from the institution due to the geographical and academic realities of the region, and that it had initiated action for transition in terms of the NCTE Guidelines by applying to the Government of Rajasthan for the requisite certificate and by submitting a draft collaboration proposal to the affiliating university for approval. The institution stated that it possesses 12,500 sq. metres of land and approximately 6,183.34 sq. metres of built-up area, stated to be adequate for conducting B.Ed. (two units), Integrated Teacher Education Programme (two units) and D.El.Ed. (one unit), and clarified that any discrepancy appearing on the website was merely technical in nature. It was further submitted that complete Society/Trust details, university-certified admitted students' lists, Jamabandi, Patwari reports, Khasra mapping and matching records, Mutation Certificates, CLU, NEC, approved Building Plan, Building Safety Certificate, Fire Safety Certificate, Disabled-Friendly Certificate, Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed 17-point format and other land-related documents had been furnished. The appellant also placed on record the teaching staff list duly approved and countersigned by the affiliating university, bank statements evidencing salary disbursement through banking channels, geo-tagged photographs of the campus and instructional facilities, and clarified that the objection relating to an alleged lease deed for 2,125 sq. ft. of land with the Gram Panchayat was factually incorrect, as no such document had been executed or uploaded by the institution.

The Appeal Committee considered the above submissions in light of the statutory framework governing recognition of teacher education institutions under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee on examination of the entire material available on record, finds that the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the said Regulations. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The Appellate Committee observed that, despite being afforded a specific opportunity during the appellate proceedings to furnish the documents and clarifications sought, the appellant institution failed to place on record the requisite documentary evidence, including those relating to multidisciplinary status, land continuity, occupancy, duly authenticated building and site plans, and valid occupancy and structural safety certifications issued by the competent authorities. In the absence of such complete, authentic and verifiable records, the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the land, building and infrastructural requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. Consequently, the material available on record does not satisfactorily substantiate fulfillment of the mandatory statutory and regulatory norms governing the recognised teacher education programme.

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

granted by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the Act and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned refusal order is warranted.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Western Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 27.02.2026 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, concluded that the WRC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned refusal order dated 27.02.2026 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, Vivekanand Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 2160/1, Village - Suroth, Street/Road-Bayana Road, District-Karauli, Rajasthan-322252.**

2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.
3. The 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 – 16.06.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**

**89-149/E-407677/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**

**APPLWRC202615615 ✓**

Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Village-Harota, PO. Chomu, Street/Road-Sikar Road, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan-303702	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Vivekanand Tanvar, Director</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Village-Harota, PO. Chomu, Street/Road-Sikar Road, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan-303702** dated 25.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no **F.No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509303518/RAJASTHAN/2025REJC/1879** dated 27.02.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has uploaded Form No 10 AC. The institution is required to upload the Exemption Certificate (Form 12A) issued by the Income Tax Department or issued by government competent authority. 2. The institution has not uploaded the certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan justifying the requirement for a teacher education programme in the area, as required under Clause 4.3(i) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. 3. Uploaded Fire Safety Certificate No 6516 dated 2/2/2024 by issued office of Nagar Parishd, chomu not verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL [https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track\\_application.aspx](https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx). 4. The institution has not upload 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. 5. Uploaded teacher staff profile is not as per NCTE norms. B.A. B.Ed. and B.Ed. The staff profile is not approved and signed by the concerned university authority. 6. 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. 7. Institution uploaded the NOC of the University. The uploaded letter of university No Acad.II/2025/14135 dated 11/11/2025 is only "Provisional No Objection". The proposal for collaboration between the institutions has not been approved by their affiliating university, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. 8. Even till the time of this scrutiny, the website of institution <http://www.mjfspm.org/> has NOT been updated and maintained in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time. The institution is required to update the website as per NCTE regulations. 9. The college name board is not visible in the geotagged photographs. 10. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of Library reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. 11. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the Multipurpose Hall is not as per NCTE norms. furniture in the multipurpose hall is inadequate. 12. College Khasra Numbers/plot numbers i.e., 2041/1, 2041/2, 2067/2 and other information are not mentioned in the Uploaded building safety certificate no. DA/2025-26/86 issued on dated 3/2/2026."

## II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Vivekanand Tanvar, Director of Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Village- Harota, PO. Chomu, Street/Road-Sikar Road, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan-303702** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. That the Appellant institution had already submitted the relevant exemption certificate Form No. 10AC issued by the Income Tax Department under clause (23C) of section 10 which is valid up to AY2026-27. (Annexure-1A) Further, samiti has been applied for extension. (Annexure-1B) The alleged deficiency is procedural and curable in nature. 2. That the required certificate justifying the need of teacher education programme in the area was pending in Govt. of Rajasthan and has been granted by the Government of Rajasthan vide letter F24() ITEP/ B.Ed./ NIS./ Akashi/ 2026 dated 13.04.2026. (Annexure-2). 3. That the institution possesses valid Fire Safety Certificate No. 6516 dated 02.02.2024 issued by Nagar Parishad, Chomu. The institution has complied with all fire safety measures. In addition, the Samiti also applied on online portal of Govt. which is enclosed. (Annexure-3). 4. Previously the Appellant Institution submitted the Non - Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by local revenue authority. Now the latest Non - Encumbrance Certificate No. 964 dated 23-04-2026 issued by the Sub-Registrar, Govt. of Rajasthan, Chomu, Jaipur who is Competent Government Authority is enclosed. (Annexure-4). 5. Teaching Staff of institution is having qualification & experience as per NCTE norms and regulations. The approval / signature from the affiliating university is under process before the University of Rajasthan, Jaipur and will be provided after issuing of LOI by NCTE. (Annexure-5). 6. That the institution is paying salary to staff in accordance with Central / State Government pay scales i.e. - for the post of Principal/HOD in pay scale of 37400-67000 and for the post of Lecturer in pay scale of 15600-39100 Monthly salary reflects from enclosed bank statements. (Annexure-6) the deficiency is wrong. 7. That the proposal for collaboration between the institutions already stands approved by the affiliating university “University of Rajasthan, Jaipur” vide Letter No. Acad.II/2025/14135 dated 11.11.2025 in accordance of NCTE (amendment) regulation 2021. The approval regarding collaboration is duly reflected on Sr. No.-06 in above cited letter. (Annexure-07) the deficiency is wrong. 8. That the institution website <http://www.mjfspm.org> has been duly updated and maintained in compliance with provisions of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time. Relevant screenshots for proofs of college website information are enclosed. (Annexure- 08). 9. That College name reflected in geo-tagged photograph clearly. Photo Enclosed. (Annexure- 09). 10. That the institution library reading room possesses adequate seating capacity strictly as per NCTE norms and standards. Geo-tagged photograph shows clearly. (Annexure- 10). 11. That the institution possesses a fully functional multipurpose hall with adequate furniture, A.V. aids and

seating capacity as per prescribed NCTE norms. Which is very clear from geo-tagged photograph. (Annexure- 11). 12. That Khasara No. 2041/1 having land area of 6100 sqm., constructed area 5707.16 Sqm. and having land use education purpose. Which is as per Norms and in addition to its, Institution have land in Khasara No-2041/2, 2067/2 which are available for future. (Annexure- 12).”

The appellant institution submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and in compliance with the deficiencies communicated through the impugned order dated 27.02.2026. In the affidavit, the institution submitted that it complies with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, and that all documents furnished are genuine and verifiable. The institution placed on record the Recommendation/Requirement Satisfaction Certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan, latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate, valid Fire Safety Certificate, Not-for-Profit Certificate, approved Building Plan and Building Completion Certificate issued by the competent authorities. It further submitted that the institutional website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements under the NCTE Regulations, 2014, and furnished the teaching staff list duly countersigned by the affiliating body along with salary records evidencing payment through banking channels. The institution also submitted geo-tagged photographs and clarifications relating to the permanent name board, playground and sports facilities, library and reading room, ICT/computer facilities, and multipurpose hall/seminar hall, stating that the requisite instructional and infrastructural facilities are available for the programmes conducted on the campus. The aforesaid submissions and supporting documents were placed on record for consideration of the appeal.

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 27.02.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant another opportunity to submit the required documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that it had already furnished Form No. 10AC issued by the Income Tax Department under clause (23C) of Section 10, valid up to Assessment Year 2026–27, and had applied for its extension. The institution further submitted that the certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan justifying the requirement of the teacher education programme in the area had subsequently been obtained and placed on record. It was also stated that the proposal for collaboration had been approved by the affiliating body, namely the University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, vide letter dated 11.11.2025, and that the institution's website had been updated and maintained in compliance with the provisions of the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The appellant further submitted that it possessed a valid Fire Safety Certificate issued by Nagar Parishad, Chomu, and had also applied through the Government online portal, and that the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Sub-Registrar, Government of Rajasthan, Chomu, Jaipur, had been furnished. It was stated that the teaching staff possessed the qualifications and experience prescribed under NCTE norms and that approval of the staff list by the University of Rajasthan was under process. The institution also submitted that salaries were being disbursed in accordance with the applicable Central/State Government pay scales through banking channels, as reflected in the bank statements placed on record. The appellant further stated that geo-tagged photographs evidencing the college name board, library reading room with adequate seating capacity, and a fully functional multipurpose hall with requisite furniture and facilities had been furnished. It was also submitted that Khasra No. 2041/1, measuring 6100 sq. metres with a constructed area of 5707.16 sq. metres earmarked for educational purposes, satisfied the prescribed norms, and that additional land comprised in Khasra Nos. 2041/2 and 2067/2 was available for future requirements. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and in response to the deficiencies communicated through the impugned order dated 27.02.2026. The institution submitted that it complies with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, and affirmed that the documents furnished are genuine and capable of verification by the competent authorities. The institution placed on record the Recommendation/Requirement Satisfaction Certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan, the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate, valid Fire Safety Certificate, Not-for-Profit Certificate, and the approved Building Plan and Building Completion Certificate issued by the competent authorities. It further stated that the

institutional website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements under the NCTE Regulations, 2014, and furnished the teaching staff list duly countersigned by the affiliating body together with salary records evidencing payment through banking channels. The institution also submitted geo-tagged photographs and clarifications relating to the permanent name board, playground and sports facilities, library and reading room, ICT/computer facilities, and multipurpose hall/seminar hall in support of the instructional and infrastructural facilities available on the campus. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value and subject to their authenticity, validity, legal admissibility and such verification as may be undertaken by the competent authority in accordance with law.

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 founded 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 27.02.2026 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, 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 27.02.2026 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, Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Village- Harota, PO. Chomu, Street/Road-Sikar Road, District - Jaipur, Rajasthan-303702.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.
3. The 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 – 16.06.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-150/E-407685/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLERC202615617-**

Natural College of Education, Khasra No. 603, Village - Krishnanagar, College Road, PO. Mahurapur, Birbhum, West Bengal-731213	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Mr. Sudipta Shekhar Chatterjee, Administrator</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, ERC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Natural College of Education, Khasra No. 603, Village - Krishnanagar, College Road, PO. Mahurapur, Birbhum, West Bengal-731213** dated 27.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202509243213/WEST BENGAL/2025/REJC/1933** dated 01.01.2026 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has submitted a Memorandum of Collaboration between Natural College of Education and Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya executed on 06.08.2025. Both the institutions are affiliated with different Universities which is not as per guidelines issued by NCTE. 2. The parent Society namely Gitanjali Foundation is running two institutions namely Natural College of Education, and Swami Vivekananda Universal College of Education. Both institutions have submitted Memoranda of Collaboration with one Institution namely Abhedananda Malivalaya which is not permissible as per NCTE guidelines. 3. Least two undergraduate degree programmes in accordance with the requirements as per guidelines and also to the effect that it has no Education Department of its own. 4. The institution is running B.Ed. (two units), D.El.Ed. (three units) and B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. (two units). The total land area is only 4088.48 sq. mts. which is lesser than what is required as per NCTE Regulations. 5. The institution has submitted a Memorandum of Collaboration between Natural College of Education and Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya executive on 06.08.2025 which are not situated within ten kilometres."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Mr. Sudipta Shekhar Chatterjee, Administrator of Natural College of Education, Khasra No. 603, Village - Krishnanagar, College Road, PO. Mahurapur, Birbhum, West Bengal-731213** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "In response to the First Show Cause Notice, the appellant institution had duly submitted a revised Memorandum of Collaboration with Turku Hansda Lapsa Hembram Mahavidyalaya (THLHM), instead of the earlier MoC with Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya. It was specifically clarified that, in West Bengal, private teacher education institutions are mandatorily affiliated with Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University (BSAEU), which is a specialized teacher education university and does not offer general degree programmes. Therefore, collaboration with a nearby general degree college affiliated to another university is a regulatory necessity and is in conformity with the NCTE guidelines permitting collaboration with a multidisciplinary HEI. The appellant further submits that Gitanjali Foundation itself is running multiple multidisciplinary programmes through its own institutions, including

teacher education, nursing, pharmacy and other allied professional programmes. The said multidisciplinary status and institutional ecosystem were duly documented and submitted before the ERC, NCTE, including the statement on multidisciplinary status of Gitanjali Foundation/New and supporting materials. It was also clarified that Gitanjali Foundation runs two teacher education colleges, and both institutions have entered into separate MoCs with different multidisciplinary colleges. Hence, there is no case of two TEIs using the same collaborating institution. The revised and independent MoCs were duly submitted with the compliance reply. The appellant also submitted a certificate from the collaborating college confirming that THLHM offers more than two undergraduate degree programmes, including Arts and Science streams, and that it has no Education Department of its own, thereby satisfying the eligibility requirements under the NCTE guidelines for multidisciplinary collaboration. Regarding land and infrastructure, the institution has sufficient land, building, classrooms, laboratories, library and other facilities as required under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. Documentary proof including land records, approved building plan, mutation documents and relevant statutory certificates were submitted with the reply to the First Show Cause Notice and are again being submitted for kind consideration. Further, the distance between Natural College of Education and THLHM is less than 9 km, which is within the prescribed 10 km radius under the NCTE guidelines for collaboration between a stand-alone TEI and a multidisciplinary HEI. It is also respectfully submitted that the appellant institution had earlier approached the NCTE Appellate Authority in Appeal No. 89-16/E-353854/2025 Appeal/10th Meeting, 2025, APPLERC202514873, wherein the matter was remanded back to the Eastern Regional Committee for fresh consideration. The Appellate Authority specifically directed ERC to examine all documents placed on record including subsequent submissions, and to take a reasoned decision in accordance with law and NCTE norms. However, despite such remand and despite submission of complete compliance documents, the ERC did not properly consider the records and passed the impugned refusal order mechanically. Therefore, all deficiencies mentioned in the refusal order had already been duly answered and complied with. The refusal order is liable to be set aside, and the application may kindly be reconsidered in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014, amended ITEP norms, and the guidelines for transforming stand-alone TEIs into multidisciplinary HEIs.”

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Eastern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 29.09.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 01.01.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant another opportunity to submit the required documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, namely Natural College of Education, that in response to the First Show Cause Notice it had submitted a revised Memorandum of Collaboration with Turku Hansda Lapsa Hembram Mahavidyalaya (THLHM) in place of the earlier collaboration with Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya. The institution clarified that, in the State of West Bengal, private teacher education institutions are mandatorily affiliated to Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University, a specialised teacher education university not offering general degree programmes, and that collaboration with a nearby multidisciplinary college affiliated to another university was therefore necessitated in accordance with the applicable NCTE Guidelines. It was further submitted that THLHM offers undergraduate programmes in Arts and Science streams and does not have an Education Department of its own, and that the distance between the appellant institution and THLHM is less than 9 kilometres, falling within the prescribed 10-kilometre radius. The appellant further stated that Gitanjali Foundation operates multiple multidisciplinary institutions offering teacher education, nursing, pharmacy and other allied professional programmes, and that documentary evidence relating to its multidisciplinary status had been placed on record. It was clarified that the Foundation runs two teacher education institutions, each having separate Memoranda of Collaboration with different multidisciplinary institutions, and that no two teacher education institutions were relying upon the same collaborating institution. The institution also submitted that it possesses adequate land, building, classrooms, laboratories, library and other instructional facilities in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014, and that relevant land records, approved building plans, mutation documents and statutory certificates had been furnished.

The Appeal Committee considered the above submissions in light of the statutory framework governing recognition of teacher education institutions under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations,

2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee on examination of the entire material available on record, finds that the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the said Regulations. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The Appellate Committee observed that, despite being afforded an opportunity to furnish the specific documents and clarifications sought during the appellate proceedings, the appellant institution failed to submit authenticated documentary evidence establishing compliance with the requirements relating to multidisciplinary status and the prescribed land and infrastructural norms. Consequently, the appellant institution has failed to substantiate compliance with the mandatory provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 01.01.2026 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

#### IV. DECISION: -

**After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, concluded that the ERC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned refusal order dated 01.01.2026 issued by ERC is confirmed.**

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील)/ Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

#### Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Natural College of Education, Khasra No. 603, Village - Krishnanagar, College Road, PO. Mahurapur, Birbhum, West Bengal-731213.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**

4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of West Bengal, Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake City, (5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor) Kolkata, West Bengal-700 091.



**एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY**

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

दिनांक/ Date – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-151/E-407693/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLERC202615620**

Swami Vivekananda Universal College of Education, Khasra No. 604, Village - Krishnanagar, Street/Road-Bank Road, Taluka/Mandal-Mayureswari, PO-Mahurapur, District-Birbhum, West Bengal-731213	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, ERC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Swami Vivekananda Universal College of Education, Khasra No. 604, Village - Krishnanagar, Street/Road-Bank Road, Taluka/ Mandal-Mayureswari, PO-Mahurapur, District-Birbhum, West Bengal-731213** dated 28.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no **F.No.NCTE/ERC/2627202509243211/West Bengal/ 2025/Rejc/1935** dated 01.01.2026 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has submitted a Memorandum of Collaboration between Swami Vivekananda universal College of Education and Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya executed on 06.08.2025. Both the institutions are affiliate with different Universities which is not as per guidelines issued by NCTE. 2. The institution is required to submit effect that ABHEDANANDA proof to the MAHAVIDALAYA are offering at least two undergraduate degree programmes in accordance with the requirements per guidelines and to the effect that it has no Education Department of its own. 3. The parent Society namely Gitanjali Foundation is running two institutions namely Natural College of Education, and Swami Vivekananda Universal College of Education. Both institutions have submitted Memoranda of Collaboration with one Institute namely Abhedananda Malivalaya which is not permissible as per NCTE guidelines. 4. The institution is running B.Ed. two units, D.El.Ed.- three units and B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed.-two unit. The total land area is only 4128.96 sq. mt. which is lesser than what is required as per NCTE Regulation."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Representative of Swami Vivekananda Universal College of Education, Khasra No. 604, Village - Krishnanagar, Street/Road-Bank Road, Taluka/Mandal-Mayureswari, PO-Mahurapur, District-Birbhum, West Bengal-731213** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. Regarding the objection that the collaborating institutions are affiliated with different Universities and that the applicant is not multidisciplinary: In the State of West Bengal, all private teacher education institutions offering B.Ed. and 4-Year Integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. multidisciplinary requirement through affiliation to BSAEU alone. This precise legal and practical position multiple programmes in teacher education and allied disciplines. The record already placed before ERC shows that under the umbrella of the Trust/Foundation, programmes in D.El.Ed., B.Ed., 4-Year Integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed., B.Sc. Nursing, GNM and D.Pharm are being conducted, thereby clearly reflecting the clarification had already been enclosed with the reply of having at

least two undergraduate degree programmes. It was also specifically clarified that the said institution programme. Thus, the finding in the refusal order that proof was required/submitted insufficiently is contrary to programmes are mandatorily affiliated to Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University (BSAEU), which is a specialised State University for teacher education and does not itself offer general undergraduate degree courses in Arts, Science or Commerce. Accordingly, a teacher education institution in West Bengal cannot satisfy the was already explained in the reply submitted before the ERC. Further, the appellant institution is not functioning in isolation it is under the same Trust, which is running multidisciplinary academic ecosystem of the Trust. The collaboration with Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya was therefore entered into only to fulfil the NCTE transition framework in the peculiar statutory context of West Bengal.

2. Regarding the objection that proof was not submitted to show that Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya offers at least two undergraduate degree programmes and has no Education Department of its own: The said documents and submitted before the ERC, and the same are again enclosed herewith for ready reference. In the earlier reply, it was specifically stated that Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya offers B.A. and B.Sc. degree programmes and other undergraduate courses, thereby satisfying the requirement does not have any Education Department of its own and is not running B.Ed./D.El.Ed. or any teacher education the materials already on record.

3. Regarding the objection that both institutions under the parent Trust have submitted Memorandum of Collaboration with one institution namely Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya, which is allegedly not permissible: The said finding is factually incorrect and wholly misconceived. It is denied that the same Memorandum of Collaboration has been used impermissibly for multiple colleges in the manner alleged. The institutions under the Trust have separate arrangements and separate documents in respect of their respective compliance requirements. The observation in the refusal order is therefore based on an erroneous appreciation of facts. In any event, the appellant had already furnished its own collaboration documents and supporting materials before the ERC. Hence, this ground is liable to be deleted as being based on a wrong factual premise.

4. Regarding the objection that the institution is running B.Ed. two units, D.El.Ed. three units and B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. two units and that the total land area is only 4128.96 sq. mts., which is less than required: The said finding is also incorrect. The institution has sufficient land and building infrastructure for running the existing and proposed programmes, and the relevant land and building documents had already been enclosed with the reply. The reply specifically mentioned that the appellant had enclosed sale deed and mutation proof for additional 2.00 acres of land, English translated mutation certificate of total land in the name of the institution, latest non-encumbrance certificate, fire safety certificate, building safety/structural stability certificate, barrier-free access certificate, and approved readable building plan. Therefore, the conclusion that the institution lacks sufficient land area is

contrary to the documentary materials already submitted and appears to have been recorded without considering the additional land documents and updated title records placed on file.”

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Eastern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 29.09.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 01.01.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant another opportunity to the institution to submit the required documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that, in the State of West Bengal, all private teacher education institutions offering B.Ed. and 4-Year Integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes are mandatorily affiliated to Baba Saheb Ambedkar Education University (BSAEU), a specialised State University for teacher education which does not offer general undergraduate programmes in Arts, Science or Commerce. The appellant stated that, in the peculiar statutory framework prevailing in the State, the collaboration with Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya had been entered into solely to fulfil the requirements of the NCTE transition framework and further submitted that the Trust under which the institution functions operates a multidisciplinary academic ecosystem comprising programmes such as D.El.Ed., B.Ed., 4-Year Integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed., B.Sc. Nursing, GNM and D. Pharm. The appellant further submitted that documentary evidence had already been furnished to establish that Abhedananda Mahavidyalaya offers undergraduate programmes in Arts and Science and does not have any Education Department of its own or conduct any teacher education programme, thereby satisfying the eligibility requirements prescribed under the NCTE Guidelines. It was also clarified that the finding that multiple institutions under the same Trust

had impermissibly relied upon the same Memorandum of Collaboration was factually incorrect, and that separate collaboration arrangements and supporting documents had been furnished in respect of the respective institutions. The institution additionally submitted that it possesses adequate land and infrastructural facilities for conducting the existing and proposed programmes and had already placed on record the sale deed and mutation documents relating to an additional 2.00 acres of land, English-translated mutation certificates evidencing the total land in the name of the institution, the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate, Fire Safety Certificate, Building Safety/Structural Stability Certificate, Barrier-Free Access Certificate and approved readable Building Plan, along with other relevant land and title records.

The Appeal Committee considered the above submissions in light of the statutory framework governing recognition of teacher education institutions under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee on examination of the entire material available on record, finds that the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the threshold eligibility conditions and mandatory standards prescribed under the said Regulations. The Appeal Committee further holds that in the absence of demonstrable and verifiable compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements, no right - vested, accrued, or equitable - can be claimed by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, records the following findings: –

- (i) The Appellate Committee observed that, despite being afforded an opportunity to furnish the specific documents and clarifications sought during the appellate proceedings, the appellant institution failed to submit authenticated documentary evidence establishing compliance with the requirements relating to multidisciplinary status and the prescribed land and infrastructural norms. Consequently, the appellant institution has failed to substantiate compliance with the mandatory provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time

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

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

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material, holds that the appellant institution continues to remain in material and substantive non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended by the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021. The Appeal Committee finds that the deficiencies identified are fundamental in nature and strike at the very threshold of eligibility for grant of recognition. Such non-fulfillment of essential statutory conditions cannot be treated as technical or rectifiable irregularities but constitutes failure to satisfy the binding regulatory framework governing recognition of teacher education programmes. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the ambit of its statutory jurisdiction and was fully justified in refusing recognition for the ITEP programme. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting interference, and the impugned order dated 01.01.2026 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, concluded that the ERC was justified in refusing recognition, and no ground is made out for interference under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned refusal order dated 01.01.2026 issued by ERC is confirmed.

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील)/ Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Swami Vivekananda Universal College of Education, Khasra No. 604, Village - Krishnanagar, Street/Road-Bank Road, Taluka/ Mandal-Mayureswari, PO-Mahurapur, District-Birbhum, West Bengal-731213.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**
4. **The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of West Bengal, Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake City, (5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor) Kolkata, West Bengal-700 091.**



**एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY**

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

दिनांक/ Date – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-153/E-407794/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLWRC202615631 -**

Sainath Institution, Khasra No. 258, 264, Village - Murawal, PO.-Katni, Ghughara District, Madhya Pradesh-483501	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Amodh Saxena, Director &amp; Deepak Mathur, Joint Director</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Sainath Institution, Khasra No. 258, 264, Village - Murawal, PO.-Katni, Ghughara District, Madhya Pradesh-483501** dated 04.05.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no **F. No. NCTE/WRC/22627202509152454/MADHYAPRADESH/2025/REJC/338** dated 24.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution has uploaded Fire Safety Certificated in the Name of SAINATH INSTITUTION (RUN BY SHRI HOSPITAL EDUCATIONAL & SPORTS SOCIETY) issued by the JABALPUR Collector/Fire Officer, JABALPUR Division, KATNI Madhya Pradesh dated 18.02.2025 for the period 17/02/2025 to 16.02.2026. The institution has not uploaded the valid 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 ii. The institution uploaded old NEC. 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. iii. Till this date, the website of the institution is not functional. 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. iv. 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 v. the uploaded documents are not proper. The institution has not uploaded Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by Competent Authority of State Government. vi. The institution has not uploaded the certificate issued by the Government of Madhya Pradesh 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."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Amodh Saxena, Director & Deepak Mathur, Joint Director of Sainath Institution, Khasra No. 258, 264, Village - Murawal, PO.-Katni, Ghughara District, Madhya Pradesh-483501** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. This is with reference to the observation regarding the Fire Safety Certificate submitted by Sainath Institution (Run by Shri Hospital Educational & Sports

Society). We would like to submit the following clarification for your kind consideration: 1. Authenticity of the Document: The Fire Safety Certificate dated 18.02.2025, issued by the Jabalpur Division (Katni, Madhya Pradesh), is indeed the official and digitally generated certificate provided by the Government of Madhya Pradesh. 2. Digital Issuance Process: In the state of Madhya Pradesh, fire safety clearances are processed through the official government channels where the Fire Officer of the respective division (Jabalpur Division for Katni district) is the competent authority to issue such certificates. 3. Portal Verification: The certificate in question is a Digitally Signed document. This is the 1 standard format issued by the MP Government's urban administration/fire department, and it serves as the final valid document for all regulatory purposes. 4. Compliance: We formally state that there is no separate or different "State-level" certificate other than the one already uploaded, as this document itself is issued under the authority and guidelines of the Government of Madhya Pradesh. 5. Renewal of Certificate: We would like to inform you that the Fire Safety Certificate has been successfully renewed for the current period (03.03.2026 TO 02.03.2029). The institution has consistently maintained compliance with all fire safety norms. We request you to kindly accept the submitted certificate as valid and verifiable, treating it as full compliance with the fire safety norms.

2. In response to the observation regarding the Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) for the land occupied by Sainath Institution (Run by Shri Hospital Educational & Sports Society), we would like to submit the following: 1. Procurement of Latest NEC: We acknowledge the requirement for the updated documentation. We have now obtained the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by the Competent Authority of the State Government (Sub-Registrar Office). 2. Current Status of Land: The newly issued NEC explicitly indicates that the institutions land is free from all encumbrances, including any mortgages, liens, or legal disputes, as of the current date. 3. Compliance: This latest certificate replaces the previous document and ensures full compliance with the regulatory guidelines of the State Government and the Council. We are attaching a copy of the Latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate herewith for your verification and record. We request you to kindly update our compliance status accordingly. 3. In response to the observation regarding the functionality and update of the institutions website, we would like to formally submit the following: 1. Functional Status: We are pleased to inform you that the official website of Sainath Institution is fully functional and accessible to the public. 2. Compliance with NCTE Regulations: The website has been thoroughly updated in strict compliance with Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14), and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014. 3. Mandatory Disclosures: All requisite information, including but not limited to: - Details of the management and faculty. - Land and building documentation. - Affidavit and recognition orders. - Student details and infrastructure facilities. have been uploaded under the Mandatory Disclosure section as per the prescribed format. 4. Verification: The website is being maintained and updated regularly to ensure transparency and easy access to information for all stakeholders. We request you to kindly visit

our website at <http://sainathinstitutionkatni.in/> for verification and update our compliance status in your records. 4. With reference to the observation regarding the Building Plan for Sainath Institution (Run by Shri Hospital Educational & Sports Society), we would like to submit the following clarification and documentation: 1. Approved Building Plan: We are enclosing the Building Plan duly approved by the Competent Authority of the State Government. This plan explicitly mentions: o Name of the Institution: Sainath Institution. - Land Details: Khasra/Plot No. 258/2, 264, 334 o Area Metrics: Total Land Area and Total Built up Area are clearly demarcated. 2. Earmarked Area for NCTE Courses: As per the NCTE Regulations, the specific built-up area and land required for the Teacher Education Programmes (including multi-disciplinary requirements) have been clearly earmarked and colored/shaded in the attached plan. 3. Utilization of Premises: We formally state that the required infrastructure for the current teacher education courses is fully available and dedicated. The remaining land/built-up area is currently vacant and kept open for future development or other institutional purposes, ensuring no overlapping or congestion with the teacher education wing. 4. Demarcation: The plan clearly distinguishes the area allocated for each course, ensuring that the NCTE-recognized programmes have the necessary exclusive space as per the norms. We request you to kindly accept this approved and earmarked building plan as full compliance with the regulatory requirements. 5. With reference to the subject and the deficiency report cited above, we would like to submit the following clarification on behalf of Sainath Institution (Run by Shri Hospital Educational & Sports Society): 1. That the Shri Hospital Educational and Sports Society is a body duly registered under the Societies Registration Act of Madhya Pradesh. 2. Regarding the observation about the Not-for-profit certificate, we wish to clarify that the registered Constitution (By-Laws) of the Society explicitly defines its non-commercial nature. 3. As per Clause/Article No. 12 of the Society's Constitution, it is clearly stated that: "All the objectives of the institution are strictly Not-for-Profit (-)." 4. Furthermore, in support of our non-profit status, the institution is also registered under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961. The 12A Registration Certificate issued by the Income Tax Department (Government of India) serves as conclusive evidence that the society's activities are purely charitable and non-profitable. 5. Since the Not-for-Profit mandate is legally enshrined in our registered Constitution and further validated by the competent authority of the Central Government (Income Tax Dept via Section 12A), we request you to consider these documents as sufficient compliance. We are enclosing a certified copy of the Society's Constitution (highlighting Clause 12) and the 12A Registration Certificate for your kind perusal and records. In view of the above-mentioned legal facts and supporting documents, we humbly request you to remove the deficiency and proceed with our recognition process. 6. With reference to the observation regarding the justification for a teacher education programme under Clause 4.3(i) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions, we would like to submit the following: 1. Issuance of Certificate: We have successfully obtained the formal

certificate/recommendation from the Government of Madhya Pradesh (Department of Higher Education) justifying the essentiality and requirement of the teacher education programme in our specific geographical area (Katni District). 2. Compliance with Clause 4.3(i): This certificate confirms that the establishment/continuation of teacher education e courses by Sainath Institution aligns with the state's educational needs and the transition towards a multidisciplinary academic framework. 3. Local Demand & Quality: The document highlights the shortage of qualified teachers and the institutional capacity of Sainath Institution to provide quality training, thereby fulfilling the state's mandate for educational expansion in the Jabalpur division. 4. Submission: A certified copy of the Requirement Justification Certificate issued by the Competent Authority of the MP State Government is attached herewith for your kind perusal and record. We request you to kindly treat this as full compliance with Clause 4.3(i) and proceed with the further processing of our application. The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. In the affidavit, the institution undertook that it fulfills the requirements of a multidisciplinary institution and complies with the provisions of the NCTE Guidelines for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions dated 20.05.2025. The institution stated that it possesses all relevant documentary evidence in support of its multidisciplinary status, including the Memorandum of Collaboration and, wherever applicable, the requisite approvals/consents obtained from Rani Durgavati Vishwavidyalaya and the Higher Education Department, Government of Madhya Pradesh. It further submitted that the copies of all documents and evidences furnished before the Appellate Authority are true, complete and authentic. The institution also affirmed that no material fact has been concealed and that the information furnished in support of the appeal is based on official records maintained by the institution. The appellant institution submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. In the affidavit, the institution undertook/submitted that it fulfills the requirements of a multidisciplinary institution and complies with the provisions of the NCTE Guidelines for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions dated 20.05.2025. The institution stated that it possesses documentary evidence in support of its multidisciplinary status, including the Memorandum of Collaboration (MoC) and, wherever applicable, the requisite approvals/consents obtained from Rani Durgavati Vishwavidyalaya and the Higher Education Department, Government of Madhya Pradesh. It further submitted that all documents and evidences furnished before the Appellate Authority are true, complete and authentic and are based on official records maintained by the institution. The institution also affirmed that no material fact has been concealed in the affidavit filed in support of the appeal.

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 24.04.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Sainath Institution, run by Shri Hospital Educational & Sports Society, that the Fire Safety Certificate originally furnished was a digitally signed certificate issued by the competent authority of the Government of Madhya Pradesh through the prescribed online mechanism and that the same had subsequently been renewed for the period from 03.03.2026 to 02.03.2029. The institution further submitted that it had obtained and placed on record the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent State authority certifying that the land was free from encumbrances, and that its website had been updated and maintained in compliance with Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, with all mandatory disclosures duly uploaded. The appellant stated that it had furnished an approved building plan issued by the competent State authority indicating the institution's name, Khasra/Plot numbers, total land area, total built-up area, and earmarked land and built-up area for teacher education programmes, and clarified that the requisite infrastructure earmarked for the NCTE-recognised programmes was exclusively available. It was further submitted that Shri Hospital Educational and Sports Society is a registered society under the laws of Madhya Pradesh, that its registered bye-laws expressly prescribe a not-for-profit character, and that its charitable status is also evidenced by registration under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, copies of which were placed on record. The institution also submitted that it had obtained the certificate issued by the Department of Higher Education, Government of Madhya Pradesh, justifying the requirement of the teacher education programme in the area in terms of Clause 4.3(i) of the Guidelines for transforming stand-alone teacher education institutions into multidisciplinary higher education institutions. The appellant institution further submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal, undertaking that it fulfills the requirements applicable to multidisciplinary institutions and complies with the NCTE Guidelines dated 20.05.2025, and

stated that it possesses and has furnished authentic documentary evidence, including the Memorandum of Collaboration and requisite approvals/consents from Rani Durgavati Vishwavidyalaya and the Higher Education Department, Government of Madhya Pradesh, wherever applicable. The institution additionally affirmed that the documents furnished before the Appellate Authority are true and complete, that no material facts have been concealed, and that the information submitted is based on official records maintained by the institution. Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. The institution submitted that it fulfills the requirements of a multidisciplinary institution and complies with the provisions of the NCTE Guidelines for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions dated 20.05.2025. It further stated that documentary evidence in support of its multidisciplinary status, including the Memorandum of Collaboration (MoC) and, wherever applicable, the approvals/consents obtained from Rani Durgavati Vishwavidyalaya and the Higher Education Department, Government of Madhya Pradesh, had been placed on record. The institution also submitted that the documents and evidences furnished before the Appellate Authority are based on official records maintained by the institution and affirmed that no material fact had been concealed in the affidavit filed in support of the appeal. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value and subject to their authenticity, validity, legal admissibility and such verification as may be undertaken by the competent authority in accordance with law.

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 founded 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 24.04.2026 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 24.04.2026 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, Sainath Institution, Khasra No. 258, 264, Village - Murawal, PO.- Katni, Ghughara District, Madhya Pradesh-483501.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**

3. The 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 – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**

**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-160/E-408159/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLNRC202615635 ✓**

Katyayani College of Education, Khasra No. 45MI, Village - Badruddin Nagar, Thesil-Sardhana, Meerut Karnal Highway, District - Meerut, Uttar Pradesh-250341	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G- 7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, NRC</b>
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026</b>
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	<b>16.06.2026</b>

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF MINUTES

The appeal of **Katyayani College of Education, Khasra No. 45MI, Village - Badruddin Nagar, Thesil-Sardhana, Meerut Karnal Highway, District - Meerut, Uttar Pradesh-250341** dated 05.05.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no **F.No. NCTE/ NCTE/2627202510033647/UTTAR PRADESH/2025/REJC/1770** dated 25.11.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "Para 4.3 (c) of the Guidelines issued by NCTE for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions provides as under: "The Collaborating Multidisciplinary HEI must not have an education department of its own.". It is noted that the institution has applied under the category of collaboration as per the Guidelines issued by NCTE for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, with the Mahaveer University whereas the said University has its own education department and has also applied to NRC for transition of its B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed. course into ITEP. In view of the above, the applicant institution is not eligible to collaborate with the Mahaveer University, Meerut."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**No one** from **Katyayani College of Education, Khasra No. 45MI, Village - Badruddin Nagar, Thesil-Sardhana, Meerut Karnal Highway, District - Meerut, Uttar Pradesh-250341** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "It is respectfully submitted that the applicant institution has applied under the 'Collaboration' category strictly in accordance with the NCTE Guidelines for transforming stand-alone teacher education institutions into multidisciplinary institutions. The said Guidelines do not prohibit collaboration with a university merely on the ground that the University has its own Department of Education or has independently applied for ITEP. Further, it is submitted that the deficiency, if any, regarding multidisciplinary status has already been duly rectified. The institution has now obtained s necessary affiliation/recognition for B.A. programme from CCS University, thereby fulfilling the requirement of being part of a multidisciplinary framework as envisaged under the Guidelines. Therefore, the earlier ground of rejection no longer survives, and the application deserves to be reconsidered in light of the updated compliance an in the interest of promoting integrated teacher education.

The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution subsequently submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. In the affidavit, the institution undertook that it had furnished

all requisite documents and compliances under the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014, applicable Norms and Standards, and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions and affirmed that the documents submitted are genuine and capable of independent verification. The institution stated that it has obtained affiliation for undergraduate programmes from Chaudhary Charan Singh University, vide Letter No. CHARANUNI/SUB/441/2026 dated 28.04.2026, and placed the same on record. It further submitted that the said affiliation has been furnished in response to the deficiency communicated by the Regional Committee concerning the multidisciplinary requirements applicable to the proposed programme. The institution also affirmed that no material fact has been concealed in the affidavit filed before the Appellate Authority.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 25.11.2025.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee, in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required documents mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and had affirmed that the documents and compliances furnished were in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014, the applicable Norms and Standards, and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. The institution submitted that it had obtained affiliation for undergraduate programmes from Chaudhary Charan Singh University, vide Letter No. CHARANUNI/SUB/441/2026 dated 28.04.2026, and placed the said affiliation approval on record. It further clarified that the aforesaid affiliation approval had been furnished in response to the deficiency communicated by the Regional Committee

concerning the multidisciplinary requirements applicable to the proposed programme. The institution also stated that the documents submitted are genuine, capable of independent verification by the concerned authorities, and that no material fact has been concealed in the affidavit filed before the Appellate Authority. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value and subject to their authenticity, validity, legal admissibility and such verification as may be undertaken by the competent authority in accordance with law.

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 founded 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 25.11.2025 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 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 25.11.2025 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, Katyayani College of Education, Khasra No. 45MI, Village - Badruddin Nagar, Thesil-Sardhana, Meerut Karnal Highway, District - Meerut, Uttar Pradesh-250341.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The 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 – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-164/E-408170/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLNRC202615571 -**

Mangalmay Institute of Management and Technology, Plot No. 8 and 9, Village- Knowledge Park II, Street/Road - Bimtech Road, PO. - Alpha -1, District- Gautam Budh Nagar, UP-201310	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Mangalmay Institute of Management and Technology, Plot No. 8 and 9, Village- Knowledge Park II, Street/Road - Bimtech Road, PO. - Alpha -1, District- Gautam Budh Nagar, UP-201310** dated 23.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the refusal order no. **F.No.NCTE/NRC/2627202509203018/UTTAR PRADESH/2025/REJC/120** dated 24.01.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution has applied for transition of its existing B.A. B.Ed. Secondary course into ITEP whereas it has been offering B.Com. course only and not the B.A. course. The institution was required to prove that it is a multidisciplinary institution in relevant subjects as per sub-regulation 2(ca) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended vide Gazette Notification dated 26.10.2021. The institution stated that it has applied to CCS University, Meerut for affiliation of new B.A. and B.Sc. programme(s), however, it has not been affiliated for these course(s) so far. The institution was required to furnish a copy of the affiliation order for these course (s)."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Representative of Mangalmay Institute of Management and Technology, Plot No. 8 and 9, Village- Knowledge Park II, Street/Road - Bimtech Road, PO. - Alpha -1, District- Gautam Budh Nagar, UP-201310** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "It is respectfully submitted that the institution had already applied for affiliation of B.A. and B.Sc. courses with Chaudhary Charan Singh University prior to submitting Application. The process was under consideration at time. Subsequently, the institution has received NOC from the University and has also completed faculty approval. The formal affiliation letter is under process and expected shortly (by April 2026). Therefore, the deficiency pointed out is purely procedural and temporary, and the institution has now substantially complied with the requirement of multidisciplinary status under NCTE Regulations. It is a settled principle that subsequent compliance should be considered in the interest of justice, especially when the deficiency is no fundamental. In view of the above, it is prayed that the refusal order may kindly be set aside, and permission transition to ITEP may be granted, subject to submission of the affiliation letter."

The appellant institution submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. In the affidavit, the institution submitted that it has obtained affiliation approval from Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut for conducting B.A. and B.Sc. courses and, on that basis, fulfills the

requirement of a multidisciplinary institution for the proposed ITEP programme. The institution further stated that, during the hearing before the Appeal Committee held on 15.05.2026, it was directed to furnish an affidavit confirming the said affiliations, and that the present affidavit has been filed in compliance with those directions. The institution placed on record the affiliation approvals relating to the B.A. and B.Sc. programmes for verification and consideration. It also affirmed that the statements made in the affidavit are true and correct and that no material fact has been concealed.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 29.09.2025. 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 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that it had applied for affiliation for B.A. and B.Sc. programmes with Chaudhary Charan Singh University prior to submission of the application for transition to ITEP and that the matter was under consideration at the relevant time. The institution stated that it has subsequently obtained the requisite No Objection Certificate from the University and has completed the process relating to approval of faculty, while the formal affiliation letter is stated to be under process and expected shortly. The appellant submitted that the deficiency pertaining to multidisciplinary status was procedural and temporary in nature and that substantial compliance with the relevant requirement under the NCTE Regulations had since been achieved through the subsequent developments and documents placed on record. The institution furnished the updated compliance documents in support of its submissions. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and stated

that it had obtained affiliation approvals from Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut for conducting B.A. and B.Sc. programmes. The institution clarified that, on the basis of the said affiliations, it fulfills the requirement of a multidisciplinary institution in relation to the proposed ITEP programme. It further submitted that, during the hearing held before the Appeal Committee on 15.05.2026, it had been directed to furnish an affidavit confirming the aforesaid affiliations and that the present affidavit had been filed pursuant to the said directions. The institution placed on record the affiliation approvals pertaining to the B.A. and B.Sc. programmes and affirmed that the statements made therein are true and based on the records maintained by the institution. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value and subject to their authenticity, validity, legal admissibility and such verification as may be undertaken by the competent authority in accordance with law.

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 founded 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, Mangalmai Institute of Management and Technology, Plot No. 8 and 9, Village- Knowledge Park II, Street/Road - Bimtech Road, PO. - Alpha -1, District- Gautam Budh Nagar, UP-201310.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The 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 – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-169/E-408656/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLSRC202615589 ✓**

Karnatak Lingayat Education Societys Shri Shivayogi Murughendra Swamiji Arts, Science and Commerce C, Survey No. 979/A/1/2, 795/4, 975/2, 976/2, 976/1, Village - Athani, Street/Road-Satti Road, District- Belgaum, Karnataka – 591304  <b>APPELLANT</b>	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G- 7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075  <b>RESPONDENT</b>
---	------------------	--

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, SRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Karnatak Lingayat Education Societys Shri Shivayogi Murughendra Swamiji Arts, Science and Commerce C, Survey No. 979/A/1/2, 795/4, 975/2, 976/2, 976/1, Village - Athani, Street/Road-Satti Road, District-Belgaum, Karnataka - 591304** dated 11.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the refusal order no. **F.No.NCTE/SRC/2627202505104179/KARNATAKA/2025/REJC/813** dated 12.02.2026 of the Southern Regional Committee, recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. SCN after LOI was issued on - 14.01.2026 2. Reply received on - 14.01.2026. 3. The faculty members selected by the institution are not appointed in accordance with different curricular areas of 4 years ITEP programmes as per clause 5.1 of the Appendix15 of NCTE Regulations, 2014 amended from time to time."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Representative of Karnatak Lingayat Education Societys Shri Shivayogi Murughendra Swamiji Arts, Science and Commerce C, Survey No. 979/A/1/2, 795/4, 975/2, 976/2, 976/1, Village - Athani, Street/Road-Satti Road, District-Belgaum, Karnataka - 591304** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "In this regard, we respectfully submit that the deficiencies pointed out in the refusal order have now been fully rectified, particularly with reference to Clause 5.1, as detailed below: The Faculty List has been comprehensively revised in strict accordance with the NCTE prescribed format for both B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes, ensuring full compliance with Clause 5.1 of Appendix-15 by appointing qualified and eligible faculty across all required curricular areas of the 4-and specialized subject areas, and the revised faculty list has year ITEP programme, including pedagogical, foundational, been duly approved by the concerned affiliating university and approval letter by concerned affiliating university is enclosed. In light of the above rectifications, we humbly request the Honorable Appellate Authority to grant approval for starting the ITEP Programme for the academic year 2026-27. We assure that the institution remains committed to maintaining the highest standards of teacher education and fulfilling all norms prescribed by the NCTE."

The appellant institution submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. In the affidavit, the institution submitted that, pursuant to the observations of the Regional Committee regarding the faculty list, it has revised and updated the teaching staff details for the B.A.B.Ed. and B.Sc.B.Ed. programmes in accordance with the requirements prescribed under the NCTE ITEP Regulations

and Guidelines. The institution stated that the revised faculty list has been duly approved by the affiliating authority, namely Rani Channamma University, Belagavi, vide approval dated 09.04.2026, and has been placed on record for consideration. It further clarified that the revised faculty composition fulfills the qualifications, subject requirements and other norms prescribed by NCTE for the concerned programmes. The institution also placed on record copies of the university-approved faculty list and supporting documents, while affirming the correctness of the statements made in the affidavit.

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

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 30.05.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the SRC vide order dated 12.02.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that the deficiency relating to faculty requirements under Clause 5.1 of Appendix-15 had subsequently been addressed by revising the faculty list strictly in accordance with the format prescribed by the NCTE for the B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes. The institution stated that qualified and eligible faculty members have been appointed across all curricular components of the four-year Integrated Teacher Education Programme, including pedagogical, foundational and specialised subject areas, in conformity with the requirements prescribed under the applicable norms. It was further submitted that the revised faculty list has been duly approved by the concerned affiliating university and that the approval letter issued by the affiliating university has been placed on record in support of the updated compliance. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. The institution submitted that, in response to the observations

of the Regional Committee regarding the faculty list, it had revised and updated the teaching staff particulars for the B.A.B.Ed. and B.Sc.B.Ed. programmes in accordance with the requirements prescribed under the NCTE ITEP Regulations and Guidelines. It was further stated that the revised faculty list had been duly approved by the affiliating authority, namely Rani Channamma University, Belagavi, vide approval dated 09.04.2026, and had been placed on record for consideration. The institution clarified that the revised faculty composition fulfills the qualifications, subject requirements and other norms prescribed by NCTE for the concerned programmes and also furnished copies of the university-approved faculty list and supporting documents while affirming the correctness of the statements made in the affidavit. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value and subject to their authenticity, validity, legal admissibility and such verification as may be undertaken by the competent authority in accordance with law.

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 founded 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 12.02.2026 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 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 12.02.2026 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, Karnatak Lingayat Education Societys Shri Shivayogi Murughendra Swamiji Arts, Science and Commerce C, Survey No. 979/A/1/2, 795/4, 975/2, 976/2, 976/1, Village - Athani, Street/Road-Satti Road, District-Belgaum, Karnataka - 591304.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**

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



**एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY**

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

दिनांक/ Date – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-170/E-408657/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLSRC202615587~**

Alvas College (Autonomous), Survey no. 599/3PA3, 599/3A5, 657/3AP1, 599//3A2, 657/3B, Village - Puthige, PO. - Vidyagiri, Taluka/Mandal-Moodubidire, District-South Kannada - 574227	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, SRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Alvas College (Autonomous), Survey no. 599/3PA3, 599/3A5, 657/3AP1, 599/3A2, 657/3B, Village - Puthige, PO. - Vidyagiri, Taluka/Mandal-Moodubidire, District-South Kannada -574227** dated 07.04.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/SRC/2526202404232195/KARNATAKA/2024/REJC/617** dated 14.01.2026 of the Southern Regional Committee, recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The Final Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution vide dated 30.12.2024 with a direction to submit reply within 15 days. The institution has not replied nor uploaded any documentary proof in respect of the Final Show Cause Notice issued on 30.12.2024 and the stipulated time period is over. 1. The staff list submitted by the Institution in the NCTE format is not approved by the Registrar of the Affiliating University. 2. As per faculty list, the appointed staff is insufficient for granting recognition to B.A. B.Ed. Preparatory (1 unit), B.Sc. B.Ed. Preparatory (1 unit), B.Com. B.Ed. Preparatory (1 unit). 3. As per faculty list, the Principal is not approved by the Affiliating University."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Representative of Alvas College (Autonomous), Survey no. 599/3PA3, 599/3A5, 657/3AP1, 599/3A2, 657/3B, Village - Puthige, PO. - Vidyagiri, Taluka/Mandal-Moodubidire, District-South Kannada -574227** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 01<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2026. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "As per the prescribed norms, staff approval is pending for submission. However, we have complied with all applicable norms, and the required details, including the Letter of Intent (LOI), were submitted through the NCTE Portal on 16.12.2025."

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 31.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the SRC vide order dated 14.01.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that the approval of the teaching staff from the competent authority/affiliating body was pending submission at the relevant stage. The institution stated that, apart from the said requirement, it had complied with the applicable norms and standards and had furnished the requisite details and documents, including compliance in response to the Letter of Intent (LOI), through the NCTE Portal on 16.12.2025. The appellant further submitted that the staff approval, being under process, remained pending for submission in accordance with the prescribed procedure.

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 founded 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 14.01.2026 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 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 14.01.2026 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, Alvas College (Autonomous), Survey no. 599/3PA3, 599/3A5, 657/3AP1, 599/3A2, 657/3B, Village - Puthige, PO. - Vidyagiri, Taluka/Mandal-Moodubidire, District-South Kannada -574227.**

2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.
3. The Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



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

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

दिनांक/ Date – 16.06.2026

**एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-180/E-408640/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLWRC202615637 ✓**

Bhartiya Prashikshan Sansthan, Khata No. 287, 290, 291, Village - Bijorawas, Maharajawas Road, Alwar, Rajasthan-301713	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Bhartiya Prashikshan Sansthan, Khata No. 287, 290, 291, Village - Bijorawas, Maharajawas Road, Alwar, Rajasthan-301713** dated 05.05.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202510053689/RAJASTHAN/ 2025/REJ/1683** dated 06.03.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that " 1. 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. ii. The Institution has not uploaded the Land affidavit in NCTE prescribed Proforma duly filled in in the online portal. iii. 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. iv. The institution has not uploaded the Building Disabled Friendly Certificate issued by the Competent Authority of the State Government. v. As per the NEC uploaded by the institution issued on 03.03.2022 by Tehsildar behror Alwar the land area is mentioned "57 acre = 5700 sq.mts". The institution has not uploaded LATEST Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by Competent Authority of State Government. vi. The institution has not provided supporting documents issued by government competent authority that all khasra numbers i.e., 287,290,291 are a single plot. vii. The institution has not uploaded the Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by. government competent authority. viii. The institution is conducting so many teachers' education programmes i.e., B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (2 unit), Middle (2 unit) B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (2 unit), Middle (2 unit), Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree. 4 units Innovative Shiksha Shastri (Sanskrit) 2 units, the sufficiency of land area and built-up area for the above courses intake cannot be ascertained. ix. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of Library reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. x. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the furniture in the multipurpose hall is inadequate. xi. The institution has uploaded Form No 10 AC. The institution has not uploaded the Exemption Certificate (Form 12A) issued by the Income Tax Department. xii. 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. xiii. The institution has not uploaded the list of teaching staff duly approved and countersigned by its affiliating body in the prescribed format of NCTE and uploaded teaching staff is not s per NCTE norms."

## II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**The Representative of Bhartiya Prashikshan Sansthan, Khata No. 287, 290, 291, Village - Bijorawas, Maharajawas Road, Alwar, Rajasthan-301713** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that

“1. The institution has submitted collaboration certificate issued from NOC issued from Aurktalaya College, Shiksha Rajasthan, Jaipur vide letter no. F.240/ ITEP/ B.ED/PVT/A.A.KA.SH/2026/21461109 dated 07.04.2026. 2. The institution has submitted the Land affidavit in NCTE prescribed proforma duly filled in authorised person of the institution. (Annexure-2). 3. The institution has submitted Building Plan approved by the Executive Engineer, PWD, UPKHAND Behror, wherein it is mentioned the name of institution, Khasra/Plot/Survey No. and also mentioned 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. (Annexure-3). 4. The institution has submitted the Building Disabled Friendly Certificate issued by Office of the Executive Engineer, PWD, Division, Behror vide letter no. EE/PWD/Bldg. saty/D-2620 dated 23.03.2026 which is valid up to 23.03.2029. (Annexure-4). 5. The institution has submitted latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by Tehsildar Behror Competent Authority of State Government. (Annexure-5). 6. The institution has submitted a certificate from Revenue Department of the State Govt. that all khasra numbers i.e. 287,290,291 are adjacent each other with single plot. (Annexure-6). 7. The institution has uploaded the Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by Government Authority. (Annexure-7). 8. Total land area is 5400 sq. mtrs and total built up area is 4376.12 Sq. mtrs which is sufficient for the programmes i.e. B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit); B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree. 4. units Innovative Shiksha Shastri (Sanskrit) 2 units. (Annexure-8). 9. The institution has submitted the geotagged photographs showing seating capacity of library and reading room. (Annexure-9). 10. The institution has submitted geotagged photographs with furniture in the multipurpose hall. (Annexure-10). 11. The institution has submitted Exemption Certificate No ITBA/EXM/F/EXM44/202526/1085717397(1) CIT(EXEMPTION), DELHI issued by the income tax Department. (Annexure-11). 12. The institution has submitted bank statement of salary of the faculty for six months.. (Annexure-12). 13. The institution has submitted list of teaching staff faculty approved by the Register, of the concerned university in the prescribed format developed by the NCTE. (Annexure-13)”

The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. In the affidavit, the institution undertook that it fulfills the requirements prescribed under the NCTE Guidelines for transformation into a Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institution and satisfies the eligibility conditions applicable to the proposed ITEP transition. The institution stated that it is presently conducting B.A.B.Ed. (1 unit), B.Sc.B.Ed. (1 unit), B.Ed. (4 units) and Innovative Shiksha Shastri

(2 units), and clarified that it possesses a total land area of 5400 sq. mtrs. and a total built-up area of 6989.28 sq. mtrs., which, according to it, are adequate for the programmes being conducted. It further placed on record the approved building plan and site plan (Najari Naksha), the Building Completion Certificate issued by the competent Government Authority in the prescribed format, and the Exemption Certificate (Form 12A). The institution also affirmed that the information and documents furnished before the Appellate Authority are true and correct.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 06.03.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that it had furnished the collaboration certificate/NOC issued by the Aayuktalaya College Shiksha, Rajasthan, Jaipur vide letter No. F.240/ITEP/B.ED/PVT/A.A.KA.SH/2026/21461/109 dated 07.04.2026 in support of its proposal under the multidisciplinary framework. The institution further submitted a land affidavit in the prescribed NCTE format, the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Tehsildar, Behror, a certificate from the Revenue Department certifying that Khasra Nos. 287, 290 and 291 constitute a single contiguous plot, and a Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by the competent Government authority. The appellant stated that it had placed on record the Building Plan approved by the Executive Engineer, PWD, Upkhand, Behror, indicating the name of the institution, Khasra particulars, total land area, total built-up area, and the earmarked and demarcated land and built-up area for each course, including teacher education and

multidisciplinary programmes. It was further submitted that the institution possesses a total land area of 5,400 sq. metres and a total built-up area of 4,376.12 sq. metres, stated to be sufficient for conducting B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) - one unit, B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) - one unit, B.Ed. - four units, and Innovative Shiksha Shastri (Sanskrit) - two units. The institution also furnished a Disabled Friendly Certificate issued by the Executive Engineer, PWD, Behror, valid up to 23.03.2029. The institution additionally submitted geo-tagged photographs evidencing the seating capacity of the library and reading room and the availability of furniture in the multipurpose hall. It further placed on record the exemption certificate issued by the Income Tax Department, bank statements evidencing payment of salaries to faculty for the preceding six months, and the list of teaching staff duly approved by the Registrar of the concerned University in the format prescribed by the NCTE. Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. The institution submitted that it fulfills the requirements prescribed under the NCTE Guidelines for transformation into a Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institution and satisfies the eligibility conditions applicable to the proposed transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). It was stated that the institution is presently conducting B.A.B.Ed. (1 unit), B.Sc.B.Ed. (1 unit), B.Ed. (4 units) and Innovative Shiksha Shastri (2 units), and clarified that it possesses a total land area of 5400 sq. mtrs. and a total built-up area of 6989.28 sq. mtrs., which, according to the institution, are adequate for the programmes being conducted. The institution further placed on record the approved building plan, site plan (Najari Naksha), the Building Completion Certificate issued by the competent Government Authority in the prescribed format, and the Exemption Certificate (Form 12A). It also affirmed that the information and documents furnished before the Appellate Authority are true and correct.

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 the impugned decision of the concerned Regional Committee is founded upon findings relating to non-compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the provisions of 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 and regulatory requirements governing eligibility, including fulfilment of the prescribed criteria for recognition of an institution as a Multidisciplinary Institution (MDI), which constitute foundational prerequisites for consideration of recognition for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP).

The Committee further noted that, 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 purportedly seeking to rectify the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. However, a substantial part of such material was admittedly not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order and has not been subjected to verification, scrutiny and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the applicable provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee also took note of the observations of the WRC and the submissions made by the appellant institution regarding the availability, adequacy and earmarking of land and built-up area. The Committee was of the considered view that the matter requires re-examination by the WRC in the light of the provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, the relevant provisions governing ITEP under the NCTE Regulations, 2021, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements. The Committee further observed that the WRC may obtain the considered opinion of the Regulation Division of the NCTE on the issue relating to the proportionate use, allocation and earmarking of land and built-up area for conducting teacher education programmes within a multidisciplinary institution/environment, so as to objectively determine and establish compliance with the mandatory infrastructure norms prescribed under the applicable NCTE framework before arriving at a final decision in the matter.

The Committee is also of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution satisfying the requirements of a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms and standards prescribed by the NCTE. While processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including the land earmarked for undergraduate-level programmes, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or other concerned statutory or regulatory authorities, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE norms and standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability, adequacy and lawful earmarking 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 from time to time, 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 authorities for the programmes already being conducted and those proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled principle that compliance with recognition norms must be established through contemporaneous,

duly authenticated and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of demonstrating strict, continuous and complete compliance rests upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace, dilute or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee without due verification by the competent authority in accordance with law. 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 06.03.2026 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 06.03.2026 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, Bhartiya Prashikshan Sansthan, Khata No. 287, 290, 291, Village - Bijorawas, Maharajawas Road, Alwar, Rajasthan-301713.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.
3. The 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 – 16.06.2026

**एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-189/E-4088871/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLWRC202615643 -**

Hans College of Education, Plot No. 271, 273, 274, 275, Village-Amai, Kotputli, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303108	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Hans College of Education, Plot No. 271, 273, 274, 275, Village-Amai, Kotputli, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303108** dated 02.05.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202510023572/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/1735** dated. 11.03.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that " 1. 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 4.2.1 of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into multidisciplinary higher education institutions. 2. 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. The institution is required to upload the 'Fresh certificate of merger' issued by competent authority. 3. The institution has not uploaded the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Competent Revenue Authority. 4. In the Land Details Built Up area mentioned in the Affidavit (in sq m) is 4343. The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. 600x3-1800, B.Sc.480x3 1440, B.Com. 120x3-360. The sufficiency of land and built-up area for the above courses with of multidisciplinary courses and intake for Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree 4 units, Diploma in Elementary Education (D.El.Ed.) 1 unit, B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), Middle (1 unit) B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), Middle (1 unit) course cannot be ascertained. 5. The institution has not uploaded the building plan which mentions 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. 6. The earmarked area for all teacher education programme is not mentioned in the BCC uploaded by the institution. The institution has not uploaded latest Building Completion Certificate (BCC) in the prescribed format of NCTE (17 points) mentioning all Khasra No. issued by the Competent Government Authority for all the courses being conducted in the premises. 7. The website is required to be functional 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. 8. The institution is required to upload Mutation Certificate mentioning all the Khasra No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 9. The institution has not uploaded Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL <https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/trackapplication.aspx>. 10. The Institution has not uploaded Latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC)

Issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 11. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the Multipurpose Hall is not as per NCTE norms furniture in the multipurpose hall is inadequate. 12. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. 13. 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. 14. 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. 15. The uploaded list of teaching staff duly countersigned by its affiliating body is not in the prescribed format of NCTE and not as per NCTE regulation 2014 and amendment time by time. 16. 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.”

## II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Representative of Hans College of Education, Plot No. 271, 273, 274, 275, Village-Amai, Kotputli, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303108** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Recommendation Certificate Issued by Govt. Of Rajasthan Is Attached Order No. F24()ITEP-Recommendation/B.Ed./Akashi/ 2026/Rajkaj Ref No. 21447901 Date:- 17.04.2026 Order No. F24(Jitep/B.Ed./Nlsan/Akashi/2026/Rajkaj Ref. No. 20998166 Date:- 13.03.2026. 2. This is to certify that Hans Education and Research Institute is operating Hans College, (B.A/B.Sc. Degree College) on the first plot of land. The same society is also operating Hans College of Education on the second plot of land, where Teacher Education Programs are being conducted. The distance between both plots is 2 kilometres. The merger of both colleges (managed by the same society) has already been approved by the Government of Rajasthan vide Order No. approve F24()ITEP/BED/N.S/AKASHI/2026/RAJKAJ REF No. 20998166 dated 13.03.2026 and by University of Rajasthan vide Order No. Acad.-11/2025/13430 dated 04.10.2025, Since both colleges are operated by the same society, as per rules, there is no requirement for a Merger Certificate issued by the Registrar of Societies. 3. Latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by Office Of The Tehsildar Kotputli Is Attached. Order No. Vividh/2026/378 Date: 06.05.2026 (For Teacher Education Programme) Order No. Vividh/2026/379 Date: - 06.05.2026 (For Degree College). 4. It is certified that the following land and building facilities are available in the name of Hans Education and Research Institute, Kotputli (Rajasthan), the details of which are as under: 1. First Plot (Hans College, Kotputli) At Village Amai, Khasra No. 730, Kotputli, a total land area of 9239 square meters is available. On this land, the institution's own building has been constructed and the said land has been converted for educational purposes. Hans College, Kotputli is being operated in the said building. The total built-up area of the building is 6122.59

square meters. The College fulfils the criteria as per Directorate of Education, Rajasthan 2. Second Plot (Hans College of Education, Kotputli) At Village Amai, Khasra Nos. 271, 273, 274, 275 & 278, Kotputli, a total land area of 9553.20 square meters is available and the said land has been converted for educational purposes. On this land, the institution's buildings (Block A, B & C) have been constructed, wherein Hans College of Education, Kotputli is being operated. Block A- B.A. B.Ed/B.Sc. B.Ed. (4 Years) Total Built-up Area-3138.64 Sq. Mtr. Block B-D.El.Ed. (2 Years) Total Built-up Area-1508 Sq. Mtr. Block C-B.Ed. (2 Years) Total Built-up Area-2856 Sq. Mtr. Total Built-up Area of Block A+B+C 7502.64 Sq. Mtr. The distance between the above-mentioned two land parcels of the institution is approximately 02 kilometers. In this regard, certificate VIVIDH/2026/378 dated 06.05.2026 has been issued by the Office of The Tehsildar, Kotputli. 5. It is certified that the following land and building facilities are available in the name of Hans Education and Research Institute, Kotputli (Rajasthan), the details of which are as under 1. First Plot (Hans College, Kotputli) At Village Amai, Khasra No. 730, Kotputli, a total land area of 9239 square meters is available. On this land, the institution's own building has been constructed and the said land has been converted for educational purposes Hans College, Kotputli is being operated in the said building. The total built-up area of the building is 6122.59 square meters. The College fulfils the criteria as per Directorate of Education, Rajasthan 2. Second Plot (Hans College of Education, Kotputli) At Village Amai, Khasra Nos. 271, 273, 274, 275 & 278, Kotputli, a total land area of 9553.20 square meters is available and the said land has been converted for educational purposes. On this land, the institution's buildings (Block A, B & C) have been constructed, wherein Hans College of Education, Kotputli is being operated. Block A-BA. B.Ed/B.Sc. B.Ed. (4 Years) Total Built-up Area-3138.64 Sq. Mtr. Block B-D.El.Ed. (2 Years) Total Built-up Area-1508 Sq. Mtr. Block C-B.Ed. (2 Years) Total Built-up Area-2856 Sq. Mtr. Total Built-up Area of Block A+B+C 7502.64 Sq. Mtr. The distance between the above-mentioned two land parcels of the institution is approximately 02 kilometers. In this regard, certificate VIVIDH/2026/378 dated 06.05.2026 has been issued by the Office of The Tehsildar, Kotputli. 6. The institution has uploaded latest Building Completion Certificate (BCC) in the prescribed format of NCTE (17 points) mentioning all Khasra No. issued by the Competent Government Authority for all the courses being conducted in the premises. 7. The website is functional and updated in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014. Website Link -[www.hanscollege.org](http://www.hanscollege.org). 8. The institution is uploaded Mutation Certificate mentioning all the Khasra No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government. 9. The institution has uploaded Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan. Application No. - LSG/KOTPUTLI/FIRENOC/2025-26/67298 VALID UPTO:-28 APRIL 2028. 10. Latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by office of the tehsildar kotputli is attached. order no. vividh/2026/378 date:- 06.05.2026 (for teacher education programme) order no. vividh/2026/379 date:- 06.05.2026 (for degree college). 11. Multipurpose Hall geotagged

photographs is uploaded as per NCTE norms. Furniture in the multipurpose hall is Adequate. 12. Reading room geotagged photographs is uploaded. Seating capacity of reading room is sufficient as per NCTE norms. 13. Staff Salary Sheet and Bank Statement is uploaded. Salary is being paid as per the Central/State Government pay scale. 14. The institution has uploaded Land Use Certificate (CLU) as per Rajasthan Urban Areas (Permission for use of Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes and Allotment) Rules, 2012. Order No. VIVIDH/2026/381 Date:- 06.05.2026 (For Teacher Education Programme) Order No. VIVIDH/2026/382 Date:- 06.05.2026 (For Degree College). 15. Teaching Staff list is duly countersigned by the affiliating body has uploaded and it is prescribed format of NCTE and as per NCTE regulation 2014. 16. This Point has been repeated twice therefore, Please refer to Point 13 (Page No. 63 to 90) (Staff Salary Sheet and Bank Statement is uploaded. Salary is being paid as per the Central/State Government pay scale). The appellatant institution also submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and in compliance with the deficiencies communicated through the Regional Committee's order dated 11.03.2026. In the affidavit, the institution undertook that it fulfills the requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014, and the Guidelines applicable to Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, and that the documents furnished are genuine and verifiable. The institution clarified that the total land area and built-up area available for the multidisciplinary programmes and teacher education programmes have been separately earmarked and reflected in the approved building plan and site plan, indicating programme-wise infrastructural allocation, Khasra particulars, and other relevant details. It further placed on record the Building Completion Certificate issued in the prescribed format, along with the Building Safety Certificate issued by the competent PWD authority, stating that the infrastructure is structurally safe and suitable for academic use. The institution also affirmed that the requisite land, infrastructure, instructional facilities, teaching staff, financial resources and academic facilities are available and that no material fact has been concealed in the submissions made before the Appellate Authority.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 01<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026, considered the case of the appellatant 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 appellatant institution.**

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellatant 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 11.03.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that Hans Education and Research Institute, Kotputli, had furnished recommendation certificates issued by the Government of Rajasthan vide Rajkaj Ref. Nos. 21447901 dated 17.04.2026 and 20998166 dated 13.03.2026 in support of its proposal under the multidisciplinary framework. The institution submitted that Hans College and Hans College of Education are being operated by the same society on two separate plots situated approximately 2 kilometres apart and that the merger of the two institutions had been approved by the Government of Rajasthan and the University of Rajasthan. It was further clarified that, both institutions being managed by the same society, no separate merger certificate from the Registrar of Societies was required. The appellant stated that it had placed on record the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificates issued by the Tehsildar, Kotputli; mutation certificates; Land Use Conversion Certificates; Fire Safety Certificate valid up to 28.04.2028; and Building Completion Certificate in the prescribed 17-point NCTE format mentioning all relevant Khasra numbers. It further submitted that Hans College, situated on Khasra No. 730, comprises 9,239 sq. metres of land with a built-up area of 6,122.59 sq. metres, whereas Hans College of Education, situated on Khasra Nos. 271, 273, 274, 275 and 278, comprises 9,553.20 sq. metres of land with Blocks earmarked for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed., D.El.Ed. and B.Ed. programmes having an aggregate built-up area of 7,502.64 sq. metres. The institution further submitted that its website is functional and updated in compliance with the provisions of the NCTE Regulations, 2014; geo-tagged photographs evidencing the adequacy of the multipurpose hall and library reading room have been uploaded; salary statements and bank records demonstrating payment of salaries in accordance with Central/State Government pay scales have been furnished; and the teaching staff list, in the prescribed NCTE format, duly countersigned by the affiliating body, has been placed on record. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and in response to the deficiencies communicated through the Regional Committee's order dated 11.03.2026. The institution submitted that it fulfills the requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines applicable to Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, and that the documents furnished are genuine and capable of verification. It was clarified that the total land area and built-up area available for the multidisciplinary and teacher education programmes have been

separately earmarked and reflected in the approved building plan and site plan, indicating programme-wise infrastructural allocation, Khasra particulars and other relevant details. The institution further stated that the Building Completion Certificate issued in the prescribed format and the Building Safety Certificate issued by the competent PWD authority had been placed on record, indicating that the infrastructure being utilized for academic purposes is structurally safe and suitable for use. The institution also submitted that documents relating to land, infrastructure, instructional facilities, teaching staff, financial resources and academic facilities had been furnished before the Appellate Authority. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value and subject to their authenticity, validity, legal admissibility and such verification as may be undertaken by the competent authority in accordance with law.

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 founded 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 11.03.2026 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 11.03.2026 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, Hans College of Education, Plot No. 271, 273, 274, 275, Village-Amai, Kotputli, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303108.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The 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 – 16.06.2026

**एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-466/E-388511/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLNRC202515420 -**

Surya College of Education, Khasra No. 835/777, National Highway, Loga, Kathua, Jammu & Kashmir – 184104	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Sh. Pankaj Dogra, Chairman</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, NRC</b>
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026</b>
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	<b>16.06.2026</b>

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF ORDER

The appeal of **Surya College of Education, Khasra No. 835/777, National Highway, Loga, Kathua, Jammu & Kashmir - 184104** dated 28.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-NRC-77803592/JAMMUANDKASHMIR/2020/ RECOGNITION ORDER** dated 29.08.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "Approval of 1 unit only."

### II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

**Sh. Pankaj Dogra, Chairman of Surya College of Education, Khasra No. 835/777, National Highway, Loga, Kathua, Jammu & Kashmir - 184104** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "Our college currently has two units running successfully. However, NCTE has approved only one unit. We request you to kindly approved two units, as we have sufficient qualified faculty and infrastructure as per NCTE norms".

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 years duration with an annual intake of 50 students (one unit) vide order no. **F.No.NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-NRC-77803592/ JAMMU AND KASHMIR/2020/Recognition order** dated 29.08.2025.

The Appeal Committee, vide order dated 15.01.2026, found that the appellant had failed to substantiate compliance with the mandatory regulatory requirements governing enhancement of intake, particularly with regard to prescribed faculty norms and supporting documentary evidence. Holding that enhancement of intake is subject to demonstrable compliance under the NCTE Act and Regulations, the Committee found no merit in the appeal. Accordingly, the appeal was dismissed and the impugned order dated 29.08.2025 issued by the NRC was upheld.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had challenged the earlier appellate order dated 15.01.2026 before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 4457/2026. The Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 06.04.2026, set aside the said appellate order and directed the Appellate Authority to treat the writ petition as a representation and reconsider the matter by passing a reasoned and speaking order within four weeks, after affording opportunity to the petitioner to furnish any clarification or supporting documents, if required. Accordingly, the instant matter has been re-examined in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

In compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 06.04.2026, the Appeal Committee considered the matter in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that it has been operating two units of the concerned teacher education programme and that both units have been functioning successfully. The appellant institution contended that, although recognition/approval has been granted for only one unit, it possesses adequate infrastructure and duly qualified faculty in conformity with the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 for conducting two units. It was further submitted that the institution has sufficient instructional and institutional resources to support the enhanced intake and relied upon its existing facilities and faculty strength in support of its claim.

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

adherence to the regulatory regime, no vested, accrued, equitable, or enforceable right can be asserted by the appellant institution under the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, therefore, proceeds to record the following findings: -

- (i) The faculty particulars furnished by the appellant institution indicate that the faculty members shown at Sl. Nos. 6 and 13 are stated to be continuing employees; however, no contemporaneous documentary evidence, such as salary slips, bank statements evidencing regular salary disbursement, or proof of qualifications approved by the affiliating University, has been placed on record to establish their continuity in service and eligibility under the applicable norms.
- (ii) The documentary material submitted by the appellant institution does not establish compliance with the mandatory faculty requirements prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. The faculty details do not disclose postgraduate subject specialisation, nor identify faculty earmarked for pedagogy and perspective education components. Despite being afforded opportunity, the institution failed to furnish duly approved existing/proposed faculty lists in the prescribed format along with complete evidence of educational and professional qualifications. Mere assertions, unsupported by verifiable and authenticated records, cannot establish compliance with the statutory faculty norms.

The Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive examination of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, records available on file, documents placed on record, and submissions advanced during the hearing, is satisfied that the impugned order is legally sound, reasoned, and in conformity with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The same does not suffer from any procedural irregularity, perversity, arbitrariness, non-consideration of relevant material, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record clearly establishes that adequate, effective, and meaningful opportunity of hearing was afforded to the appellant institution. The grounds for non-grant/restoration of additional intake pertain to core statutory requirements, including adequacy of infrastructure, availability of duly qualified and approved faculty, instructional facilities, and overall regulatory compliance. The deficiencies identified are substantive, fundamental, and go to the root of eligibility, and cannot be treated as minor or curable irregularities in absence of contemporaneous, credible, and verifiable documentary compliance.

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

The Appeal Committee holds that recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory, conditional, and contingent upon strict and continuous compliance with the prescribed norms. No institution can claim any vested or accrued right to recognition or intake capacity in absence of demonstrable compliance at the time of consideration. Past status or assertions unsupported by legally admissible evidence cannot override the statutory framework. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities, the appellant institution has failed to discharge the statutory burden of establishing compliance with the mandatory provisions of the Act and Regulations. The action of the Regional Committee is thus lawful, justified, and in accordance with the regulatory framework, warranting no appellate interference. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity in the impugned order dated 29.08.2025, and the same is hereby affirmed.

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

**After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, concluded that instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned order dated 29.08.2025 issued by NRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.**

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



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

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

1. **The Principal, Surya College of Education, Khasra No. 835/777, National Highway, Loga, Kathua, Jammu & Kashmir - 184104.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.
3. The Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Mini Block Civil Secretariat, Jammu, J&K.



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

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

दिनांक/ Date – 16.06.2026

**एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-121/E-404396/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLWRC202615577 -**

Taj Memorial Teacher Training College, Khasra No. 433(433/1), 434, 436 (1008/1004), Village-Jagdisgpura, Street/Road-Jagdishpur, Taluka/Mandal-Kotputli, PO. Sharund, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303105	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Taj Memorial Teacher Training College, Khasra No. 433(433/1), 434, 436 (1008/1004), Village-Jagdisgpura, Street/Road-Jagdishpur, Taluka/Mandal-Kotputli, PO. Sharund, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303105** dated 23.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the refusal order no **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509263352/RAJASTHAN/ 2025/REJC/438** dated 06.03.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. 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. 2. The institution has not uploaded the Exemption Certificate (Form 12A) issued by the Income Tax Department or issued by government competent authority. 3. The institution has not uploaded the Building Disabled Friendly Certificate issued by eh Competent Authority of the State Government. 4. The institution has not uploaded the admitted students list counter signed by Affiliating University. 5. The institution has not uploaded the certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan justifying the requirement for a teacher education programme in he area, as required under Clause 4.3(i) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institution. 6. The institution has not uploaded the list of teaching staff of all Education Faulty programmes in the prescribed format of NCTE duly approved and countersigned by its affiliating body. 7. Bank Statement has not been uploaded by the institution. It cannot be ascertained whether the institute teachers are being paid the salary as per Central/State Govt. 8. The institution is not provide proof that all Khasara number i.e. 433 (433/1), 434, 436, (1008/1004) are in a single plot. 9. The institution has not uploaded latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by the Competent Authority of State Government indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances issued by Competent Government Authority. 10. The website of institution has NOT been updated and maintained in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time. 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. 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. 12. The institution has not uploaded Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL <https://lsgonline.rajasthan>

.gov.in/track\_application.aspx. 13. The institute has not uploaded the Mutation certificate (Jamabandhi) of all Khasra issued by Government Competent Authority. 14. The institution has not uploaded the Not-For -Profit Certificate issued by government competent authority. 15. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the college does not have adequate playgrounds and sports facility. 16. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of Library reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. 17. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the Multipurpose Hall is not as per NCTE norms. Furniture in multipurpose hall is inadequate.”

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

**Representative of Taj Memorial Teacher Training College, Khasra No. 433(433/1), 434, 436 (1008/1004), Village-Jagdisgpura, Street/Road-Jagdishpur, Taluka/Mandal-Kotputli, PO. Sharund, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303105** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The CLU as per Rajasthan Urban Areas Rules has been obtained from the competent authority (Nagarpalika Mandal, Kotputli) mentioning all relevant khasra numbers and the same is enclosed herewith. 2. Our society, the Shri Ram Shiksha Samiti, is registered under the State Government Societies Act, 1958, and is exempt from the Income Tax Department. The exemption certificate is enclosed. 3. The institution building is barrier -free with ramps and necessary facilities for differently abled persons. The certificate issued by the competent authority is enclosed. 4. In the state of Rajasthan, the centralized admission process is done through counselling. For the last three years, this counselling is being done by Vardhaman Mahaveer Open University, Kota. Hence, the list of students admitted by them is enclosed. 5. As per NCTE norms, the State Government has issued No Objection Certificate to the college, a copy of which is enclosed. 6. The list of teaching staff in prescribed format fully approved an counter signed by the affiliating body is attached. 7. The bank statement showing salary payment to faculty as per State/Central Government norms is enclosed. 8. All Khasra numbers mentioned in the application constitute a single contiguous plot and documentary proof is attached. 9. The latest NEC issued by the competent authority confirming that the land is free from encumbrances is enclosed. 10. The institutional website has now been updated as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 and necessary details have been uploaded. 11. The building plan approved by the competent authority mentioning total land area and built-up area for each programme is enclosed. 12. The Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Fire Department. Government of Rajasthan and verifiable on the official portal is attached. 13. Jamabandi/Mutation certificate of all Khasra Numbers issued by the competent authority is enclosed. 14. The Certificate confirming that the institution is being run on not-for-profit basis is attached. 15. The college uploaded geotagged photos of the colleges playgrounds and sports facilities in the transaction application. The college has all the sports facilities available in

accordance with NCTE Regulations. 16. The college has a well-equipped library-cum-reading room. The reading room has a seating capacity of 100 students, whose geo-tagged photos have been uploaded. 17. As per the rules of NCTE, the college has a multi-purpose hall with a seating capacity of more than two hundred in which 250 sets of furniture are available, the geo-tagged photos of which were uploaded. The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and in compliance with the deficiencies communicated through the impugned order dated 06.03.2026. In the affidavit, the institution undertook that it complies with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, and that the documents furnished are genuine and verifiable. The institution submitted the Land Use Certificate, latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate, Fire Safety Certificate, Jamabandi/Mutation records, approved building plan indicating Khasra particulars and programme-wise earmarked areas, barrier-free access certificate, and documentary evidence to establish that the relevant Khasra numbers constitute a single land parcel. It further placed on record the State Government recommendation certificate, teaching staff list duly approved by the affiliating body, salary records evidencing payment through banking channels, admitted students' list obtained through the centralized counselling process, and documents in support of its not-for-profit status and income tax exemption. The institution also stated that the institutional website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements under the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and furnished geo-tagged photographs relating to the playground and sports facilities, library and reading room, and multipurpose hall, stating that the requisite instructional and infrastructural facilities are available on the campus.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 06.03.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2026. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that the Change of Land Use certificate issued by the competent authority, namely Nagar Palika Mandal, Kotputli, mentioning all relevant Khasra numbers, had been furnished. The institution further submitted that Shri Ram Shiksha Samiti is registered under the State Government Societies Act, 1958 and enjoys exemption under the Income Tax provisions, and that the relevant exemption and not-for-profit certificates had been placed on record. It was also stated that the institution had furnished the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate, Jamabandi/Mutation records, documentary proof establishing that all Khasra numbers constitute a single contiguous plot, the approved building plan indicating the total land and built-up area for each programme, the Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan, and the barrier-free access certificate issued by the competent authority. The appellant further submitted that the list of admitted students for the preceding three years, generated through the centralized counselling process conducted by Vardhaman Mahaveer Open University, Kota, had been enclosed, along with the No Objection Certificate issued by the State Government. The institution also placed on record the teaching staff list in the prescribed NCTE format duly approved and countersigned by the affiliating body, and bank statements evidencing payment of salaries to faculty in accordance with State/Central Government norms. It was further stated that the institutional website had been updated in compliance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The institution additionally submitted that geo-tagged photographs evidencing the availability of playground and sports facilities had been uploaded; that the library-cum-reading room is adequately equipped with seating capacity for 100 students; and that the institution possesses a multipurpose hall with seating capacity exceeding 200 persons, equipped with approximately 250 sets of furniture, in conformity with the prescribed norms. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal and in response to the deficiencies communicated through the impugned order dated 06.03.2026. The institution submitted that it complies with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, and that the documents furnished are genuine and capable of verification. It was further stated that the Land Use Certificate, latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate, Fire Safety Certificate, Jamabandi/Mutation records, documentary evidence indicating that the relevant Khasra numbers constitute a single land parcel, and the approved building plan reflecting Khasra particulars and programme-wise earmarked land and built-up areas had been placed on record, along with the barrier-free access certificate. The institution also submitted the recommendation certificate issued by the State Government, the teaching staff list duly approved by the affiliating body, salary records evidencing payment through banking channels, the admitted students' list obtained

through the centralized counselling process, and documents relating to its not-for-profit status and income tax exemption, besides stating that the institutional website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. It was additionally submitted that geo-tagged photographs relating to the playground and sports facilities, library and reading room, and multipurpose hall had been furnished in support of the instructional and infrastructural facilities available on the campus. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value and subject to their authenticity, validity, legal admissibility and such verification as may be undertaken by the competent authority in accordance with law.

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 founded 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 06.03.2026 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 06.03.2026 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, Taj Memorial Teacher Training College, Khasra No. 433(433/1), 434, 436 (1008/1004), Village-Jagdisgpura, Street/Road-Jagdishpur, Taluka/Mandal-Kotputli, PO. Sharund, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303105.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.
3. The 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 – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-122/E-404398/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLWRC202615581-**

Pandit Badri Prasad Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. E-1, Village - Riico Industrial Area, Kolana, Bandikui, Baswa, Dausa, Rajasthan-303313	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, WRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

### I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Pandit Badri Prasad Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. E-1, Village - Riico Industrial Area, Kolana, Bandikui, Baswa, Dausa, Rajasthan-303313** dated 30.03.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the refusal order no **F. No. NCTE/ WRC/2627202509162565/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/1667** dated 20.02.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. 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 above documents. 2. The institution has stated that Pandit Badri Prasad Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya and Jyotiba Phule College are situated within a radius of 10 kms. However, the instruction is required to upload evidence of the same. 3. The institution has not filled the category Column of online application. 4. The institution has not uploaded the Mutation Certificate of Land issued by government competent authority. 5. 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 multidisciplinary programmes. 6. The website of institution has NOT been updated and maintained in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time. 7. 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. 8. The ITEP course at Plot No.. E-1 and Plot No. SP-2, RIICO Industrial Area Kolana Bandikui Distt. Dausa (Rajasthan), the Plot No. SP-2 is allotted by RIICO in 2025 whereas the recognition for 4 years B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. course was granted by NCTE in 2017, which is not acceptable. The institution has shifted to new premises without approval from NCTE. The institute is required to clarify the same. 9. As per the land details column land area is 8181.95 sq. mts. whereas the Fire portal plot/land area is mentioned 4000 sq. mts. The land area is mismatched. The institution has not uploaded Fire Safety Certificate with its correct land area issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL [https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track\\_application.aspx](https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx). 10. The uploaded geotagged photographs show that furniture is not available in the multi-purpose hall. 11. The uploaded

geotagged photographs reveal that the reading room in the library does not have seating capacity for students as per NCTE norms. 12. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the college does not have adequate playgrounds and sports facility. 13. Computer labs and ICT related facilities are not visible in the uploaded geotagged photographs 14. 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 15. The institution does not upload the list of teaching staff duly approved and countersigned by its affiliating body in the prescribed format of NCTE and teaching staff should be as per NCTE norms. The institution not upload the proper bank statement of last six months indicating the transaction of the salary / remuneration to its Teaching Staff”.

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

**Representative of Pandit Badri Prasad Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. E-1, Village - Riico Industrial Area, Kolana, Bandikui, Baswa, Dausa, Rajasthan-303313** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. In response of Point no. 1 - The institution stated that as per guide lines for transforming in to multi-disciplinary institution under clause 4.3(i) the institution collaborate Jyotiba Phule College Dhandholai, Bandikui for makeing in Multidisciplinary institutions in this regard the institution uploaded NOC issued by university of Rajasthan & apply for NOC to Govt. of Rajasthan but mean time Govt. of Rajasthan was not issued NOC in prescribed time now the Govt. of Rajasthan had issued NOC vide letter no. F.24( ) ITEP / B.Ed. /N.S./Aakash/2026 dated-13.02.2026 for collaboration of transforming into Multidisciplinary institution, In this regard the institution submitted memorandum of (mou) of collaboration, NOC issued by University of Rajasthan & NOC issued by Govt. of Rajasthan. (Enclose: - Annexure-1, MOU Copy). (Enclose: - Annexure-2, Noc University Of Rajasthan). (Enclose: - Annexure-3, NOC Govt. of Rajasthan). 2. In response of Point no. 2 - The institution stated that Pandit Badri Prasad Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya Bandikui and Jyotiba Phule College Bandikui are situated within a radius of 10 kms. In this Regard institution submitted a certificate no.3374 dated-06.02.2026 issued by Executive Engineer Public Works Department Bandikui Dausa Rajasthan. (Enclose: - Annexure-4 Distance certificate copy). 3. In response of Point no. 3 - The institution Established year 2017 at Plot no. E-1 Area 4000 sqm. allotted by Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited Kolana Bandikui. In Addition, Land Plot no. SP-2 area 4181.95 sqm Alloted by Riico Industrial Area Kolana Bandikui. In Favour of R.G.V.S. Education Development Foundation the above SP-2 Land is at Joint Land to E-1 Plot the SP-2 Land is added for additional land in future. 4. In response of Point no. 4 - The institution stated that land and build up area for running B.Ed. D.El.Ed. B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed., is required as NCTE Regulation 2014 Apendex-2, para 6.1(d) Apendex-2, 3000 sqm. Build up area 3000 sqm land is required. But the land of the institution is plot no.- E-1, 4000.00 sqm and SP-2, 4181.95

sqm total land 8181.95 sqm. Total build up area 4008 sqm for sufficient for existing teacher education programme. In this regard the institution submitted land document and approved building plan. (Enclose: - Annexure 5, Land document copy). (Enclose: - Annexure 6, Building Plan copy). 5. In response of Point no. 5 - The institution stated that as per guide lines for transforming in to multi-disciplinary institution under clause 4.3(i) the institution collaborate Jyotiba Phule College Dhandholai, Bandikui for making in Multidisciplinary institutions in this regard the institution uploaded NOC issued by university of Rajasthan & apply for NOC to Govt. of Rajasthan but mean time Govt. of Rajasthan was not issued NOC in prescribed time now the Govt. of Rajasthan had issued NOC vide letter no. F.24( ) ITEP / B.Ed. /N.S./Aakashi/2026 dated-13.02.2026 for collaboration of transforming into Multidisciplinary institution, In this regard the institution submitted memorandum of (MOU) of collaboration, NOC issued by University of Rajasthan & NOC issued by Govt. of Rajasthan. (Enclose: - Annexure 1, MOU Copy). (Enclose: - Annexure 2, NOC University of Rajasthan). (Enclose: - Annexure 3, NOC Govt. of Rajasthan). 6. In response of Point no. 6 - The Institution stated that both Institution proposed for collaboration are affiliated with the same university that is University of Rajasthan. In this regards the institution submitted affiliation letter for both institutions. (Enclose: - Annexure 7, Affiliation order both Institute copy). 7. In response of Point no. 7 - The institution stated that collaboration institution namely Jyotiba Phule College Dhandholai, is offering liberal art & science in the regards the institution has submitted affiliation later for offering liberal art & science programme issued by University of Rajasthan. 8. In response of Point no. 8 - The institution stated that the category of the institution is private self-finance Institution. 9. In response of Point no. 9 - The institution Stated that the website of the institution has been updated in provision under clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 in this regard the institutions submitted photo copy of home page of institution website. (Enclose: - Annexure 8, Web site home page copy). 10. In response of Point no.10 - The institution Stated that NOC of affiliating university of Rajasthan vide NOC no. ACAD-II/2025/9191dated 28/06/2025 is attached. (Enclose: - Annexure 9, NOC affiliating university of Rajasthan copy). 11. In response of Point no. 11 - The institution stated that land and build up area for running B.Ed. D.El.Ed. B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed., is required as NCTE Regulation 2014 Apendex-2, para 6.1(d) Apendex-2, 3000 sqm. Build up area 3000 sqm land is required. But the land of the institution is plot no.- E-1, 4000.00 sqm and SP-2, 4181.95 sqm total land 8181.95 sqm. Total build up area 4008 sqm for sufficient for existing teacher education programme. In this regard the institution submitted land document and approved building plan. (Enclose: - Annexure 5, Land document copy). (Enclose: - Annexure 6, Building Plan copy). 12. In response point -12, The institution is already uploading photocopy pan & Aadhar cards all society member & again submitted the same. (Enclose: - Annexure 10, Pan & Aadhar copy). 13. In response of Point no. 13 - The institution is already uploading list of admitted student in portal reply of show cause notice the same is again submitted. (Enclose: - Annexure 11, Admitted

student list copy). 14. In response of Point no. 14 - The institution stated that the society/trust is Registered Not for profit in this regards the institution submitted by laws of Memorandum and articles of association. (Enclose: - Annexure 12, Company Memorandum copy). 15. In response of Point no. 15 - The institution is already uploading exemption certificate (Form 12A) issued by Income Tax Department in reply of show cause notice the same again submitted. (Enclose: - Annexure 13, Form 12a copy). 16. In response of Point no. 16 - That the land of the institution allotted by Rajasthan State industrial Development and investment Corporation limited the RIICO is part of govt. of Rajasthan for allotting land to concerned party for education purpose the RIICO allotted land to institutional that is E-1 & SP-2 for a education purpose for period of 99 years in the regards the institutions is submitted land allotment letter & lease deed affidavit enclose. (Enclose: - Annexure 14, Land Document) (Enclose: - Annexure 15, Original Affidavit). 17. In response of Point no. 17 - That Mutation Certificate is not required because land is allotted by Rajasthan State industrial Development and investment Corporation limited for educational purpose. Certificate no.1639 dated-06.03.2026 attached issue by RIICO Dausa. (Enclose: - Annexure 16, Mutation Certificate copy). 18. In response of Point no. 18 - The institution stated that land use certificate is not required for agriculture land to non-agriculture land because land is allotted by Rajasthan State industrial Development and investment Corporation limited for education purpose in this regards the institution is submitted certificate no 1639 dated-06.03.2026 issued by RIICO Dausa. (Enclose: - Annexure 16, CLU certificate copy). 19. In response of Point no. 19 - The institution is already uploaded Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by tehsildar Baswa. In reply SCN the same is again submitted. (Enclose: - Annexure 17, Non-Encumbrance Certificate copy). 20. In response of Point no. 20 - The institution already uploading building plan approved by Assistant Engineer Public Work Department Baswa is reply of SCN the same is again submitted. (Enclose: - Annexure 5, Building Plan copy). 21. In response of Point no. 21 - The institution is already uploaded BCC issued by Assistant Engineer Public Work Department Baswa Reply of SCN the same is again submitted. (Enclose: - Annexure 18, Building Completion Certificate). 22. In response of Point no. 22 - The institution is already uploading staff list approved by affiliating university along with bank statement in reply of SCN the same is again attached. (Enclose: - Annexure 19, Teaching staff List). (Enclose: - Annexure 20, Six Month Bank Statement & Salary Slip). 23. In response of Point no. 23 - The institution is already uploaded geo tag photo with different angels of ramp, Electricity & drinking water, toilets etc. in reply of SCN the same is again attach. (Enclose: - Annexure 21, Photos). 24. In response of Point no. 24 - The institution is already uploaded fire Safety Certificate issued by Nagar Palika Bandikui in reply of SCN the same is again attached. (Enclose: - Annexure 22, Fire Safety Certificate). 25. In response of Point no.25 - The institution is already uploading Building Safety Certificate issued by Executive Engineer Public Work Department Bandikui In reply of SCN the same is again submitted. (Enclose: - Annexure 23, Building Safety Certificate copy). 26. In

response of Point no. 26 - The institution is already uploaded photo with different angles of front view, rear view, Multipurpose Hall, Library, Labs & Playground in reply of SCN the same is again attachment. (Enclose: - Annexure24, Photos). 27. In response of Point no. 27 - The institution is already uploaded Building Disabled Friendly Certificate issued by Assistant Engineer Public Work Department Baswa . In reply of SCN the same is again attached. (Enclose: - Annexure 25, Building Disabled Friendly Certificate). The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. In the affidavit, the institution undertook that it fulfills the requirements prescribed under the NCTE framework for transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) and that the documents furnished are true, correct and duly certified by the competent authorities. The institution stated that Plot No. E-1 measuring 4000 sq. mtrs., allotted by RIICO Limited for educational purposes, together with the constructed building measuring 4008 sq. mtrs., is available for the proposed ITEP and that the said premises are presently being utilized for conducting B.Ed., D.El.Ed. and B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed. integrated programmes. It further submitted that the approved building plan and authenticated site plan issued by the competent authority, indicating the institutional name and plot particulars, have been placed on record. The institution also stated that the sponsoring society is a not-for-profit entity registered under the Companies Act, 2013 and furnished the relevant constitutional documents in support thereof. It additionally submitted Form 10AC issued by the Income Tax Department evidencing exemption under the applicable provisions, valid up to the assessment year 2026-27.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 20.02.2026.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 6<sup>th</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Pandit Badri Prasad Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Bandikui, that it had entered into collaboration with Jyotiba Phule College, Dhandholai, Bandikui, in accordance with Clause 4.3(i) of the Guidelines for transformation into multidisciplinary institutions. In support thereof, the institution placed on record the Memorandum of Collaboration, the No Objection Certificate issued by the University of Rajasthan, and the recommendation/NOC issued by the Government of Rajasthan vide letter dated 13.02.2026. It was further submitted that both institutions are affiliated with the University of Rajasthan, the collaborating institution offers Liberal Arts and Science programmes, and the two institutions are situated within a radius of 10 kilometres, as certified by the Executive Engineer, PWD, Bandikui. The appellant further submitted that the institution possesses sufficient land and built-up area in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014 for conducting B.Ed., D.El.Ed. and B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes, stating that Plot No. E-1 admeasuring 4,000 sq. metres and adjoining Plot No. SP-2 admeasuring 4,181.95 sq. metres, allotted by RIICO for educational purposes, together constitute a total land area of 8,181.95 sq. metres with a built-up area of 4,008 sq. metres. The institution placed on record the relevant land documents, lease deed, approved building plan, Building Completion Certificate, Building Safety Certificate, Fire Safety Certificate, barrier-free access certificate, Non-Encumbrance Certificate and the RIICO certificate indicating that mutation and land use conversion were not separately required in respect of land allotted by RIICO for educational purposes. The institution also submitted that its website had been updated in compliance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and that copies of PAN and Aadhaar details of the society members, admitted students' lists, Memorandum and Articles of Association evidencing not-for-profit status, Form 12A exemption certificate, teaching staff list duly approved by the affiliating university, six months' bank statements and salary slips had been furnished. It was further stated that geo-tagged photographs relating to the institutional infrastructure, including ramps, drinking water facilities, toilets, multipurpose hall, library, laboratories, playground and other campus facilities, had already been uploaded and were again placed on record in support of the compliance claimed. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit in support of the appeal. The institution submitted that it fulfills the requirements prescribed under the NCTE framework for transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) and that the documents furnished are true, correct and issued by the competent authorities. It was stated that Plot No. E-1 measuring 4000 sq. mtrs., allotted by RIICO Limited for educational purposes, together with the constructed building measuring 4008 sq. mtrs., is available for the proposed ITEP and that the said premises are presently being utilized for conducting B.Ed., D.El.Ed. and B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed. integrated programmes. The institution further submitted that the approved building plan and authenticated site plan indicating the institutional name and plot particulars, the constitutional documents

evidencing that the sponsoring society is a not-for-profit entity registered under the Companies Act, 2013, and Form 10AC issued by the Income Tax Department evidencing exemption under the applicable provisions valid up to the assessment year 2026-27, had been placed on record. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value.

The Committee further noted that, 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 purportedly seeking to rectify the deficiencies noted by the Regional Committee. However, a substantial part of such material was admittedly not placed before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order and has not been subjected to verification, scrutiny and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the applicable provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee also took note of the observations of the WRC and the submissions made by the appellant institution regarding the availability, adequacy and earmarking of land and built-up area. The Committee was of the considered view that the matter requires re-examination by the WRC in the light of the provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, the relevant provisions governing ITEP under the NCTE Regulations, 2021, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements. The Committee further observed that the WRC may obtain the considered opinion of the Regulation Division of the NCTE on the issue relating to the proportionate use, allocation and earmarking of land and built-up area for conducting teacher education programmes within a multidisciplinary institution/environment, so as to objectively determine and establish compliance with the mandatory infrastructure norms prescribed under the applicable NCTE framework before arriving at a final decision in the matter.

The Committee is also of the considered view that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution satisfying the requirements of a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the norms and standards prescribed by the NCTE. While processing and considering applications for ITEP, it is incumbent upon the concerned Regional Committee to ensure that the infrastructure facilities, including the land earmarked for undergraduate-level programmes, are duly authenticated and found to be in conformity with the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or other concerned statutory or regulatory authorities, in addition to compliance with the applicable NCTE norms and standards. Such examination shall necessarily include verification of the availability, adequacy and lawful earmarking 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 from time to time, 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 authorities for the programmes already being conducted and those proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled principle that compliance with recognition norms must be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of demonstrating strict, continuous and complete compliance rests upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace, dilute or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee without due verification by the competent authority in accordance with law. 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 20.02.2026 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, 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 20.02.2026 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, Pandit Badri Prasad Shikshak Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Plot No. E-1, Village - Riico Industrial Area, Kolana, Bandikui, Baswa, Dausa, Rajasthan-303313.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**
3. **The 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 – 16.06.2026

**एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-160(A)/E-65791/2018 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**WRCAPPOLD201860401 ✓**

Adarsha Adhyapak Mahavidyalaya, Survey no. 14/2, At. Koli-Karanja (Lad), Maharashtra-444105	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>No one appeared</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	<b>Regional Director, WRC</b>
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2026</b>
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	<b>16.06.2026</b>

## आदेश/ ORDER

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

The appeal of **Adarsha Adhyapak Mahavidyalaya, Survey no. 14/2, At. Koli-Karanja (Lad), Maharashtra-444105** dated 26.02.2018 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the order no **F. No. WRC/OAPW02835/123373/285th/2017/10114** dated 01.01.2018 of the Western Regional Committee, recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "1. List of teaching staff, duly approved by the affiliating body, appointed by the institution for each course. 2. Proof of maintaining the Endowment fund and Reserve fund as per NCTE Regulations, 2014. 3. A duly notarized Building Completion Certificate (BCC) issued by the Competent Authority."

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

No one from **Adarsha Adhyapak Mahavidyalaya, Survey no. 14/2, At. Koli-Karanja (Lad), Maharashtra-444105** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "No explanation given by the Appellant".

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

The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 17.12.2005. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 the institution has submitted affidavit dt. 07.01.2015 for its willingness for adherence of provisions of new Regulations. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 31.05.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the WRC vide order dated 01.01.2018.

The Appeal Committee noted that the instant matter had earlier been adjudicated by the Appeal Committee vide order dated 27.03.2019, whereby the Committee held that the WRC was justified in withdrawing recognition and dismissed the appeal by confirming the impugned order. Aggrieved by the aforesaid appellate order, the institution preferred Writ Petition No. 682 of 2020

before the Hon'ble High Court. The operative part of the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court is reproduced below: -

**“... Heard**

**2. The challenge is to order dated 27.03.2019 passed by respondent no. 2 thereby dismissing appeal filed by the petitioner against order of withdrawal of recognition passed by respondent no.**

**3. The argument is that while deciding appeal, respondent no. 2 did not consider the documents furnished by the petitioner.**

**4. We have gone through the order wherein respondent no. 2 has noted that the petitioner – appellant with the appeal routinely enclosed copies of some documents. The respondent no. 2 thereafter has accepted the conclusion of Western Regional Committee (WRC) to withdraw the recognition.**

**5. We do not find from the order that respondent no. 2 has considered the documents submitted by the petitioner. It has straightaway jumped to the conclusion that the decision of WRC is justified.**

**6. The order impugned, therefore, suffers from non-application of mind. Accordingly, writ petition is partly allowed. Order dated 27.03.2019 passed by respondent no. 2 in Appeal F. no. 89-160(A)/E-65791/2018 is quashed and set aside. The appeal is remanded back to respondent no. 2 for consideration afresh in accordance with law.**

**7. The respondent no. 2 shall consider the documents submitted by the petitioner and take a decision as expeditiously as possible and preferably within three months from the date of receipt of this order.**

**Writ petition is disposed of in above terms.”**

In compliance with the order dated 09.02.2026 passed by the Hon'ble High Court, the Appeal Committee considered the instant case and noted that the appellant institution had submitted a representation dated 30.03.2026 in response to the Appeal Notice dated 19.03.2026, stating that the same was being filed in compliance with the directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay, Nagpur Bench. The appellant institution submitted that all relevant documents and supporting records, as considered necessary by it, had been furnished for consideration by the Appeal Committee and requested that an appropriate decision be taken in accordance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court and the applicable provisions of law. The institution further affirmed that the contents of the representation and the documents annexed thereto are true and correct to the best of its knowledge and belief, and undertook to comply with the norms, standards and other requirements prescribed by the NCTE from time to time.

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the matter in the present meeting and considered Appeal Report, the documents placed on record, and the submissions advanced during the online hearing. The Appeal Committee, upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the

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

- (i) The appellant institution submitted a faculty list which is neither approved nor countersigned by the affiliating University. Further, the faculty list indicates that the appointments were made during the year 2025, i.e., subsequent to the withdrawal of recognition by the WRC. The institution has not furnished the duly approved faculty list pertaining to the relevant period when recognition was in force.
- (ii) The Building Completion Certificate furnished by the appellant institution has not been authenticated/certified by the competent authority designated for issuance of such certificate in terms of the applicable regulatory requirements.
- (iii) The Appeal Committee noted that, despite having been afforded a specific opportunity, in the interest of natural justice, to furnish duly authenticated documentary evidence, including a valid Building Completion Certificate, the approved faculty list pertaining to the relevant period, proof of salary disbursement through banking channels, the appellant institution failed to place the requisite documents on record. The deficiencies relate to compliance with mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, and the submissions made by the institution remained unsupported by contemporaneous and verifiable documentary evidence.

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

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

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

factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 01.01.2018 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

**IV. DECISION: -**

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, holds that the appellant institution, having no subsisting recognition, lawful affiliation, or duly approved faculty, is non-existent in law for regulatory purposes. Accordingly, the withdrawal order dated 01.01.2018 passed by the Western Regional Committee is confirmed and the appeal is rejected.

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

  
उप सचिव (अपील)/ Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

**Copy to :-**

1. **The Principal, Adarsha Adhyapak Mahavidyalaya, Survey no. 14/2, At. Koli-Karanja (Lad), Maharashtra-444105.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.
3. The Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Directorate of Higher Education, Elphiston Technical School premises, 3, Mahapalika Marg, Dhobi Talao, Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus Area, Fort, Mumbai, Maharashtra 400001.



**एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY**

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

दिनांक/ Date – 16.06.2026

**एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/**  
**APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT**  
**89-128/E-404809/2026 Appeal/8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026**  
**APPLNRC202314716 -**

Deen Dayal Mahesh Public College of Education, Khasra No. 467/88, Village - Sugh Bhatoli, Indora, Mandoli, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh-176022	<b><u>Vs</u></b>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
<b>APPELLANT</b>		<b>RESPONDENT</b>

<b>Representative of Appellant</b>	<b>Representative of the institution</b>
<b>Respondent by</b>	Regional Director, NRC
<b>Date of Hearing</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2026
<b>Date of Pronouncement</b>	16.06.2026

## आदेश/ ORDER

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

The appeal of **Deen Dayal Mahesh Public College of Education, Khasra No. 467/88, Village - Sugh Bhatoli, Indora, Mandoli, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh-176022** dated 12.10.2023 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per the order no **F. NCTE-Reg/015/3803/2021--Regulation Section (HP)-NRC/222968** dated 14.08.2023 of the Northern Regional Committee, recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "1. The institution is not a Multi-Disciplinary institution as defined under clause 2(b) of NCTE Regulation, 2014. 2. The Non-Encumbrance Certificate submitted is issued in 2003. Latest NEC not submitted. 3. The institution has simply submitted the computerized building plan. Plot/Khasra/Khata No. not mentioned in the Building Plan. The Building plan is not approved by any Government Engineer, as desired by NRC. It is simply signed by Regd. Architect. 4. The Building Completion Certificate is not in the prescribed format of NRC. The same is also not issued by any Government Engineer. It is simply signed by Registered Architect. 5. The institution has not submitted the Site Plan issued by the Competent Authority. 6. The institution has not submitted the Building Disabled Friendly Certificate issued by the Competent Authority. 7. The institution has not submitted the Building Safety Certificate issued by the Competent Authority. 8. Fire Safety Certificate issued by Competent Authority of the State Government not submitted. 9. The institution has submitted the FDRs from Kangra Central Co-operative Bank, which is not acceptable as per NCTE Regulations. 10. The institution has shown only seven teaching staff, as against requirement of 1+15 for two units of B.Ed. course. 11. None of the staff is approved by the affiliating body. 12. The website of the institution is not updated as per clause 7(14) and 8(14) of NCTE Regulations 2014."

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

**Representative of Deen Dayal Mahesh Public College of Education, Khasra No. 467/88, Village - Sugh Bhatoli, Indora, Mandoli, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh-176022** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. In the response to Final Show Cause Notice we sent point wise reply on ref. no. DDM/B.Ed./ 1202 on dated 11.07.2023. 2. We submitted all the land documents (Hibanama, Lease Deed, Land Total Certificate etc. 3. We also sent the Building Completion Certificate, Building Plan. 4. We have submitted the two copies of FDRs of SBI Bank (Amount 500000 and 700000 and one FDR of 10 Lac. From KCCB. (Our two FDRs of SBI Bank is pledged in NCTE office w.e.f. 2015). 5. We have only one unit. 6. Our college website is updated. The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit/declaration in support of the appeal and in

compliance with the deficiencies communicated through the withdrawal order dated 14.08.2023, as well as the directions contained in the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in CM APPL. No. 81995/2025. In the affidavit, the institution undertook that the information furnished is true and based on official records and that any variation or incorrect information would attract action under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The institution submitted the land occupancy certificate, latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate and Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authorities, and placed on record the approved building plan and authenticated site plan indicating the institutional land particulars and programme-wise built-up area. It further stated that the latest faculty list for the B.Ed. programme, duly approved by the Registrar, Himachal Pradesh University, in accordance with the prescribed norms, had been furnished. The institution also submitted salary statements of the faculty members duly certified by the concerned bank authorities in support of payment through banking channels.

### III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

**The Appeal Committee, in its 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 2026 held online on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 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 18.08.2004. 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 31.07.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 14.08.2023.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution submitted that an online application was filed on 12.10.2023. However, the hard copy of the application could not be submitted within the stipulated time. The appellant institution approached the Hon'ble High Court by filing a writ petition. The Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 12.10.2023, issued directions in the matter. In compliance with the aforesaid directions, the institution requested that its case be considered on merits and appropriate relief be granted in accordance with law. The operative part of the Hon'ble High Court order is as under:-

#### **CM APPL. 81995/2025 (Exemption)**

*1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.*

2. *Application stands disposed of.*

**W.P. (C) No. 19623/2025**

*"6. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of taking on record the assurance of the Petitioner that all necessary documents will be furnished after a communication is received from the Respondents indicating the documents required. Respondents shall send a communication to the Petitioner indicating the documents required and on receipt of the same, Petitioner will furnish the requisite documents. Thereafter, Respondents shall take a fresh decision on the pending statutory appeal dated 12.10.2023, after granting opportunity of personal hearing to the Petitioner. Reasoned and speaking order shall be passed by the Appellate Committee and communicated to the Petitioner. The entire exercise will be completed within six weeks from today. Needless to state if aggrieved, Petitioner will be at liberty to take recourse to legal remedies."*

The instant matter was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Appeal Committee meeting. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the matter decided to grant second opportunity to the institution to submit the required mentioned therein.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution that a point-wise reply to the Final Show Cause Notice had been submitted vide reference No. DDM/B.Ed./1202 dated 11.07.2023. The institution stated that it had furnished all relevant land-related documents, including the Hibanama, Lease Deed and Land Total Certificate, along with the Building Completion Certificate and approved Building Plan. It was further submitted that copies of Fixed Deposit Receipts, comprising two FDRs of ₹5,00,000 and ₹7,00,000 respectively from the State Bank of India and one FDR of ₹10,00,000 from KCCB, had been placed on record, and that the two SBI FDRs had remained pledged with the NCTE since 2015. The appellant also clarified that the institution was running only one unit and that its website had been updated. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution had submitted an affidavit/declaration in support of the appeal and in response to the deficiencies communicated through the withdrawal order dated 14.08.2023, as well as in the context of the directions contained in the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in CM APPL. No. 81995/2025. The institution submitted that the particulars furnished in the affidavit were true and based on official records and acknowledged that any variation or incorrect information would entail consequences under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The institution further stated that the land occupancy certificate, latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate and Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authorities had been placed on record, along with the approved building plan and authenticated site plan indicating the institutional land particulars and programme-wise built-up area. It was also submitted that the latest faculty list for the B.Ed. programme, duly approved by the Registrar, Himachal Pradesh University, in accordance with the prescribed norms, and salary statements of faculty members duly certified by the concerned bank authorities had been furnished. The aforesaid submissions and documents were taken on record as filed by the

appellant institution, without expressing any opinion on their evidentiary value and subject to their authenticity, validity, legal admissibility and such verification as may be undertaken by the competent authority in accordance with law.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the material available on record, and the submissions advanced during the hearing, records that at the appellate stage under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record certain documents and a compliance report in purported rectification of the deficiencies noted in the impugned order. However, it is evident that a substantial portion of such material was either not placed before the concerned Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not undergone due verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. Under the statutory scheme of the NCTE Act, 1993 read with the aforesaid Regulations, grant, continuation, or modification of recognition is contingent upon strict, demonstrable, and contemporaneous compliance with the prescribed norms and standards relating to land, building, instructional and infrastructural facilities, duly qualified and approved faculty, and other regulatory parameters, which must be established through duly authenticated and verifiable documentary evidence. Mere assertions, undertakings, or reliance upon unverified documents cannot displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee in exercise of its statutory jurisdiction. The Appeal Committee reiterates that the statutory burden to establish compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and no vested, accrued, or equitable right arises merely upon submission of representations or additional documents unless such compliance is established in accordance with law at the time of consideration. The regulatory framework does not contemplate post facto regularization on the basis of unverified, incomplete, or subsequently produced material. At the same time, the Committee notes that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and are capable of objective verification within the statutory framework. The additional documents placed on record during appellate proceedings are relevant to the issues under consideration and, in the interest of procedural fairness, warrant examination by the competent authority. In this context, the Committee takes note of the principle laid down 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 held that documents produced at the appellate stage may be examined for the limited purpose of verification, subject to scrutiny by the competent authority.

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 submissions and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the Appeal Committee, 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 to ensure factual verification and strict regulatory scrutiny of the appellant institution's claim of compliance. Since the institutional land is stated to be held on lease, the authenticity, validity and continued subsistence of the leasehold rights assume material significance and require thorough examination by the Northern Regional Committee. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 14.08.2023 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the Northern Regional Committee for fresh consideration. The NRC shall undertake a comprehensive re-examination of the appellant institution's claim and specifically verify the legality, validity, continuity and enforceability of the lease deed, together with all land and infrastructure related documents, including title/lease documents, Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC), Change of Land Use (CLU) Certificate, approved Building Plan, Building Completion Certificate (BCC), Building Safety/Structural Stability Certificate and all other statutory approvals issued by the competent authorities designated by the Government of Himachal Pradesh. The NRC shall satisfy itself that the documents were valid, subsisting and legally enforceable at the relevant point of time and that the land and building earmarked for the teacher education programme fully conform to the requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The appellant institution shall, within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of this order, submit

before the NRC a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness and completeness of all documents relied upon, together with certified copies of all statutory approvals and certificates issued by the competent authorities. The burden of establishing strict compliance shall rest entirely upon the appellant institution. The NRC, being the statutory custodian and primary fact-finding authority, shall independently verify the authenticity, adequacy and legal validity of all documents and, if considered necessary, undertake further verification, including inspection through a Visiting Team or any other appropriate mechanism, for the purpose of ascertaining actual and regulatory compliance. Thereafter, the NRC shall pass a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations contained herein, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that the present remand is confined to ensuring due verification and regulatory scrutiny and shall not be construed as recognising any right, creating any equity, conferring any presumption of compliance, or expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims. In the event the appellant institution fails to establish complete and strict compliance with the statutory requirements, including the legality and subsistence of the leasehold land and related approvals, the claim shall be liable to be rejected 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 14.08.2023 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, Deen Dayal Mahesh Public College of Education, Khasra No. 467/88, Village - Sugh Bhatoli, Indora, Mandoli, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh-176022.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan -2, New Delhi – 110001.**

3. The 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.