



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 – 21.07.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-267/E-413349/2026 /Appeal/10th Meeting, 2026
APPLERC202615684 / E-90482

Assam University, Department of Education, Plot No. 197, 92/98, 93/199, 94/200, Dorgakona, Cachar, Assam – 788011	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Prof. Ajay Kumar Singh, Professor, Department of Education
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	06.07.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.07.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Assam University, Department of Education, Plot No. 197, 92/98, 93/199, 94/200, Dorgakona, Cachar, Assam – 788011** dated 18.06.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F.No.NCTE/ERC/2627202509202989/ASSAM/2025/REJC/1704** dated 10.02.2026 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “1. HoD is not qualified as per the NCTE Regulation. 2. The institution has not appointed teaching faculty course-wise and subject wise as per NCTE Regulations amended from time to time.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Prof. Ajay Kumar Singh, Professor, Department of Education of Assam University, Department of Education, Plot No. 197, 92/98, 93/199, 94/200, Dorgakona, Cachar, Assam – 788011 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Assam University has appointed Prof. R. K. Mahto as the Independent Coordinator of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) and M.Ed. Programme of the Department of Education. He possesses the qualifications and experience prescribed under the NCTE Regulations and shall oversee the academic and administrative functioning of these programmes. In his capacity as Independent Coordinator, Prof. Mahto will be responsible for monitoring, coordinating, and ensuring the effective implementation of the ITEP and M.Ed. programmes in accordance with the applicable regulations and university norms. Prof. Mahto shall report directly to the Dean, A. M. School of Educational Sciences, Assam University, for all matters relating to the administration and functioning of the programmes. 2. The observation regarding non-appointment of teaching faculty course-wise and subject-wise as per the NCTE Regulations, as amended from time to time, has been duly complied with. The University has appointed and deployed the requisite teaching faculty for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) in accordance with the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Regulations. The appointed faculty members possess the qualifications, experience, and subject specializations required under the applicable NCTE norms for the respective courses and subject areas. Further, Prof. R. K. Mahto has been appointed as the Independent Coordinator of the ITEP in the Department of Education. He fulfils the qualifications and experience requirements prescribed by the NCTE Regulations and has been entrusted with the responsibility of overseeing the academic and administrative functioning of the programme. He shall report directly to the Dean, A. M. School

of Educational Sciences, Assam University. Accordingly, the University is presently in compliance with the faculty requirements and other relevant provisions stipulated under the applicable NCTE Regulations. The appellant institution also submitted vide letter dated 9th June 2026 that its application for recognition of the ITEP (Transition) B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) Programme had been rejected on account of deficiencies relating to the qualification of the Head of the Department and appointment of teaching faculty under the NCTE norms. The institution submitted that the Letter of Intent was issued on 26.11.2025, compliance thereto was submitted on 20.01.2026, and a detailed compliance report along with supporting documents was furnished in response to the Post-LOI Show Cause Notice dated 02.02.2026. It further stated that the deficiencies pointed out by the Regional Committee were administrative and rectifiable in nature and had subsequently been complied with by furnishing the requisite documentary evidence. The institution submitted that the qualifications of the Head of the Department and the appointment/deployment of faculty members had been brought in conformity with the applicable NCTE Regulations.” It further explained that the appeal could not be filed within the prescribed period due to procedural and technical constraints beyond its control and sought condonation of delay. The institution stated that it has been successfully conducting the Integrated B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme and possesses the requisite academic expertise, infrastructure and institutional capacity for offering the ITEP Programme. It further submitted that the present application relates to the transition of the existing Integrated B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme into the ITEP framework envisaged under NEP 2020 and the NCTE Regulations. The institution also stated that it is prepared to admit eligible NCET-qualified candidates in accordance with the applicable NCTE Regulations, NCET admission procedures, Government reservation policy and University rules. It further undertook to comply with all statutory requirements, regulations and quality benchmarks prescribed by the NCTE from time to time.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 10th Meeting, 2026 held online on 06th & 7th July, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Eastern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running

the ITEP Course on 27.09.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the ERC vide order dated 10.02.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Assam University, against the refusal of its application for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The appellant submitted that the deficiencies relating to the appointment of an Independent Coordinator and teaching faculty have been rectified. The appellant submitted that Prof. R. K. Mahto has been appointed as the Independent Coordinator for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) and M.Ed. Programme in the Department of Education. It was stated that he possesses the qualifications and experience prescribed under the NCTE Regulations and has been entrusted with the academic and administrative coordination of the programmes. The appellant further submitted that the Independent Coordinator shall report directly to the Dean, A. M. School of Educational Sciences, Assam University, for matters relating to the administration and functioning of the programmes. The appellant further submitted that the University has appointed and deployed the requisite course-wise and subject-wise teaching faculty for the ITEP in accordance with the qualifications, experience and subject specializations prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, as amended from time to time. It was stated that the institution has complied with the faculty requirements and other relevant provisions applicable to the programme. Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution vide letter dated 9th June, 2026 submitted that its application for recognition of the ITEP (Transition) B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) Programme had been rejected on account of deficiencies relating to the qualification of the Head of the Department and appointment of teaching faculty under the applicable NCTE norms. The institution stated that the Letter of Intent was issued on 26.11.2025, compliance thereto was submitted on 20.01.2026, and a detailed compliance report along with supporting documents was furnished in response to the Post-LOI Show Cause Notice dated 02.02.2026. It further submitted that the deficiencies pointed out by the Regional Committee were administrative and rectifiable in nature and clarified that the requisite compliance had subsequently been furnished along with documentary evidence. The institution submitted that the qualifications of the Head of the Department and the appointment/deployment of faculty members had been brought in conformity with the applicable NCTE Regulations and placed the relevant documents on record. It further explained that the appeal could not be filed within the prescribed period due to procedural and technical constraints beyond its control. The institution also stated that it has been conducting the Integrated B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme and possesses the requisite academic expertise, infrastructure and institutional capacity for offering the ITEP Programme. It further submitted

that the present application relates to the transition of the existing Integrated B.Sc. B.Ed. Programme into the ITEP framework envisaged under NEP, 2020 and the NCTE Regulations. The institution also stated that it is prepared to admit eligible NCET-qualified candidates in accordance with the applicable NCTE Regulations, NCET admission procedures, Government reservation policy and University rules, and undertook to comply with the statutory requirements, regulations and quality benchmarks prescribed by the NCTE. 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 of appointment of duly qualified faculty 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 mandatory statutory requirements governing duly qualified faculty, and other regulatory parameters, which must be established through duly authenticated and verifiable documentary evidence in terms of NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), 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 prescribed infrastructure & instructional requirements including availability of duly qualified faculty of the institution in its capacity as a Multidisciplinary Institution intending to offer the ITEP programme, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended, the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory requirements, taking into account the land and built-up area requirements prescribed by the respective competent/statutory authority for the programmes already established and proposed to be offered by the institution. It is a settled position that compliance with recognition norms is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated, and verifiable documentary evidence, and the burden of establishing strict and continuous compliance rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto submissions, or unverified documents cannot, by themselves, displace or invalidate the findings recorded by the Regional Committee. In this context, the Committee also takes note of the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016***, wherein it has been recognised that subsequent material and developments brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely on the ground that the same were not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order. The Hon'ble Court has recognised that such material may be considered by the Appellate Authority and, where warranted, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, the Committee emphasises that consideration of additional material at the appellate stage does not ipso facto establish regulatory compliance or confer validity upon such documents, and that any such material is necessarily required to be subjected to strict factual verification and regulatory scrutiny in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

Noting the Appeal Report, the submissions placed on record, the material available in the appeal file, the applicable statutory framework, and upon careful, independent, and objective consideration of the entire matter, and having regard to the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the present case, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and in furtherance of the principles of fairness and due process, deems it appropriate to set aside the impugned order dated 10.02.2026 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC), strictly for the limited purpose of factual re-examination of the appellant institution's claim regarding fulfilment of requirement of appointment of duly qualified faculty, and other regulatory parameters/deficiencies identified in the impugned order, which must be established through duly authenticated and verifiable documentary

evidence in terms of NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended). 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 & instructional facilities with appointment of duly qualified faculty, including land earmarked for the undergraduate-level programme, are duly authenticated and conform to the norms prescribed by the UGC and/or the concerned statutory/regulatory authority, in addition to the applicable NCTE Norms and Standards. The Regional Committee shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations made herein. It is clarified that the present remand is limited in scope and shall not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution.

IV. **DECISION:** -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order, the records available on file, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, hereby sets aside the impugned order dated 10.02.2026 and remands the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) for fresh consideration and factual re-examination, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, subject to the directions contained hereinabove. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a reasonable timeframe.

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


उप सचिव (अपील)/ Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Assam University, Department of Education, Plot No. 197, 92/98, 93/199, 94/200, Dorgakona, Cachar, Assam – 788011.**
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 Education, Govt. of Assam, Assam Secretariat, Block 'C', 3rd Floor, Secretariat Road, Dispur, Guwahati, Assam-781006.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date – 21.07.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-269/E-413974/2026 /Appeal/10th Meeting, 2026

APPLWRC202615678 ✓

Bagoda College, Khasra no. 2679/273, 2680/273, 2681/273, 273, 2936/2926, Bagoda, Sayala, Jalore, Rajasthan-343032	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Mr. S. S. Chouhan, Secretary
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	06.07.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.07.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Bagoda College, Khasra no. 2679/273, 2680/273, 2681/273, 273, 2936/2926, Bagoda, Sayala, Jalore, Rajasthan-343032** dated 23.06.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No.NCTE/WRC/2627202510023577/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/1612** dt. 24.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "i. As per the affiliation order is uploaded, the institution is conducting only B.A. programme. The institution is not running multi-disciplinary B.Sc. course in the field of sciences, or mathematics as per Regulation no. NCTE-Regl011/80/2018- MS(Regulation)-HQ dated 26.10.2021 as amended from time to time and Public Notice no. NCTE-Regl012/7/2025-Reg. Sec-HQ dated 12.09.2025 related with extension of timeline to existing recognized teacher education institutions for transition from B.Sc.B.Ed. Programme to ITEP before the start of academic session 2026-27. The institution does not fall in the category of multi-disciplinary institution for B.Sc. B.Ed. course. ii. The institution is required to upload Mutation (Jamabandi) Certificate mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government. iii. The institution is conducting degree courses Le. B.A. 240x3=720. The sufficiency of total built-up area measuring 3019.34 sq.mts. for the above multidisciplinary courses and for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), and B.Ed. course with two Unit 100 seats cannot be ascertained. iv. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the Multipurpose Hall is not as per NCTE norms. furniture in the multipurpose hall is inadequate. v. A board with the name of the college is seen to be put up temporarily. This board can be removed at any time. vi. It cannot be ascertained from the bank statement uploaded by the institution that the salary is being paid as per Central/State Govt. The institution has not been able to prove/confirm whether it is paying salary to the teaching staff as per Central/State Govt norms vii. The uploaded teaching staff list is not as per NCTE norms and not in the prescribed format of NCTE. This teaching staff list is not signed by Registrar of the University. viii. 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 ix. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of Library reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. x. Computer lab is not in good condition and ICT related facilities are not visible in the uploaded geotagged photographs. xi. Committee noted that, the institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. 240x3=720. The sufficiency of total built-up area measuring 3019.34 sq.mts. for the above multidisciplinary courses and for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary

(1 unit), and B.Ed. course with two Unit 100 seats cannot be ascertained. The area earmarked for Multi-disciplinary programmes is not adequate as per the Guidelines issued by the Government of Rajasthan for available on <https://hte.rajasthan.gov.in/dept/dce/uploads/doc/NOCpolicy202122.pdf>. xii. 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.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Mr. S. S. Chouhan, Secretary of Bagoda College, Khasra no. 2679/273, 2680/273, 2681/273, 273, 2936/2926, Bagoda, Sayala, Jalore, Rajasthan-343032 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The intuitions is running multidisciplinary course Certificate issue by affiliated body Jai Narain Vyas University jodhpur wide no-JNVU/Afft/2026/2182 dated-20-06-2026. The institution is running multi-disciplinary BA & B.Sc. course recognize by State Government Rajasthan. Enclosed multidisciplinary course Certificate issue by affiliated Jai Narain Vyas University jodhpur and NOC of State Government Rajasthan. Annexure-1. 2.The institution has uploaded Mutation Certificate and Jamabandi with all Khashra/Survey Number issued by Competent Authority of State Government. Vide No. 1 dated 09.02.2026. (Enclosed Mutation Certificate & Jamabandi copy). Annexure-2. 3. With reference to the observation regarding the built-up area, we would like to clarify that the 3,019.34 Sq. mts, was a clerical mistake. The institution actually possesses a total built-up area of 6,800.00 Sq. mts. This actual arca of 6,800.00 Sq. mts. Built-up area is fully sufficient to run multidisciplinary courses B.A. degree course & B.Sc. degree course and teacher education programme B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 Unit), B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 Unit), and the B.Ed. course. The institution has submitted Building plan prepared by Registered Planning Engineer and approved by the Assistant Engineer, PWD, Sayala, Jalore, Rajasthan. (A copy of the Approval building plan attached). Annexure-3. 4. The institution has a multipurpose hall as per NCTE Norms with a seating capacity of more than 200 students. It is well-furnished with featuring a dais and all amenities. The Multipurpose Hall area 2536.4 sq. fts. In this regard, enclosed the geotagged photographs have been uploaded. Annexure- 4. 5.The institution has installed a permanent digital LED monitor name of the college board with an electrical system. supported by an iron frame with GI pipes, and steel-aluminium channels. In this regard. Enclosed the geo-tagged photograph of the College board. Enclosed geo-tagged photograph of the College name

board. Annexure- 5 The institution is paying salary through the Bank. Teaching faculty salary which is being paid as per the Central/State Government pay scale. The institution has submitted details of salary statement issued by SBI Bank, Jalore, (Enclosed the Bank statement) Annexure-6 The institution is submitting the teaching staff list in the prescribed NCTE format and as per NCTE norms. The list is duly approved and signed by the Registrar of the affiliating university. (copy the prescribed format with approval list enclosed) Annexure-7. 8. The institution has fully updated and maintained its official website in compliance with the provisions under Clauses 7(14)(1), 8(6), 8(14), and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended from time to time). The institutional website is fully functional as per NCTE norms and can be accessed via the link: www.bagodacollege.com. Enclosed the Copy of Home page of website) Annexure-8. 9. The institution has a well-equipped library reading room currently features a seating capacity for more than 60 students. Which is fully sufficient as per NCTE norms. The institution has a total area of Library reading room 1740.48 sq. ft., Fts., (Enclosed Library reading room with seating Geotagged photographs) Annexure-9.10. The institution has a well-furnished and fully functional computer lab. All ICT facilities are in excellent condition and working properly. We have enclosed new geotagged photographs that clearly show the computer lab and the ICT equipment. Enclosed the geotagged photographs of Computer lab with ICT related. Annexure-10. 11. With reference to the observation regarding the built-up area we would like to clarify that the 3,019.34 Sq. mtrs. mentioned in the records was a clerical mistake. The institution actually possesses a total built-up area of 6,800.00 Sq. mtrs. This actual built-up area of 6,800.00 Sq. mtrs. is fully adequate and completely satisfies building norms prescribed for running multidisciplinary programmes. It is fully sufficient to run all our existing courses, including the B.A. degree course, B.Sc. degree course, B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 Unit), B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 Unit), and the B.Ed. course. The institution has submitted the Building Plan prepared by a Registered Planning Engineer and duly approved by the Assistant Engineer, PWD, Sayala (Jalore, Rajasthan). Earmarked of the Land area for the Multidisciplinary programme 4996.00 sq. mtrs and for the Teacher education programme 6000.00 sq. mtrs. Earmarked of the built-up area for the Multidisciplinary programme 2200.00 sq. mtrs and for the Teacher education programme and B.Ed. 4600.00 sq. mtrs (Enclosed approval building plan) Annexure-11. 12. The institution has submitted a proper Building Plan with mentioning name of institution, Khasra/Survey Number and mentioning the total land area and total built-up area, earmarked for each course being run in the premises and the demarcated land and built-up area for the teacher education programmes including multidisciplinary programmes prepared by a Registered Planning Engineer and duly approved by the Competent Authority of the State Government, the Assistant Engineer, PWD, Sayala, Jalore, Rajasthan. In The building plan clearly shows the total land area of 10,996.00 Sq. Mtrs., Earmarked of the Land area for the Multidisciplinary programme 4996.00 sq. mtrs and

for the Teacher education programme 6000.00 sq. mtrs. Earmarked of the built-up area for the Multidisciplinary programme 2200.00 sq. mtrs and for the Teacher education programme and B.Ed. 4600.00 sq. mtrs (Enclosed the approval Building plan) Annexure-12.” The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the deficiencies communicated by the Regional Committee and had fulfilled the applicable provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. The institution submitted that it is a multidisciplinary institution conducting B.A. and B.Sc. programmes and furnished the certificate issued by Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur, together with the State Government No Objection Certificate in support thereof. The institution further submitted the Mutation (Jamabandi) Certificate issued by the competent authority covering all Khasra numbers. It clarified that the built-up area of 3,019.34 sq. mtrs. reflected earlier was due to a clerical error and stated that the actual total built-up area is 6,800 sq. mtrs., supported by the approved building plan prepared by a Registered Planning Engineer and approved by the Assistant Engineer, PWD, indicating the earmarked land and built-up area for the multidisciplinary and teacher education programmes. The institution further submitted that the multipurpose hall, library with reading room, computer laboratory, ICT facilities and permanent institutional name board are available in accordance with the prescribed norms and furnished geo-tagged photographs in support thereof. The institution also submitted that salaries are being paid through banking channels in accordance with the applicable pay scales and furnished salary statements and bank records. It further submitted the teaching staff list in the prescribed NCTE format duly approved by the affiliating university. The institution stated that its official website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The institution also undertook that all documents and information furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid, verifiable and issued by the competent statutory authorities.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 10th Meeting, 2026 held online on 06th & 7th July, 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 24.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Bagoda College, against the refusal of its application for transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The appellant submitted that the deficiencies pointed out in the refusal order have been rectified by furnishing the requisite documents and clarifications. The appellant submitted that the institution is conducting multidisciplinary B.A. and B.Sc. programmes, duly recognized by the Government of Rajasthan, and that a certificate issued by Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur, along with the State Government NOC, has been furnished. It was further submitted that the institution has uploaded the Mutation Certificate and Jamabandi containing all relevant Khasra/Survey numbers issued by the competent State Government authority. The appellant further submitted that the built-up area of 3,019.34 sq. metres reflected in the records was due to a clerical error and that the actual built-up area is 6,800 sq. metres, which is adequate for conducting the multidisciplinary programmes and the teacher education programmes, namely B.A.B.Ed. (one unit), B.Sc.B.Ed. (one unit), and B.Ed. It was stated that the institution has submitted a Building Plan prepared by a Registered Planning Engineer and approved by the Assistant Engineer, Public Works Department, Sayala, Jalore, indicating a total land area of 10,996 sq. metres, with 4,996 sq. metres earmarked for multidisciplinary programmes and 6,000 sq. metres for teacher education programmes, and a built-up area of 2,200 sq. metres earmarked for multidisciplinary programmes and 4,600 sq. metres for teacher education programmes. The appellant also submitted that the institution has a Multipurpose Hall conforming to NCTE norms with seating capacity for more than 200 students; a permanent digital LED name board displaying the name of the institution; a library reading room with seating capacity for more than 60 students; and a well-equipped Computer Laboratory with ICT facilities, supported by updated geo-tagged photographs. The appellant further submitted that salaries are being disbursed through banking channels in accordance with the applicable Central/State Government pay scales, supported by salary statements issued by State Bank of India. It was also submitted that the teaching staff list, duly approved and signed by the Registrar, Jai Narain Vyas University, has been furnished in the prescribed NCTE format. The appellant additionally submitted that the institutional website has been updated and maintained in compliance with Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution submitted an Affidavit that it had complied with the deficiencies communicated by the Regional Committee and fulfilled the applicable provisions of the

National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. The institution submitted that it is a multidisciplinary institution conducting B.A. and B.Sc. programmes and placed on record the certificate issued by Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur, along with the No Objection Certificate issued by the State Government in support thereof. The institution further submitted the Mutation (Jamabandi) Certificate issued by the competent authority covering all relevant Khasra numbers. It clarified that the earlier reference to a built-up area of 3,019.34 sq. metres was due to a clerical error and stated that the actual total built-up area is 6,800 sq. metres, supported by the approved building plan prepared by a Registered Planning Engineer and approved by the Assistant Engineer, PWD, indicating the earmarked land and built-up area for the multidisciplinary and teacher education programmes. The institution further submitted that the multipurpose hall, library with reading room, computer laboratory, ICT facilities and permanent institutional name board are available in accordance with the prescribed norms and placed on record geo-tagged photographs in support thereof. The institution also submitted that salaries of the teaching staff are being disbursed through banking channels in accordance with the applicable norms and furnished salary statements and bank records. It further stated that the teaching staff list in the prescribed NCTE format, duly approved by the affiliating university, had been furnished. The institution also submitted that its official website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014, and undertook that all documents and information furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid, verifiable and issued by the competent statutory authorities. 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, Bagoda College, Khasra no. 2679/273, 2680/273, 2681/273, 273, 2936/2926, Bagoda, Sayala, Jalore, Rajasthan-343032.**
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 – 21.07.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-270/E-413715/2026 /Appeal/10th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615677 ✓

Maharishi Dadhichi Mahila Mahavidhyalaya, Plot No. 2, Madhuban Housing Board, Basni – I, Jodhpur City, Jodhpur, Rajasthan- 342005	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G- 7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Mr. Asutosh Dadhich, Director (Admin)
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	06.07.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.07.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Maharishi Dadhichi Mahila Mahavidhyalaya, Plot No. 2, Madhuban Housing Board, Basni – I, Jodhpur City, Jodhpur, Rajasthan-342005** dated 20.06.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F.No.NCTE/WRC/2627202509273385/RAJASTHAN/REJC/7** dated 24.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “i. The institution has not uploaded Exemption Certificate (12A) issued by Income Tax Department instead of Form 10AC. ii. As per the approved Building Plan uploaded by the institution is mentioned the Built-up area is 4455.56 sq. mts. Whereas the mentioned built-up area in the uploaded BCC is 3851 sq. mts. The Built-up area is mismatched. iii. The institution has not uploaded Mutation Certificate/Jamabandi mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government. iv. 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. v. The institution has NOT uploaded additional information and NOT maintained their website as per provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time. vi. The institution is required to upload Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL https://lsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx. vii. Now the institute is showing a separate room as the reading room of the library. This room does not seem to be connected to the library. The reading room should be in the library. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of Library reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms. viii. The institution uploaded teaching staff list, but it has not in the prescribed format of NCTE and as per NCTE norms. ix. 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. The institution has not been able to prove/confirm whether the institution is paying salaries to the teaching staff as per Central/State Govt norms x. The institution has not uploaded the approved intake capacity of each course. The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. 2 sections, B.Com. 1 Section, B.Sc. 2 Sections. The sufficiency of land and built-up area for the above courses with of multidisciplinary courses and intake for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (1 unit), course cannot be ascertained. The area earmarked for multi-disciplinary programmes is not adequate as per the Guidelines issued by the Government of Rajasthan for available on <https://hte.rajasthan.gov.in/dept/dce/>

uploads/doc/NOCpolicy202122.pdf. xi. Computer lab is not in good condition and ICT related facilities are not visible in the uploaded geotagged photographs.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Mr. Asutosh Dadhich, Director (Admin) of Maharishi Dadhichi Mahila Mahavidhyalaya, Plot No. 2, Madhuban Housing Board, Basni – I, Jodhpur City, Jodhpur, Rajasthan-342005 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The institution had uploaded Form 10AC issued by the Income Tax Department evidencing registration and exemption status under the Income Tax Act. 2. The difference between the built-up area mentioned in the approved Building Plan (4455.56 sq. mtrs.) and the Building Completion Certificate (3851 sq. mtrs.) has arisen due to the fact that the approved plan depicts the total sanctioned construction, whereas the Building Completion Certificate certifies the completed built-up area available at the relevant stage. The institution possesses sufficient built-up area as prescribed under NCTE norms. The revised building completion certificate is enclosed. 3. It is submitted that as per the prevailing land administration system, Jamabandi/Mutation records are primarily maintained for agricultural/revenue lands under the Revenue Department. In the case of urban developed land allotted by statutory authorities such as the Rajasthan Housing Board, the allotment letter, possession letter, and lease deed issued by the competent authority constitute the legally valid proof of title and possession. The institution is in lawful possession of the land and holds valid allotment/lease documents issued by the Rajasthan Housing Board, which clearly mention the plot details and establish ownership/lease rights. These documents have already been uploaded on the NCTE portal for verification. It is further submitted that, in such cases, separate Mutation Certificate/Jamabandi is generally not issued or required, as the title flows directly from the statutory allotment by the Government authority. In view of the above legal and factual position, it is humbly prayed that the Hon'ble authority may kindly accept the allotment/lease documents issued by Rajasthan Housing Board In lieu of Mutation Certificate/Jamabandi. 4. The land belonging to the institution is free from all encumbrances. The latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent authority is enclosed with this appeal. 5. The institution has maintained its official website and disclosed information in compliance with the spirit of Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014. Any deficiency observed was due to technical issues or delay in updating certain particulars. The website has since been updated and all required disclosures have been uploaded. 6. The Reg. No. is: LSG/JODHPUR/ FIRENOC/2026-27/69974 for Fire Safety Certificate on the official LSG portal of the Government of Rajasthan. The institution has complied with all fire safety requirements and has enclosed the application details/certificate

issued by the competent authority. 7. The institution respectfully submits that the reading room forms part of the library facilities earmarked for students. The geotagged photographs may not have adequately reflected the connectivity and seating arrangement due to the angle and manner in which photographs were captured. The institution possesses adequate seating capacity as per applicable norms, and geotagged photographs along are enclosed to establish compliance. 8. The institution had uploaded the list of teaching staff however, the format adopted may not have strictly corresponded with the prescribed NCTE format. The same has now been submitted in the exact format prescribed by NCTE. The qualification and appointment of faculty members are in conformity with the prescribed norms. 9. The institution has been regularly disbursing salaries to its teaching staff through banking channels. Since certain faculty members are appointed on fixed remuneration as per the terms approved by the competent authority and applicable State provisions, the bank statements alone may not have reflected the salary structure in the manner expected. The bank statement showing salary proof of payment are enclosed. There has been no default in payment of salaries. 10. The institution has uploaded and now re-submits the approved intake capacity for all multidisciplinary courses being conducted, namely B.A., B.Com. and B.Sc., along with the sanctioned intake for B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes. The institution possesses adequate land and built-up area to cater to all programmes in accordance with NCTE norms and the applicable policy of the Government of Rajasthan. The observation regarding insufficiency appears to have been made in the absence of complete appreciation of the available documents. 11. The institution possesses a functional computer laboratory equipped with the requisite ICT facilities. The uploaded geotagged photographs may not have adequately displayed the available infrastructure. Updated geotagged photographs, inventory of computers and ICT equipment, internet connectivity are enclosed to establish full compliance." The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit stating that it possesses a total land area of 6496 sq. metres, which is available exclusively for conducting its educational programmes. The institution submitted that it has obtained a valid Fire Safety No Objection Certificate issued by the competent authority and stated that the same is available for verification on the Local Self Government (LSG), Government of Rajasthan portal. It further stated that adequate infrastructure is available, including classrooms, laboratories, library, multipurpose hall, faculty rooms, administrative offices and other essential facilities. The institution submitted that sufficient built-up area and instructional facilities are available for conducting both the multidisciplinary programmes and the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) simultaneously in accordance with the applicable NCTE norms and regulatory requirements. It further clarified that the institution is a Multidisciplinary Institution and is presently conducting multidisciplinary programmes on the same campus with the requisite academic and infrastructural facilities. The institution also stated that the affidavit had

been submitted in compliance with the directions issued by the Appeal Committee during the online hearing and verified that the statements made therein are true and correct to the best of its knowledge and belief.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 10th Meeting, 2026 held online on 06th & 7th July, 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 24.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Maharishi Dadhichi Mahila Mahavidhyalaya, against the refusal of its application for transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The appellant submitted that the deficiencies pointed out in the refusal order have been addressed by furnishing the requisite documents and clarifications. The appellant submitted that Form 10AC issued by the Income Tax Department evidencing registration and exemption under the Income Tax Act had been uploaded. It was further submitted that the difference between the built-up area reflected in the approved Building Plan (4455.56 sq. metres) and the Building Completion Certificate (3851 sq. metres) arose because the Building Plan represents the total sanctioned construction, whereas the Building Completion Certificate certifies the completed construction available at the relevant stage. A revised Building Completion Certificate has also been furnished. The appellant further submitted that the institution holds valid allotment, possession and lease documents issued by the Rajasthan Housing Board, which constitute valid proof of title and possession, and that a separate Mutation Certificate/Jamabandi is generally neither issued nor required in such cases. It was also submitted that the institution has furnished the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent authority certifying that the land is free from encumbrances. The appellant submitted that the institutional website has been updated and now complies with the disclosure requirements prescribed under Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE

Regulations, 2014, and that any earlier deficiency was attributable to technical or updating issues. It was further submitted that the institution has complied with fire safety requirements and furnished the application/certificate issued by the competent authority on the official Government of Rajasthan portal. The appellant further submitted that the library reading room possesses adequate seating capacity and that updated geo-tagged photographs have been furnished to demonstrate compliance. It was also submitted that the teaching staff list has been resubmitted in the prescribed NCTE format and that the qualifications and appointments of the faculty conform to the prescribed norms. The appellant additionally submitted that salaries are regularly disbursed through banking channels and supporting bank statements evidencing salary payments have been enclosed. The appellant also submitted that the approved intake for all multidisciplinary programmes, namely B.A., B.Com. and B.Sc., along with the sanctioned intake for B.A.B.Ed. and B.Sc.B.Ed., has been furnished and that the institution possesses adequate land and built-up area for all programmes in accordance with NCTE norms and the applicable policy of the Government of Rajasthan. It was further submitted that the institution has a functional Computer Laboratory with the requisite ICT facilities, and updated geo-tagged photographs and details of ICT infrastructure have been enclosed in support of compliance. Further Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it possesses a total land area of 6496 sq. metres, which is exclusively available for conducting its educational programmes. The institution submitted that it has obtained a valid Fire Safety No Objection Certificate issued by the competent authority and stated that the same is available for verification on the Local Self Government (LSG), Government of Rajasthan portal. It further stated that adequate infrastructural facilities, including classrooms, laboratories, library, multipurpose hall, faculty rooms, administrative offices and other essential facilities, are available in the institution. The institution submitted that sufficient built-up area and instructional infrastructure are available for conducting both the multidisciplinary programmes and the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) simultaneously in accordance with the applicable NCTE norms and regulatory requirements. It further clarified that it is a Multidisciplinary Institution presently conducting multidisciplinary programmes on the same campus with the requisite academic and infrastructural facilities. The institution also submitted that the affidavit had been furnished in compliance with the directions issued by the Appeal Committee during the online hearing and verified that the statements made therein are true and correct to the best of its knowledge and belief. 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, Maharishi Dadhichi Mahila Mahavidhyalaya, Plot No. 2, Madhuban Housing Board, Basni – I, Jodhpur City, Jodhpur, Rajasthan-342005.**
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 – 21.07.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-271/E-413722/2026 /Appeal/10th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615673 ✓

Suratgarh B.Ed. College, Plot No. 01 NH. No. 62, Khasra No. 318/4, Sri Suratgarh, Ganganagar, Rajasthan- 335804	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G- 7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Representative of the institution
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	06.07.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.07.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Suratgarh B.Ed. College, Plot No. 01 NH. No. 62, Khasra No. 318/4, Sri Suratgarh, Ganganagar, Rajasthan-335804** dated 16.06.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No.NCTE/WRC/2627202510053695/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/1714** dt. 24.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "i. 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 documentary evidence confirming that Suratgarh B.Ed. College and Suratgarh P.G. College, are situated within the radius of 10 Kilometres, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. iii. 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. iv. The institution has not uploaded copy of Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by the concerned govt. competent authority. v. The institution has not uploaded Exemption Certificate (12A) issued by Competent Government Authority. vi. 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. vii. As per the BCC uploaded by the institution the land area is mentioned 5625 sq. mts., whereas the uploaded land document the land area is mentioned 5625 sq. yards (4658.063 sq. mts. approx.). The land area is still mismatch. The institution has not uploaded latest Building Completion Certificate (BCC) in the prescribed format of NCTE (17 points) issued by the Competent Government Authority for all the courses being conducted in the premises. viii. The website of the institution is not functional. The website is required to be functional and updated as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 of para 7(14)(1), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) as amended from time to time. The institution is required to update the website as per NCTE regulations. ix. The Multipurpose Hall does not meet NCTE norms, as it lacks a seating capacity of 200 and has an extremely inadequate number of chairs. x. Library and library reading room facility, Computer labs and ICT related facilities are not visible in the uploaded geotagged photographs. xi. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the college does not have adequate playgrounds and sports facility. xii. The uploaded list of teaching staff and salary details are not legible. xiii. 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.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative of Suratgarh B.Ed. College, Plot No. 01 NH. No. 62, Khasra No. 318/4, Sri Suratgarh, Ganganagar, Rajasthan-335804 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (i) pointed out by the respondent that the institution had submitted the application to the Government of Rajasthan for issuance of the required certificate under Clause 4.3(i) of the NCTE Guidelines for transformation into a Multidisciplinary Institution. That the State Government of Rajasthan vide certificate dated 09.06.2026 has requisite recommendation/NOC. 2. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (ii) pointed out by the respondent that the institution has obtained certificate from office of Assist. Engineer, Public Work Department, Sub-Division-I, Suratgarh showing that Suratgarh B.Ed. College and Suratgarh P.G. College, are situated within the radius of 10 Kilometers, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. 3. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (iii) pointed out by the respondent that the institution has obtained the approval from the affiliating university for collaboration between the institutions as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines. 4. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (iv) pointed out by the respondent that the Suratgarh Educational and Social Welfare Trust, Suratgarh, Rajasthan, is duly registered under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961. As per the prevailing provisions, the registration under Section 12A is issued in Form 10AC, which clearly certifies the exemption status of the trust. It is further submitted that as per Point No. 06 of Form 10AC, the TRUST is registered under Section 12A for the Assessment Years 2027-28 to 2031-32. 5. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (v) pointed out by the respondent that the Suratgarh Educational and Social Welfare Trust, Suratgarh, Rajasthan, is duly registered under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961. As per the prevailing provisions, the registration under Section 12A is issued in Form 10AC, which clearly certifies the exemption status of the society. It is further submitted that as per Point No. 06 of Form 10AC, the society is registered under Section 12A for the Assessment Years 2022-23 to 2026-27. 6. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (vi) pointed out by the respondent that the institution has 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. 7. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (vii) pointed out by the respondent that due to typographical mistake the land area mentioned in BCC is 5625 sq. mts., whereas it is actually 5625 yards, which comes out to 4705 sq. mts. It is submitted that the typographical mistake may be condoned. 8. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (viii) pointed out by the respondent that the website of the institution is functional and updated as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 of para 7(14)(1), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) as amended from time to time. It's URL is <https://suratgarhbedcollege.com/> 9. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (ix) pointed out by the respondent that the appellant have Multipurpose Hall meeting the NCTE norms and have fabricated furniture an surround sound public address system. 10. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (x) pointed out by the respondent that the Appellant/Institution have adequate Library and library reading room facility, Computer labs and ICT related facilities which are visible in the geotagged photographs. 11. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (xi) pointed out by the respondent that the Appellant/Institution have adequate playgrounds and sports facility. 12. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (xii) pointed out by the respondent that the Appellant/Institution had uploaded the scan list of teaching staff and salary details. 13. That it is submitted in response to the deficiency No. (xiii) pointed out by the respondent that the Appellant/Institution has approved Building Plan approved by the Competent Authority of state government. The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the deficiencies communicated by the Regional Committee and had fulfilled the applicable 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 the certificate of requirement of the Teacher Education Programme from the State Government and the certificate issued by the Assistant Engineer, Public Works Department in accordance with the applicable MDI Guidelines. The institution further submitted that approval of the affiliating university for collaboration between the institutions had been obtained. It stated that the sponsoring trust is registered under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 and furnished Form 10AC in support of its registration. The institution further submitted that the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent authority had been obtained and clarified that the discrepancy in the land area mentioned in the Building Completion Certificate was a typographical error, stating that the correct land area is 4,705 sq. mtrs. The institution also submitted that its website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. It further stated that the institution has a multipurpose hall, library with reading room, computer laboratory, ICT facilities, playground and sports facilities in accordance with the prescribed norms, supported by geo-tagged photographs. The institution

submitted that the teaching staff details and salary records had been furnished. It further submitted that the approved building plan and Building Completion Certificate issued by the competent authority indicate the total land area and earmarked built-up area for the teacher education and multidisciplinary programmes. The institution also undertook that all documents and information furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid, verifiable and issued by the competent statutory authorities.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 10th Meeting, 2026 held online on 06th & 7th July, 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 Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Suratgarh B.Ed. College, against the refusal of its application for transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The appellant submitted that the deficiencies pointed out in the refusal order have been addressed by furnishing the requisite documents and compliances. The appellant submitted that the Government of Rajasthan has issued the certificate/recommendation dated 09.06.2026 under Clause 4.3(i) of the NCTE Guidelines for transformation into a multidisciplinary institution. It was further submitted that a certificate issued by the Assistant Engineer, Public Works Department, Sub-Division-I, Suratgarh establishes that Suratgarh B.Ed. College and Suratgarh P.G. College are situated within a radius of 10 kilometres, and that approval for collaboration between the institutions has been granted by the affiliating university in accordance with Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines. The appellant further submitted that the sponsoring body, Suratgarh Educational and Social Welfare Trust, is registered under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, and the exemption certificate has been issued in Form 10AC, evidencing its registration under the applicable provisions. It was also submitted that the institution has furnished the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent State Government authority certifying that the land is free from encumbrances. The appellant further submitted that the discrepancy in the land area mentioned in the Building Completion

Certificate was due to a typographical error, wherein 5625 square yards was inadvertently recorded as 5625 square metres, and requested that the error be treated accordingly. It was also submitted that the institutional website has been updated in compliance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The appellant additionally submitted that the institution possesses a Multipurpose Hall conforming to NCTE norms with adequate furniture and public address system; adequate library and reading room facilities, computer laboratories and ICT facilities; playground and sports facilities; duly uploaded teaching staff details and salary records; and an approved Building Plan issued by the competent State Government authority. Further the Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the deficiencies communicated by the Regional Committee and fulfilled the applicable provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the applicable Norms and Standards, and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. The institution submitted that it had obtained the State Government certificate regarding the requirement of the Teacher Education Programme and the certificate issued by the Assistant Engineer, Public Works Department in accordance with the applicable Guidelines. It further submitted that approval of the affiliating University for collaboration between the institutions had been obtained and placed on record the relevant approval documents. The institution stated that the sponsoring Trust is registered under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 and furnished Form 10AC in support thereof. It further submitted the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent authority and clarified that the discrepancy in the land area mentioned in the Building Completion Certificate was due to a typographical error, stating that the correct land area is 4,705 sq. metres. The institution also submitted that its official website has been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. It further stated that the institution has a multipurpose hall, library with reading room, computer laboratory, ICT facilities, playground and sports facilities in conformity with the prescribed norms, and placed on record geo-tagged photographs in support thereof. The institution submitted the teaching staff details and salary records and further placed on record the approved building plan and Building Completion Certificate indicating the total land area and the earmarked built-up area for the teacher education and multidisciplinary programmes. The institution also undertook that all documents and information furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid, verifiable and issued by the competent statutory authorities. 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, Suratgarh B.Ed. College, Plot No. 01 NH. No. 62, Khasra No. 318/4, Sri Suratgarh, Ganganagar, Rajasthan-335804.**
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 – 21.07.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-274/E-414188/2026/Appeal/10th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615674 ✓

Smt. Narayani Devi Verma Women Teachers Training College (Mahila Ashram), Khasra No. 855 to 867, 869 to 872, 876, 877, Vijay Singh Pathik Nagar, Bhilwara, Rajasthan-311001	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Smt. Vandana Mathur, Secretary
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	06.07.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.07.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Smt. Narayani Devi Verma Women Teachers Training College (Mahila Ashram), Khasra No. 855 to 867, 869 to 872, 876, 877, Vijay Singh Pathik Nagar, Bhilwara, Rajasthan-311001** dated 21.06.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No.NCTE/WRC/2627202509303496/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/537** dt. 24.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "i. The uploaded documents are not proper. The institution has not uploaded the certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan justifying the requirement for a teacher education programme in the area, as required under Clause 4.3(i) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions. ii. The uploaded documents are not proper-- 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. iii. The institution has not uploaded Mutation (Jamabandi) Certificate mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government. iv. 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. v. The Multipurpose Hall does not meet NCTE norms, as it lacks a seating capacity of 200 and has an extremely inadequate number of chairs vi. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of Library reading room is not sufficient as per NCTE norms vii. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the college does not have adequate playgrounds and sports facility. viii. ICT related facilities are not visible in the uploaded geotagged photographs. ix. A geotagged photograph shows some part of the building left unrepaired x. The institution mentioned in the online application its land area as 70806 sq. mt. whereas on the fire safety certificate portal of Rajasthan Government, the Plot Area is mentioned as 3974 sq. mts. The land area is different. The institution is required to upload the proper fire certificate. xi. As per the institution has uploaded faculty list but not in prescribed format of NCTE Regulation 2014. The institution has not uploaded list of teaching staff of all Education Faculty Programmes duly approved and countersigned by its affiliating body. xii. bank statement has not uploaded by the institution. But the institution has uploaded a copy of pay disbursement register, which shows that the institution is not disbursing salary as per

Central/State Govt. The institution has not been able to prove/confirm whether it is paying salary to the teaching staff as per Central/State Govt norms. xiii. The institution has not uploaded the 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. xiv. In the Land Details Built Up area mentioned in the Affidavit (in sq m) is 3974. If the institution is running various teacher education programme/courses in the same campus/premises i.e. Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) degree 4 units, The sufficiency of land and built-up area for the above courses with of and intake for B.A. B.Ed. Secondary(2 unit), B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (2unit), course cannot be ascertained. xv. The website of the institution has not been compliance as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 of para 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) as amended from time to time. The institution is required to update the website as per NCTE regulations."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Smt. Vandana Mathur, Secretary of Smt. Narayani Devi Verma Women Teachers Training College (Mahila Ashram), Khasra No. 855 to 867, 869 to 872, 876, 877, Vijay Singh Pathik Nagar, Bhilwara, Rajasthan-311001 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The institution has having collaboration with Smt. Sushila Devi Mathur Kanaya Mahavidalaya Mahila Ashram Bhilwara, Rajasthan. In this regard the institution uploaded and submitted order dated 27.04.2026 issued by Aayuktalaya College Shiksha Jaipur (Govt. of Rajasthan) Rajasthan is attached. and Order dated 04.04.2026 issued by the Affiliating University. The same is annexed as ANNEXURE-1. 2. The institution has having collaboration with Smt. Sushila Devi Mathur Kanaya Mahavidalaya Mahila Ashram Bhilwara, Rajasthan. In this regard the institution uploaded and submitted order dated 04.04.2026 issued form the University and order dated 27.04.2026 issued from Ayuktalaya College Shiksha Jaipur (Govt. of Rajasthan) Rajasthan. The same is annexed as ANNEXURE-2. 3. The institution has uploaded and submitted Mutation (Jamabandi) certificate with all khasra No. issued from the Govt. Competent Authority. Copy of same is attached. The same is annexed as ANNEXURE-3. 4. The institution has submitted building plan alongwith Building Completion Certificate prepared by the Architecture which is registered by council of architecture and approved by the by the Assistant Engineer, PWD, Bhilwara, (Govt of Rajasthan) Rajasthan. The same is annexed as ANNEXURE-4. Earmarked land area and built-up area are as under:- Total Land area is 20234.00 sq mtrs (Land area allotted for B.Ed Programme 5000.00 Mtrs, ITEP 10,000.00 Sqmts & Multidisciplinary Programme 5234.00 sq mtrs) Total Buitup area 8973.72 Sq mtrs (Built-up Area allotted for ITEP Programme. 3973.72 sq mtrs, B.Ed Programme 2500.00 Mtrs

& Multidisciplinary Programme 2536.00 sq mtrs). 5. The institution having Multipurpose Hall with more than 2000 Sq.Ft, the same is sufficient for more than 200 students as per NCTE Norms. In this regard Geotag photograph of the same is attached. The Geotagged Photo is annexed as ANNEXURE-5. 6. The institution having sufficient size of library and in the library seating capacity for reading which is sufficient as per NCTE norms. In this regard Geotagged photograph of the same is attached as ANNEXURE-6. 7. The institution having adequate playgrounds and sports facility for the students. In this regard Geotagged photograph of the same is attached as ANNEXURE-7. 8. The institution has developed ICT facilities as per NCTE Norms. In this regard Geotagged photograph of the same is attached as ANNEXURE-8. 9. The institution building now repaired in all respect. In this regard Geotagged photograph of the same is attached as ANNEXURE-9. 10. The land area as 70806 sq. mt is not related to the proposed institution. The institution mentioned in the online application and affidavit also the total land area is approx. 20234.00 Sq. Mtrs. The institution has submitted fire safety certificate issued by Govt. Competent Authority (NGAR NIGAM BHILWARA) vide order dated 06.06.2025. The institution constructed the building which mentioned as plot area for ITEP. Certified Copy of land documents and Fire Safety Certificate are attached as ANNEXURE-10. 11. The institution has uploaded and submitted teaching faculty list, which is approved by the Registrar, M.D.S, University, Ajmer, Rajasthan dated 27.02.2026. In this regard a copy of the same is attached as ANNEXURE-11. 12. The institution has submitted bank statement issued by the ICICI Bank, Bhilwara Rajasthan showing salary of teaching faculty member is attached as ANNEXURE-12. 13. The institution has submitted latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by Uppanjiyak, Panjiyan Evam Mudrank, Bhilwara Pratham, he is the Government Authority and indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances. Copy for NEC is Attached as ANNEXURE-13. 14. The institution has submitted building plan prepared by the Architecture which is registered by council of architecture and approved by the by the Assistant Engineer, PWD, Bhilwara, (Govt of Rajasthan) Rajasthan. The same is annexed as ANNEXURE-4. Earmarked land area and built-up area are as under: -Total Land area is 20234.00 sq mtrs (Land area allotted for B.Ed. Programme 5000.00 Mtrs, ITEP 10,000.00 sq. mts & Multidisciplinary Programme 5234.00 sq. mtrs) Total Built-up area 8973.72 Sq mtrs (Built-up Area allotted for ITEP Programme. 3973.72 sq. mtrs, B.Ed Programme 2500.00 Mtrs & Multidisciplinary Programme 2536.00 sq. mtrs). 15. The website of the institution now updated in compliance as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 of para 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) as amended from time to time.in this regard necessary screenshots are submitted herewith this appeal as ANNEXURE-15." The appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the deficiencies communicated by the Regional Committee and had fulfilled the applicable provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. The

institution submitted that it has established collaboration with Smt. Sushila Devi Mathur Kanya Mahavidyalaya, Bhilwara, and stated that the requisite approval orders issued by the affiliating University and the Aayuktalaya, College Shiksha, Government of Rajasthan, had been obtained. The institution further submitted that the Mutation (Jamabandi) Certificate, latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate and other land records had been furnished in respect of the institutional land. It stated that the approved building plan and Building Completion Certificate, prepared by a registered Architect and approved by the Assistant Engineer, PWD, Bhilwara, clearly indicate the earmarked land and built-up area for the B.Ed., ITEP and multidisciplinary programmes. The institution clarified that the land area reflected as 70,806 sq. mtrs. does not pertain to the proposed institution and that the total institutional land measures 20,234 sq. mtrs. It further submitted that the institution has adequate infrastructure including a multipurpose hall, library with reading facilities, playground, ICT facilities and other instructional infrastructure, supported by geo-tagged photographs. The institution also submitted that the institutional building has been repaired and that a valid Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority had been furnished. The institution stated that the teaching faculty list duly approved by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer, salary bank statements evidencing payment through banking channels, and the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate had been furnished. The institution further submitted that its official website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The institution also undertook that all documents and information furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid, verifiable and issued by the competent statutory authorities.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 10th Meeting, 2026 held online on 06th & 7th July, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Western Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 02.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 24.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Smt. Narayani Devi Verma Women Teachers Training

College, preferred against the refusal of transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The appellant submitted that it has entered into collaboration with Smt. Sushila Devi Mathur Kanya Mahavidyalaya, Mahila Ashram, Bhilwara, Rajasthan, and has furnished the approval orders dated 04.04.2026 issued by the affiliating university and 27.04.2026 issued by the Commissionerate of College Education, Government of Rajasthan, in support of the collaboration. The appellant further submitted that the Mutation (Jamabandi) Certificate containing all relevant Khasra numbers has been issued by the competent Government authority and has been furnished. It was also submitted that the approved building plan and Building Completion Certificate, prepared by an architect registered with the Council of Architecture and approved by the Assistant Engineer, PWD, Bhilwara, have been furnished, showing a total land area of 20,234 sq. metres and a total built-up area of 8,973.72 sq. metres, with earmarked land and built-up area separately allocated for the B.Ed., ITEP and multidisciplinary programmes. The appellant submitted that the institution possesses a Multipurpose Hall exceeding 2,000 sq. ft., a library with adequate seating capacity, sufficient playground and sports facilities, ICT facilities, and that the institutional building has been repaired. Geo-tagged photographs of these facilities have been furnished in support of the claimed compliance. The appellant further submitted that the observation regarding land measuring 70,806 sq. metres does not relate to the appellant institution and that the institution possesses 20,234 sq. metres of land as disclosed in the online application and affidavit. It was also submitted that a valid Fire Safety Certificate issued by the Nagar Nigam, Bhilwara, together with certified land documents, has been furnished. The appellant also submitted that the teaching faculty list duly approved by the Registrar, Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer, bank statements issued by ICICI Bank evidencing payment of salaries to the teaching staff, the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent registration authority, and the approved building plan have been furnished in support of compliance. The appellant further submitted that the institutional website has been updated and maintained in compliance with Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time, and supporting screenshots have been furnished. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the deficiencies communicated by the Regional Committee and fulfilled the applicable provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. The institution submitted that it has established collaboration with Smt. Sushila Devi Mathur Kanya Mahavidyalaya, Bhilwara, and placed on record the approval orders issued by the affiliating University and the Aayuktalaya, College Shiksha, Government of Rajasthan. It further submitted the Mutation (Jamabandi) Certificate, the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate and other land records in respect of the institutional land. The institution stated that the approved building plan and Building Completion Certificate, prepared by a registered Architect and approved by the Assistant Engineer, PWD, Bhilwara, indicate the earmarked land and built-up area for the B.Ed., ITEP and multidisciplinary

programmes. It clarified that the land area of 70,806 sq. metres reflected in certain records does not pertain to the proposed institution and that the institutional land measures 20,234 sq. metres. The institution further submitted that adequate infrastructural facilities, including a multipurpose hall, library with reading facilities, playground, ICT facilities and other instructional infrastructure, are available and placed on record geo-tagged photographs in support thereof. The institution also stated that the institutional building has been repaired and that a valid Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority has been furnished. It further submitted the teaching faculty list duly approved by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer, salary bank statements evidencing payment through banking channels, and the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate. The institution also submitted that its official website has been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014, and undertook that all documents and information furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid, verifiable and issued by the competent statutory authorities. 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, Smt. Narayani Devi Verma Women Teachers Training College (Mahila Ashram), Khasra No. 855 to 867, 869 to 872, 876, 877, Vijay Singh Pathik Nagar, Bhilwara, Rajasthan-311001.
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 – 21.07.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-279/E-414529/2026 Appeal/10th Meeting, 2026
APPLNRC202615683 ✓

Janak Raj Mahajan B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 3964/2092-2093- 4156/3967/2161, Gangath, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh-176204	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G- 7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Manish Sharma, Assistant Professor
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	06.07.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.07.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Janak Raj Mahajan B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 3964/2092-2093-4156/3967/2161, Gangath, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh-176204** dated 26.06.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no **F.No.NRC/NCTE/HP-56 & HP-87/B.Ed. & B.Ed. Add./459th Meeting (Part – 2) (Sl. No. 8)/2026/236850-59 Computer No. 74988** dated 14.05.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting **B.Ed. course** on the grounds that “1. Initial recognition to the institution was granted by NRC in a leased premises and already been constructed on the said leased land, this fact is not mentioned in the registered sale deed. later on, the same land was registered in the name of institution. As the building has already been constructed on the said leased land, this fact is not mentioned in the registered sale deed. 2. The institution has submitted a list of faculty comprising of 01 Principal & 5 Assistant Professor(s) duly approved by the Pro. Vice Chancellor, Sardar Patel University, the institution has submitted a list of faculty comprising of 01 Principal & 5 Assistant Mandi alongwith the copy of approval letter in respect of Principal and 05 faculty issued by HP. University dated 10.05.2010 & 20.07.2019. The institution has also submitted another faculty list comprising of 04 Assistant Professor (s) which is selected by the Management and not approved by the affiliating body. As such, requisite number of teaching faculty qualified as per NCTE norms is not appointed. 3._Quality education is the foundation of a prosperous future, transforming minds from empty vessels into open. Quality education is an important aspect in providing high quality, equitable and accessible education. In the absence of requisite faculty as per NCTE Regulations 2014, the quality education could not be delivered, and an institution should not be allowed/ permitted to offer the programme. 9. The Committee deliberated on the documents submitted by the institution in reply to Show Cause Notices/ letter issued to it and noted that the institution is still deficient in multiple parameters inclusive of shortage of faculty for the B.Ed. course, as per NCTE Regulations 2014 despite reasonable opportunities provided to the institution.

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Manish Sharma, Assistant Professor of Janak Raj Mahajan B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 3964/2092-2093-4156/3967/2161, Gangath, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh-176204 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “the initial owner of the land and building was the same Society, Gangath) (Affidavit attached, copy of certificate management (Janak Raj Mahajan Welfare and Education signed by the Naib Tehsildar, Gangath, Distt. Kangra and copy of non-

encumbrance certificate signed by Patwari, Gangath and signed by Naib Tehsildar, Gangath attached) 2. We are submitted the, authorised counter signed faculty Performa by HP university, Shimla with faculty approval letters college has fulfil the vacant post (Assistant Professor) according the NCTE norms total faculty (1+1011) for one unit submit the affidavit by management and affidavit (individually) to be submitted by the staff. 3. We are submitting the copy of affiliation order (2015 to 2026). 2. We are submitted the, authorised counter signed faculty Performa by HP university, Shimla with faculty approval letters college has fulfil the vacant post (Assistant Professor) according the NCTE norms total faculty (1+10) for one unit submit the affidavit by management and affidavit (individually) to be submitted by the staff. we are as such teaching faculty fulfil as per NCTE norms is appointed. 3. We are submitting the copy of affiliation order (2015 to 2026) we are submitted.” The appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that the land situated at Village Gangath, Tehsil Nurpur, District Kangra, comprised in the specified Khewat/Khasra numbers and measuring 14 Kanals (7082 sq. metres), stands leased/registered in favour of Janak Raj Mahajan Welfare and Education Society, Gangath for a period of 99 years for establishing and running the B.Ed. programme. The institution further submitted that the B.Ed. College has been functioning on the said land and in the building constructed thereon since the year 2002. It stated that certificates issued by the Naib Tehsildar, Gangath and the Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent revenue authorities had been furnished in support of the land records and legal status of the property. The institution clarified that the said certificates had been issued on the basis of the latest revenue records maintained in the offices of the Tehsil Indora and Sub-Tehsil Gangath. It further submitted that the land and building continue to be available for the purpose of conducting the teacher education programme and affirmed that the contents of the affidavit are true and correct to the best of its knowledge and belief.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 10th Meeting, 2026 held online on 06th & 7th July, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students (Existing 60 + Additional 40) vide order dated 05.07.2003. 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 22.05.2015. The NRC vide order dated 20.09.2016 reduced the intake from 100 students to 50 students. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 14.05.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Janak Raj Mahajan B.Ed. College, preferred against the impugned order. The appellant submitted that the land and building are owned by the sponsoring society, Janak Raj Mahajan Welfare and Education Society, and that the ownership and title are supported by the lease deed, registered deed, affidavit of the management, certificate issued by the Naib Tehsildar, Gangath, and the Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Patwari, Gangath and countersigned by the Naib Tehsildar, Gangath. The appellant further submitted that the institution has appointed the requisite teaching faculty in accordance with the NCTE Norms, including filling the vacant post of Assistant Professor, and has furnished the faculty list in the prescribed format duly approved and countersigned by Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, along with the university approval letters. It was also submitted that affidavits of the management and individual faculty members have been furnished in support of the appointments. The appellant further submitted that copies of the affiliation orders issued by Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, covering the period from 2015 to 2026, have been furnished in support of the institution's claim of continued affiliation. Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that the land situated at Village Gangath, Tehsil Nurpur, District Kangra, comprised in the specified Khewat/Khasra numbers and measuring 14 Kanals (7082 sq. metres), stands leased/registered in favour of Janak Raj Mahajan Welfare and Education Society, Gangath for a period of 99 years for the purpose of conducting the B.Ed. programme. The institution further stated that the B.Ed. College has been functioning on the said land and in the building constructed thereon since the year 2002. It submitted certificates issued by the Naib Tehsildar, Gangath and the Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the competent revenue authorities in support of the land records and legal status of the property. The institution clarified that the aforesaid certificates had been issued on the basis of the latest revenue records maintained in the offices of the Tehsil Indora and Sub-Tehsil Gangath. It further stated that the land and building continue to be available for conducting the teacher education programme and affirmed that the contents of the affidavit are true and correct to the best of its knowledge and belief. 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 14.05.2026 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 14.05.2026 and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee for fresh consideration and re-examination in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), subject to the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within the stipulated timeframe.

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



उप सचिव (अपील)/ Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Janak Raj Mahajan B.Ed. College, Khasra No. 3964/2092-2093-4156/3967/2161, Gangath, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh-176204.**
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.



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 – 21.07.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-284/E-414689/2026/Appeal/10th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615679 ✓

Adarsh Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 2982/548, Kuchaman City, Station Road, Nagaur, Rajasthan-341508.	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Shree Raja Ram, President
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	06.07.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.07.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Adarsh Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 2982/548, Kuchaman City, Station Road, Nagaur, Rajasthan-341508** dated 25.06.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F.No. NCTE/WRC/2627202509132259/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/311** dt. 03.06.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "As the reply given by the institution is not satisfactory, the Committee accepts the report of the visiting team in this regard that:- i. Affiliating Body Details - College does not have the current affiliation letter-Not Accepted. The institution is unable to show the present University Affiliation Letter to the VT members and during inspection it was found that the university affiliation to the institution was up to 2024-2025 session. ii. Parent Organization-Not Accepted by Visiting team. iii. Existing Teacher Education Programme(s)- Not Accepted- Even after getting recognition from NCTE to run 4 years BA B.Ed., B.Sc. B.Ed. programme, the institution has failed to develop facilities as per NCTE norms such as library, digital/online resources, multipurpose hall, all labs of science and humanities, appointment of both teaching and non-teaching staffs, ramp, lift, fire safety system, disable friendly infrastructure and other facilities. iv. Details of Mutation Certificate of Land - Not Accepted - Not presented. v. Faculty Room-Not Available. vi. The space available for the administrative office is insufficient - Need to be developed. vii. Common Room- Only Girls common Room available without Basic Facilities. viii. The facilities for co-curricular activities are inadequate. ix. The institution has applied for conversion of this programme into the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), namely B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary). During the inspection, it was found that the institution has not fulfilled the necessary academic and infrastructural arrangements in accordance with the norms and standards prescribed by NCTE for conducting the ITEP - B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary) programmes. x. During the inspection, the institution tried to misguide the VT members by presenting individuals other than the actual faculty members and non-teaching staffs working in the institution. xi. The infrastructural facility of the institution is not disable-friendly. xii. Even after getting recognition from NCTE to run 4 years BA B.Ed., B.Sc. B.Ed. programme, the institution has failed to develop facilities as per NCTE norms such as library, digital/online resources, multipurpose hall, all labs of science and humanities, appointment of both teaching and non-teaching staffs, ramp, lift, fire safety system, disable friendly infrastructure, Kitchen garden, rain water harvesting system and other facilities. xiii. The library does not have the sufficient

titles, educational encyclopaedia, reference books, digital/online resources and found the last date of book issued to students was 2024.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Shree Raja Ram, President of Adarsh Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 2982/548, Kuchaman City, Station Road, Nagaur, Rajasthan-341508 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. It is respectfully submitted that Adarsh Mahavidyalaya, Kuchaman City is in possession of valid affiliation granted by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer for conducting its multidisciplinary programmes. The University has granted Extension in Provisional Affiliation vide the following orders: Letter No. F.14(311) Acad. II/MDSU/2025/36652 dated 06.12.2025 granting extension in provisional affiliation for the academic session 2025-26 for the programmes B.A., B.Com., B.Sc., M.A. (Geography), and M.Sc. programmes. Letter No. F.14(311) Acad. II/MDSU/2026/1257 dated 10.06.2026 granting extension in provisional affiliation for B.A. B.Ed. (Four Years) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Four Years) with an intake of 50 seats each for the academic session 2025-26. Copies of the aforesaid affiliation orders have been uploaded and attached for verification. The institution, therefore, possesses valid and subsisting affiliation from the affiliating University for all relevant programmes. In view of the above, the objection raised by the Committee regarding affiliation stands fully complied with. The relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for kind verification and consideration. 2. That the Parent Organization of Adarsh Mahavidyalaya, namely Adarsh Shikshan Sansthan Kuchaman city, is a duly registered society under the Rajasthan Societies Registration Act-1958, vide Registration No. 208/Nagaur/2008-09 dated 30.01.2009. The Registration Certificate, Memorandum of Association, Rules & Regulations, List of Governing Body Members, and other relevant documents of the Society have been duly uploaded and submitted. The objects of the Society specifically include the establishment, management and promotion of educational institutions. The Parent Organization is legally constituted and competent to establish and manage educational institutions and all relevant records in support thereof have been furnished before the Committee. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification. 3. That all the necessary academic, instructional, and infrastructural facilities, as prescribed under the NCTE Norms and Standards for conducting the 4-Year Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) - B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary), are available within the college campus. The institution has developed and maintained adequate infrastructure including the College Building, Multipurpose Hall, Digital Library and Reading Room with online resources, Science

Laboratories, Psychology Laboratory, ICT Laboratory, Language Laboratory, Classrooms, Principal's Room, Staff Room, Administrative Office, Common Rooms for Boys and Girls, Sports Room, Fire Safety Equipment, Ramp, Drinking Water Facilities, Wheelchair, Separate Toilet Facilities for Persons with Disabilities, General Toilet Facilities and Playgrounds. Further, the institution has appointed qualified teaching and non-teaching staff in accordance with the NCTE norms and University regulations. The University-approved list of teaching staff is enclosed. Geotagged photographs of all the above facilities and supporting documents have been uploaded/submitted as evidence in support of compliance with the NCTE requirements for the proposed ITEP programmes. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification.

4. That the land of the institution is duly recorded in the records of the competent authority (Nagar Parishad, Kuchaman City) and the ownership, possession, and lawful use of the land for educational purposes stand established through the land documents submitted by the institution. Nagar Parishad Kuchaman City has issued Patta/Lease Deed No. 016/2023 dated 19.04.2023 in favour of Adarsh Shikshan Sansthan, Kuchaman City for institutional purposes. Further, the Commissioner, Nagar Parishad, Kuchaman City has issued a certificate vide No. N.P.K/2024-25/5419 dated 10.10.2024, certifying the land records of the institution. It is respectfully submitted that the land is situated within the jurisdiction of Nagar Parishad, Kuchaman City (Urban/Municipal Area) and is governed by municipal records. Therefore, mutation in revenue records is neither required nor applicable in the present case. The title and possession of the land are duly established through the Patta Lease Deed, Municipal Records, Registration Documents, Fee Receipts, Site Plan, and Certificate issued by Nagar Parishad, Kuchaman City. The aforesaid documents were uploaded on the NCTE portal and were also available for verification during the online Virtual Inspection. Copies of the Patta/Lease Deed, Nagar Parishad Certificate, Registration Documents, Fee Receipts, Site Plan, and other relevant land records are attached for verification. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification.

5. That a well-equipped and furnished Faculty Room is available within the college campus for the use of teaching staff. The Faculty Room is provided with adequate furniture and necessary facilities for academic and administrative purposes. Geo-tagged photographs of the Faculty Room have been uploaded and attached for verification. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification.

6. It is respectfully submitted that a well-equipped and furnished Administrative Office is available within the college campus for carrying out all administrative and academic functions of the institution. The office is provided with adequate space, furniture, computers, internet facilities, record storage arrangements, and other necessary infrastructure required

for the efficient administration of the institution. Geo-tagged photographs of the Administrative Office have again been uploaded for verification. The Administrative Office was available and functional at the time of the Virtual Inspection and fulfills the requirements prescribed under the NCTE Norms and Standards. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification. 7. It is respectfully submitted that well-equipped and furnished Common Rooms for both boys and girls are available within the college campus. Geo-tagged photographs of the Boys' Common Room and Girls' Common Room are attached for verification. Both Common Rooms are adequately furnished and equipped with necessary facilities including seating arrangements, lighting, ventilation, drinking water facilities, notice boards, and other basic amenities required for the comfort and welfare of students. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification. 8. It is respectfully submitted that the institution has adequate facilities for conducting co-curricular and extracurricular activities as prescribed under the NCTE Norms and Standards. The college has a Multipurpose Hall, Sports Room, Playground, Cultural Activity Facilities, Art and Craft Resource Centre, Health and Physical Education Facilities and other infrastructure necessary for organizing literary, cultural, sports, community engagement and co-curricular activities for students. Geo-tagged photographs of the Multipurpose Hall, Sports Room Playground, Art and Craft Resource Centre, Health and Physical Education Facilities and other relevant infrastructure have been uploaded and submitted for verification. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification. 9. It is respectfully submitted that the institution has fulfilled all necessary academic, instructional and infrastructural requirements prescribed under the NCTE Norms and Standards for conducting the 4-Year Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), namely B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary). The institution has established and maintained the requisite infrastructure including classrooms, multipurpose hall, library with digital and online resources, science laboratories, psychology laboratory, ICT laboratory, language laboratory, administrative office, principal room, staff room, common rooms, sports facilities, fire safety arrangements, barrier-free access facilities, drinking water facilities, sanitation facilities, and other essential amenities required for the proposed ITEP programmes. Further, qualified teaching and non-teaching staff have been appointed in accordance with the NCTE Norms and Standards and the University-approved faculty list issued by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University; Ajmer has been submitted. Geo-tagged photographs and all supporting documents relating to academic facilities, infrastructure, teaching staff, non-teaching staff and student support facilities have been uploaded and attached for verification. Therefore, the objection raised by

the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification. 10. It is respectfully submitted that the teaching staff presented before the Visiting Team were duly appointed faculty members of the institution and their appointments were made in accordance with the NCTE Norms and Standards. The teaching staff of the institution has also been duly approved by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer vide Order No. F.14/Shiksha-II/B.ED./MDSU/2026/16214 dated 01.05.2026. Similarly, the non-teaching staff presented during the inspection were regularly working employees of the institution. The details of teaching and non-teaching staff, appointment letters, joining reports, qualification documents, attendance records, salary records and University approval documents have been uploaded and submitted for verification. It is further respectfully submitted that all the actual faculty members and non-teaching staff of the institution were available during the Virtual Inspection. If any doubt arose during the interaction, the same may have been due to minor communication or understanding issues during the virtual mode of inspection. However, there was no intention whatsoever to mislead or misguide the Visiting Team. For abundant clarity, all relevant documents relating to the teaching and non-teaching staff have again been uploaded and attached for verification. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification. 11. It is respectfully submitted that the college campus is equipped with ramps for barrier-free access, wheelchair facilities, accessible toilet facilities for persons with disabilities, handrails and other necessary arrangements to ensure easy access and mobility for differently abled persons within the campus. Geo-tagged photographs of the ramps, wheelchair, accessible toilets and other disability-friendly facilities have been uploaded and submitted for verification. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification. 12. It is respectfully submitted that the institution has developed and maintained all necessary academic, instructional, infrastructural, safety and support facilities as prescribed under the NCTE Norms and Standards for conducting the 4-Year Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), namely B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Secondary). The institution has a well-equipped Library, Digital Library with Online Resources, Multipurpose Hall, Science Laboratories, Psychology Laboratory, ICT Laboratory, Language Laboratory, Classrooms, Administrative Office, Principal Room, Staff Room, Common Rooms, Sports Facilities, Fire Safety Equipment, Ramp, Wheelchair, Accessible Toilets for Persons with Disabilities, Drinking Water Facilities, Kitchen Garden, Rain Water Harvesting System, and other essential infrastructure required under the NCTE Norms and Standards. Further, qualified Teaching and non-teaching staff have been appointed in accordance with the NCTE Norms and Standards and the approved faculty list issued by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University,

Ajmer has been appointed in accordance with the NCTE Norms and Standards and the approved faculty list issued by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer has been submitted. Geo-tagged photographs of the Library, Digital Resources, Laboratories, Multipurpose Hall, Fire Safety Arrangements, Disability-Friendly Facilities, Kitchen Garden, Rain Water Harvesting System and other infrastructural facilities have been uploaded and submitted for verification. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification. 13. It is respectfully submitted that sufficient titles, number of books, educational encyclopaedias, reference books, educational journals, digital/online resources, E-encyclopaedias, E-educational journals, E-books, adequate furniture and other library facilities are available in the college library in accordance with the NCTE Norms and Standards. Copies of the list of titles and volumes of books available in the library, accession register, bills of journals, encyclopaedias and books, geo-tagged photographs of Professional Research Journals, Digital and Online Resources, and copies of the library issue register have been uploaded and submitted for verification. The library remains functional and is regularly utilized by students and faculty members for academic and research purposes. All relevant records relating to library resources and book issue transactions have been maintained and are attached for verification. Therefore, the objection raised by the Committee stands fully complied with and the relevant supporting documents have been uploaded and attached for verification."

The appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the deficiencies communicated by the Regional Committee and had fulfilled the applicable provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. The institution submitted that the latest provisional affiliation for the academic session 2025–26 issued by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer had been obtained. It further submitted that its parent society is a duly registered educational society competent to establish and manage educational institutions. The institution stated that the academic, instructional and infrastructural facilities prescribed for the B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. (ITEP) programmes, including library, digital resources, laboratories, multipurpose hall, classrooms, administrative facilities, sports facilities, fire safety arrangements, barrier-free access and student support facilities, had been established and supported by geo-tagged photographs. The institution further submitted that the land is held under a Patta/Lease Deed issued by Nagar Parishad, Kuchaman City and clarified that mutation in revenue records is not applicable in respect of municipal land, relying upon municipal records and related land documents. The institution

submitted that the approved building plan, Building Completion Certificate and earmarked land and built-up area for the B.Ed., ITEP and multidisciplinary programmes had been furnished. The institution further stated that qualified teaching and non-teaching staff had been appointed in accordance with the prescribed norms and that the faculty list approved by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer had been furnished. It also submitted that the administrative office, faculty room, common rooms, co-curricular facilities, disability-friendly infrastructure, kitchen garden, rainwater harvesting system and other institutional facilities are available in accordance with the applicable norms. The institution clarified that the faculty and non-teaching staff presented before the Visiting Team were the regular employees of the institution and attributed any discrepancy during the virtual inspection to communication issues. The institution further submitted that the library contains the prescribed titles, reference books, educational encyclopaedias, journals, digital and online resources and that the accession records, issue registers and supporting documents had been maintained. The institution also undertook that all documents and information furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid, verifiable and issued by the competent authorities.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 10th Meeting, 2026 held online on 06th & 7th July, 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 03.06.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Adarsh Mahavidyalaya, Kuchaman City, preferred against the refusal of transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The appellant submitted that it holds valid affiliation from Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer for its multidisciplinary programmes as well as the B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. (Four-Year Integrated) programmes, and copies of the extension of provisional affiliation orders have been furnished. The appellant further submitted that its sponsoring body, Adarsh Shikshan Sansthan, Kuchaman City, is a society duly registered under the Rajasthan Societies Registration Act, 1958, and that the registration certificate, Memorandum of Association,

Rules and Regulations, Governing Body details and other supporting documents establishing its competence to establish and manage educational institutions have been submitted. The appellant submitted that all academic, instructional and infrastructural facilities prescribed under the NCTE Norms and Standards for the proposed ITEP are available within the campus, including classrooms, multipurpose hall, digital library and reading room with online resources, science laboratories, psychology laboratory, ICT laboratory, language laboratory, principal's room, staff room, administrative office, boys' and girls' common rooms, sports room, playground, fire safety equipment, barrier-free access facilities, drinking water facilities, wheelchair, accessible toilets and other essential amenities. It was further submitted that qualified teaching and non-teaching staff have been appointed in accordance with the NCTE norms and the university-approved faculty list has been furnished along with geo-tagged photographs and supporting documents. The appellant further submitted that the land stands recorded in the municipal records of Nagar Parishad, Kuchaman City, and that ownership, possession and educational use are established through the Patta/Lease Deed, municipal certificate, registration documents, fee receipts, site plan and other land records. It was contended that, as the land falls within the municipal area, mutation in revenue records is neither applicable nor required. The appellant also submitted that adequate faculty room, administrative office, boys' and girls' common rooms, sports facilities, art and craft resource centre, health and physical education facilities and other infrastructure required for curricular and co-curricular activities are available, supported by geo-tagged photographs. The appellant further submitted that the teaching staff presented before the Visiting Team were duly appointed and approved by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer, and that the non-teaching staff were regular employees of the institution. Appointment orders, joining reports, qualification documents, attendance records, salary records and university approval documents have been furnished. It was further stated that, if any doubt arose during the virtual inspection, it was attributable only to communication or understanding issues during the virtual interaction and not to any intention to mislead the Visiting Team. The appellant also submitted that the institution has adequate disability-friendly facilities, including ramps, wheelchairs, accessible toilets and handrails, together with fire safety arrangements, rainwater harvesting, kitchen garden and other support infrastructure as required under the NCTE Norms and Standards. The appellant further submitted that the library is adequately equipped with sufficient titles, volumes, educational encyclopedias, professional journals, digital and online resources, e-books, furniture and other facilities as prescribed under the NCTE norms. Copies of the accession register, issue register, bills relating to books and journals, lists of titles and volumes, and geo-tagged photographs have been furnished in support of the claimed compliance. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the deficiencies communicated by the Regional

Committee and fulfilled the applicable provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions. The institution submitted that the latest provisional affiliation for the academic session 2025–26 issued by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer had been obtained and that its parent society is a duly registered educational society competent to establish and manage educational institutions. It further submitted that the requisite academic, instructional and infrastructural facilities for the B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. (ITEP) programmes, including library, digital resources, laboratories, multipurpose hall, classrooms, administrative facilities, sports facilities, fire safety arrangements, barrier-free access and student support facilities, had been established and placed on record geo-tagged photographs in support thereof. The institution stated that the land is held under a Patta/Lease Deed issued by Nagar Parishad, Kuchaman City and clarified that mutation in revenue records is not applicable in respect of municipal land, placing reliance upon the Patta/Lease Deed, municipal records and other land documents. The institution further submitted the approved building plan, Building Completion Certificate and documents indicating the earmarked land and built-up area for the B.Ed., ITEP and multidisciplinary programmes. It stated that qualified teaching and non-teaching staff had been appointed in accordance with the prescribed norms and placed on record the faculty list duly approved by Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer. The institution further submitted that the administrative office, faculty room, common rooms, co-curricular facilities, disability-friendly infrastructure, kitchen garden, rainwater harvesting system and other institutional facilities are available in accordance with the applicable norms. It clarified that the teaching and non-teaching staff presented before the Visiting Team were regular employees of the institution and attributed the perceived discrepancies during the virtual inspection to communication issues. The institution also submitted that the library contains the prescribed titles, reference books, educational encyclopedias, journals and digital resources, and placed on record the accession register, issue register and related supporting documents. The institution further undertook that all documents and information furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid, verifiable and issued by the competent statutory authorities. 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 order has been passed in the

context of compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended from time to time), read with the applicable Guidelines governing recognition of Multidisciplinary Institutions. The Committee further observes that the deficiencies forming the basis of the impugned order primarily relate to infrastructural and instructional facilities, their adequacy, functionality, availability and supporting documentary evidence as recorded during the Visiting Team inspection. The Committee notes that such deficiencies are predominantly factual in nature and, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, are capable of objective verification by the competent statutory authority. However, where the deficiencies arise from physical observations recorded during inspection, any subsequent photographs, affidavits, undertakings or additional documents produced at the appellate stage cannot, by themselves, displace or supersede the contemporaneous findings of the Visiting Team unless the same are duly verified in accordance with the statutory framework. The Committee further notes that, during the appellate proceedings under Section 18 of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the appellant institution has placed on record additional documents and a compliance report purporting to address the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order. A substantial part of such material was either not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order or has not been subjected to factual verification and authentication by the competent authority in accordance with the National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The Committee reiterates that compliance with the recognition norms prescribed under the statutory framework is required to be established through contemporaneous, duly authenticated and verifiable documentary evidence. The burden of establishing strict, continuous and demonstrable compliance rests entirely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions, post facto explanations or documents produced during appellate proceedings do not, by themselves, establish compliance unless verified by the competent Regional Committee in accordance with law. Recognition under the NCTE Act, 1993 is regulatory in character and remains subject to continuous compliance with the prescribed norms and standards. The Committee further observes that eligibility for offering the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) is contingent upon the institution qualifying as a Multidisciplinary Institution in accordance with the applicable provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025. The concerned Regional Committee is therefore required to verify, inter alia, the authenticity and legal validity of the land documents, the adequacy and earmarking of land and built-up area, and conformity with the applicable NCTE norms as well as the requirements prescribed by the concerned statutory or regulatory

authorities governing the multidisciplinary programmes. 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 material brought on record during the pendency of appellate proceedings cannot be disregarded merely because it was not before the Regional Committee at the time of passing of the impugned order, and that, where the circumstances so warrant, the matter may appropriately be remitted for reconsideration in accordance with law. At the same time, such additional material does not ipso facto establish compliance and necessarily requires factual verification and regulatory scrutiny by the competent Regional Committee.

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, is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 03.06.2026 warrants interference only to the limited extent indicated herein. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 03.06.2026 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the Western Regional Committee solely for factual re-verification through an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee in accordance with the National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The appellant institution shall, within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of this order, deposit the prescribed processing fee and submit before the concerned Regional Committee a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness and completeness of all documents relied upon in the appeal, together with duly authenticated copies of all statutory approvals, certificates and other supporting documents. The Online Visiting Team shall confine its verification to the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order and such consequential issues as are necessary for determining compliance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and the applicable norms governing implementation of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). Upon receipt of the Visiting Team Report and the documents submitted by the appellant institution, the Western Regional Committee shall verify the authenticity, correctness, completeness and regulatory conformity of the documents and infrastructure relied upon by the institution, examine the Visiting Team Report together with the entire record, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations contained in the present order, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that

the present remand is confined solely to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny. This order shall not be construed as acceptance of the appellant institution's claims, nor shall it create any presumption, equity or vested right in favour of the appellant institution. In the event the institution fails to establish strict compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under NCTE Act, 1993, the National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the NCTE Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Institutions (MDI) dated 15.05.2025, and other applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, the Western Regional Committee shall take an appropriate decision strictly in accordance with law.

IV. DECISION:

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee of the Council, in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decided to set aside the impugned order dated 03.06.2026 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee for limited factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee and strict compliance with the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall forward the relevant documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within the stipulated timeframe.

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



उप सचिव (अपील)/ Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Adarsh Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 2982/548, Kuchaman City, Station Road, Nagaur, Rajasthan-341508.**
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 – 21.07.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-286/E-414841/2026 Appeal/10th Meeting, 2026
APPLNRC202615687 -

Laureate Institute of Education and Training, Khasra No. 263-268, 269-273, 276-278, 641/255-643/255, AG Shimla, Branch Peth, Mashobra, Bharari, Simla, Himachal Pradesh – 171003.	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075.
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Ram Singh, Managing Director
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	06.07.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.07.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Laureate Institute of Education and Training, Khasra No. 263-268, 269-273, 276-278, 641/255-643/255, AG Shimla, Branch Peth, Mashobra, Bharari, Simla, Himachal Pradesh – 171003** dated 29.06.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no **F.No.NRC/NCTE/HP-173/B.Ed./459th Meeting (Sl. No. 14)/2026/236968-76 Computer No. 50362** dated 03.06.2026 of the Northern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting **B.Ed. course** on the grounds that “1. The institution has submitted certified sale deed dated 17.06.2003, with Khasra No. 262, land area - 250.15 Sq. mtrs, in favour of Laurate Public School. Title of land is neither in name of the institution nor in the name of the sponsoring Society/Trust. 2. Lease of land and building for Khasra No. 274. 275 and 281 registered on 20.11.2015 is from the Private Party which is not acceptable as per NCTE Regulations 2014. 3. The institution has not submitted a certificate to the effect that the building is disabled friendly issued by the Competent Government Authority. 4. The institution has not submitted Change of Land Use Certificate issued by Competent Government Authority. 5. The faculty of Physical Education, Visual Art and Performing Art is not approved by the affiliating body. Quality education is the foundation of a prosperous future, transforming minds from empty vessels into open. 6. Quality education is an important aspect in providing high quality, equitable and accessible education. In the absence of requisite faculty as per NCTE Regulations 2014, the quality education could not be delivered, and an institution should not be allowed/ permitted to offer the programme. 7. The Committee deliberated on the documents submitted by the institution in reply to Show Cause Notices/ letter issued to it and noted that the institution is still deficient in multiple parameters inclusive of shortage of faculty for the B.Ed. course, as per NCTE Regulations 2014 despite reasonable opportunities provided to the institution.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Ram Singh, Managing Director of Laureate Institute of Education and Training, Khasra No. 263-268, 269-273, 276-278, 641/255-643/255, AG Shimla, Branch Peth, Mashobra, Bharari, Simla, Himachal Pradesh – 171003 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. It is humbly submitted that the Laureate Institute of Education & Training (L.I.E.T) is situated on Khasra No.642/255, 643/255,270,269,276,277,278,271,272 and Khasra No. 641/ 255, 265, 266, 267, 268, 263 and 264. That abovesaid land is in name OF Dr. Ran Singh and

Dr. Meera Singh who are managing committee members of Laureate Educational Society and they have by registered lease deed dated 12.04.2006 given this parcel of land to the sponsoring society. As per the NCTE regulations 2005, the private lease was acceptable when the institution was granted recognition. That the khasra no.262 LAND paper was submitted for the reference purpose to show the composite land holding by the lessors. 2. It is humbly submitted that in the registered lease deed dated 12.04.2006, the khasra no.274,275 and 281 has specially been carved out for the school purpose and it has no co relation with teacher education course run by laureate educational society. 3. It is humbly submitted that the institution is submitting disability friendly certificate dated 13.12.2021 issued by competent authority. 4. It is humbly submitted that the institution is submitting municipal corporation Shimla order dated 15.02.2007 which reflect that the institution land is used for the educational purpose which is in favor lessors. 5. It is humbly submitted that the institution is submitting approved faculty list of physical education, visual arts and performing arts by Affiliating University. 6. The Institute is focusing on the quality education by fulfilling faculty norms as prescribed by NCTE, thereby ensuring quality teacher education. The Institute has appointed requisite nos. of qualified faculty through transparent recruitment process followed by the affiliating University. Faculty members regularly participate in Seminars, Workshops, Conferences and Faculty Development Programmes to update their knowledge and teaching practices for innovative teaching learning process. The Institute remains committed to maintain prescribed standard and enhance the quality of teacher education. The Institute has been recognized by UGC under Section 2(f) of UGC Act, 1956. The appellant institution also submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the observations communicated through the impugned order and fulfilled the applicable provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014, the applicable Norms and Standards. The institution further submitted that all statutory, infrastructural, academic, administrative, financial and regulatory requirements prescribed under the applicable NCTE framework stand fulfilled. It stated that the institution is situated on the land comprised in the specified Khasra numbers and placed on record the registered lease deed dated 12.04.2006 executed in favour of Laureate Educational Society, along with the relevant society records and resolution. The institution clarified that certain Khasra numbers form part of the land used by Laureate Public School and were disclosed to indicate the composite land holdings of the society. It further submitted the Disability Friendly Certificate issued by the competent authority and stated that the institution complies with the prescribed accessibility requirements. The institution also placed on record documents issued by the Municipal Corporation, Shimla and property tax records indicating that the land is being used for educational purposes. The institution submitted the approval letter issued by Himachal Pradesh University together with the approved faculty list in respect of Physical Education, Visual Arts and Performing Arts in the

prescribed NCTE format. It further stated that qualified faculty members have been appointed in accordance with the applicable NCTE norms and placed on record the communication of Himachal Pradesh University regarding compliance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014, along with the NAAC Certificate, ISO Certificate and UGC recognition under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, 1956." The institution also undertook that all documents furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid, verifiable and issued by the competent statutory authorities, and affirmed its continued compliance with the applicable statutory requirements relating to land, infrastructure, instructional facilities, faculty and financial resources.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 10th Meeting, 2026 held online on 06th & 7th July, 2026, considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined the Appeal Report, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 11.08.2006. 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 05.06.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 03.06.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Laureate Institute of Education and Training, preferred against the impugned order raising deficiencies relating to land documents, lease, disability-friendly infrastructure, land use, and faculty. The appellant submitted that the institution is situated on land comprised in Khasra Nos. 642/255, 643/255, 270, 269, 276, 277, 278, 271, 272, 641/255, 265, 266, 267, 268, 263 and 264, owned by Dr. Ran Singh and Dr. Meera Singh, who are members of the managing committee of the sponsoring society, and that the said land was leased to the society through a registered lease deed dated 12.04.2006. It was further submitted that, under the NCTE Regulations applicable at the time recognition was granted, such private lease was permissible. The appellant clarified that the document relating to Khasra No. 262 was furnished only for reference to indicate the composite landholding of the lessors and that Khasra Nos. 274, 275 and 281 were specifically carved out under the lease deed for school purposes and had no relation to the teacher education programme. The appellant further submitted that it has furnished a Disability-Friendly Certificate dated

13.12.2021 issued by the competent authority and an order dated 15.02.2007 issued by the Municipal Corporation, Shimla, indicating that the land is permitted for educational use in favour of the lessors. The appellant also submitted the duly approved faculty list for Physical Education, Visual Arts and Performing Arts, duly approved by the affiliating University. It was further submitted that the institution has appointed the requisite qualified faculty in accordance with the NCTE norms through the prescribed recruitment process, continues to maintain the prescribed faculty standards for quality teacher education, and is recognized by the UGC under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, 1956. Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the observations communicated through the impugned order and fulfilled the applicable provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014, the applicable Norms and Standards. The institution further submitted that all statutory, infrastructural, academic, administrative, financial and regulatory requirements prescribed under the applicable NCTE framework stand fulfilled. It stated that the institution is situated on the land comprised in the specified Khasra numbers and placed on record the registered lease deed dated 12.04.2006 executed in favour of Laureate Educational Society, together with the relevant society records and resolution. The institution clarified that certain Khasra numbers pertain to the land utilised by Laureate Public School and were disclosed to indicate the composite land holdings of the society. It further submitted the Disability Friendly Certificate issued by the competent authority and stated that the institution complies with the prescribed accessibility requirements. The institution also placed on record the Municipal Corporation, Shimla order and property tax records indicating that the land is being used for educational purposes. The institution submitted the approval letter issued by Himachal Pradesh University along with the approved faculty list in respect of Physical Education, Visual Arts and Performing Arts in the prescribed NCTE format. It further stated that qualified faculty members have been appointed in accordance with the applicable NCTE norms and placed on record the communication of Himachal Pradesh University regarding compliance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014, together with the NAAC Certificate, ISO Certificate and UGC recognition under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, 1956. The institution also undertook that all documents furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid and capable of independent verification by the competent statutory authorities. 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 03.06.2026 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 03.06.2026 and remands the matter to the Northern Regional Committee for fresh consideration and re-examination in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), subject to the directions contained herein. The appellant institution shall submit the requisite documents within fifteen (15) days, whereupon the Regional Committee shall proceed in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within the stipulated timeframe.

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


उप सचिव (अपील)/ Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Laureate Institute of Education and Training, Khasra No. 263-268, 269-273, 276-278, 641/255-643/255, AG Shimla, Branch Peth, Mashobra, Bharari, Simla, Himachal Pradesh – 171003.**
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.



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 – 21.07.2026

एन सी टी ई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-292/E-414945/2026 /Appeal/10th Meeting, 2026
APPLWRC202615686 -

Seth Sushil Kumar Bihani S.D Shiksha Mahavidyalya, Khasra No. 12 and 13, Near Sukhadiya Circle, Suratgarh Road NH 62, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan-335001.	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative of the institution
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	06.07.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.07.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Seth Sushil Kumar Bihani S. D. Shiksha Mahavidyalya, Khasra No. 12 and 13, Near Sukhadiya Circle, Suratgarh Road NH 62, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan-335001** dated 24.06.2026 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F.No.NCTE/WRC/2627202510053711/RAJASTHAN/2025/REJC/265** dt. 30.04.2026 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that " i. The institution has not uploaded the Fire Safety Certificate. ii. Committee noted that, the institution in its reply to deficiency regarding building safety certificate has submitted that it is uploaded the revised building safety certificate, however, no document has been uploaded. iii. The institution in its reply to deficiency of salary to staff has stated that it is uploading the bank statement of teaching staff, however, no document has been uploaded. iv. The reply uploaded by the institution is not acceptable in view of following (1) the floor area mentioned in the present BCC is less than the earlier BCC, which is not possible (2) the institution is required to mention the date of additional construction in the BCC. v. The institution has not uploaded Mutation certificate/Jamabandi issued by the Government Competent Authority. vi. The name of the applicant institution i.e. "SETH SUSHIL KUMAR BIHANI SD SHIKSHA MAHAVIDYALYAY" mentioned in the NRC recognition order for B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed. programme and multidisciplinary Institution name is "Seth G.L. Bihani S.D. P.G. College". vii. 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. viii. The website of the institution has not been in compliance to provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended from time to time. The institution has not updated the website as per NCTE regulations. ix. The institution has uploaded the list of teaching staff duly approved and countersigned by its affiliating body but not in the prescribed format of NCTE and not as per NCTE norms. x. The institution has not uploaded Not-for-Profit Certificate issued by Competent Authority of State Government. xi. Committee noted that, the institution is conducting Multidisciplinary and Teacher Education courses in the same premises i.e. B.A. B.Sc. B.Com. B.B.A. B.C.A. B.Sc. (Biotechnology) LL.B. B.Pharm D.Pharm Postgraduate Programmes: M.Com. M.Sc. M.C.A. LL.M. Teacher Education Programmes: D.El.Ed. 1 unit, B.Ed., 2 units, B.A. B.Ed. Secondary (4 unit), Middle (4 unit) & B.Sc. B.Ed. Secondary (4 unit), Middle (4 unit) Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), the institution has mentioned the total built-up area 7056 sq.mts. This built-up area is not sufficient to run the above courses.

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. The institution has not been able to prove/confirm whether the institution is paying salaries to the teaching staff as per Central/State Govt norms. xiii. No attachments have been uploaded by the institution in response to the reply (1) the floor area mentioned in the present BCC is less than the earlier BCC, which is not possible (2) the institution has not mentioned the date of additional construction in the BCC. xiv. The Committee noted that the name of the applicant institution i.e. "SETH SUSHIL KUMAR BIHANI SD SHIKSHA MAHAVIDYALYAY" mentioned in the NRC recognition order for B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed. programme and multidisciplinary Institution name is "Seth G.L. Bihani S.D. P.G. College". There is mismatch in the name of applicant institution and Multidisciplinary Institution. xv. Committee noted that, the institution has mentioned in the land details Column its land area 9110 sq.mts. and built-up area 7056 sq.mts. In the NEC Column land area is mentioned 61990 sq.mts., in the Building Plan column land area mentioned is 4405.85 sq.mts. and in the BCC column land area mentioned is 4405 sq.mts. The land area is mismatch in all the Columns in online application. xvi. As the institution is running the various courses in the same campus, the institution has not submitted the demarcated site plan duly demarcating the land area for the existing College course and the proposed ITEP course. The institution has not demarcated the land and built-up area as per the Guidelines issued by the Government of Rajasthan for (Niji Mahavidyalaya Niti) available on <https://hte.rajasthan.gov.in/dept/dce/uploads/doc/NOCpolicy202122.pdf> xvii. 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. But 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."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative of Seth Sushil Kumar Bihani S.D Shiksha Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 12 and 13, Near Sukhadiya Circle, Suratgarh Road NH 62, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan-335001 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The Appellant respectfully submits that the aforesaid documenta had already been uploaded on the NCTE portal within the stipulated period. However, without prejudice to the above submission, all such documents are being enclosed again with the present Appeal for verification and consideration. The institution should not be made to suffer on account of any technical, procedural or portal-related issue in viewing or retrieving the documents already uploaded by the institution. 2. The

Appellant submits that the revised certificate was issued after verification and measurement by the competent authority. The revised Building Completion Certificate, along with supporting records, clearly explains the actual built-up area and construction details. The discrepancy is merely technical and stands duly clarified. 3. The Appellant respectfully submits that both institutions have always been managed and controlled by the same sponsoring body, namely Seth Girdhari Lal Bihani Sanatan Dharma Shiksha Trust, Sri Ganganagar, Further, subsequent to the passing of the impugned order, Maharaja Ganga Singh University, Bikaner vide Letter No. F.07)MGSUB/Acad-1/2026/323 dated 30.05.2026 approved the merger of Seth Sushil Kumar Bihani S.D. Shiksha Mahavidyalaya with Seth G.L. Bihani S.D. P.G. College. The Government of Rajasthan has also approved the said merger vide its order dated 19.06.2026. Accordingly, the issue relating to nomenclature or identity of the multidisciplinary institution no longer survives and stands conclusively resolved. The sole substantive objection recorded by the Committee has therefore ceased to exist. 4. The Appellant submits that the website has been updated and all mandatory disclosures required under the NCTE Regulations have been uploaded. A detailed compliance report, along with supporting screenshots, is enclosed. 5. The Appellant submits that the faculty list duly approved by the affiliating university is enclosed in the prescribed format. The institution fulfils the faculty requirements prescribed under the NCTE norms. 6. The built-up area of 7056 square metres referred to by the institution pertains exclusively to Teacher Education and allied educational programmes and not to the entire campus or all institutions being operated by Seth G.L. Bihani S.D. Shiksha Trust. The Committee appears to have considered all programmes being conducted under the Trust while assessing only the area earmarked for teacher education programmes. The Trust possesses additional land and infrastructure earmarked for various departments and programmes. A copy of the Master Plan/Layout Plan of Seth G.L. Bihani S.D. Shiksha Trust clearly showing the demarcated land area, built-up area, departments and course-wise allocation of infrastructure is enclosed herewith. The enclosed plan establishes that adequate and separate infrastructure is available for Teacher Education Programmes, Multidisciplinary Programmes and other courses being conducted under the Trust. Accordingly, the finding that the built-up area of 7056 square metres is insufficient for all programmes is factually incorrect. 7. The observation is not sustainable. The institution is a self-financed institution affiliated to Maharaja Ganga Singh University, Bikaner and is governed by the norms, regulations and conditions prescribed by the affiliating University and the competent authorities from time to time. The institution has been regularly disbursing salaries to its teaching and non-teaching staff through banking channels. The salary records, bank transfer statements and other supporting documents evidencing such payments are enclosed herewith. It is respectfully submitted that the institution pays salaries in accordance with the norms and requirements prescribed by the affiliating University and other applicable

regulatory authorities. No adverse finding has ever been recorded by the affiliating University regarding payment of salaries to the staff. Therefore, the observation that the institution has failed to establish payment of salary as per the applicable norms is factually incorrect and deserves to be set aside. 8. The Appellant submits that the figures referred to in different documents represent different parameters such as total campus area, institutional land area and built-up area. A consolidated explanatory statement, along with supporting land documents, is enclosed for proper appreciation. 9. The Appellant submits that a revised and duly certified site plan clearly demarcating the land area and built-up area allocated for teacher education programmes, multidisciplinary programmes and other academic activities is enclosed. 10. The Appellant submits that the approved building plan issued by the competent authority showing khasra details, land area, built-up area and programme-wise allocation of infrastructure is enclosed. The institution fulfils the infrastructural requirements prescribed under the applicable norms. 11. It is respectfully submitted that the merger approved by Maharaja Ganga Singh University, Bikaner, on 30.05.2026 and by the Government of Rajasthan on 19.06.2026 are subsequent events of substantial significance having a direct bearing on the eligibility of the institution. These developments conclusively establish that the Appellant Institution is now an integral part of Seth G.L. Bihani S.D. P.G. College, a multidisciplinary institution, thereby fully satisfying the requirements prescribed under NEP 2020, NCTE Regulations and ITEP Guidelines. In view of the above facts, the refusal order deserves to be set aside, and the matter deserves fresh consideration in the interest of justice.”

The appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the applicable provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions and undertook that all documents furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid and capable of independent verification. The institution submitted that the Fire Safety Certificate, Building Safety Certificate, Building Completion Certificate, CLU, Mutation/Jamabandi, Not-for-Profit Certificate and staff salary records had already been uploaded on the NCTE portal and were again furnished along with the appeal. It further stated that the revised Building Completion Certificate had been issued by the competent authority after due verification and reflected the actual built-up area. The institution clarified that the teacher education institution and the multidisciplinary institution are managed by the same sponsoring trust and submitted that the merger of the institutions had subsequently been approved by Maharaja Ganga Singh University, Bikaner and the Government of Rajasthan. The institution further submitted that its website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. It stated that the faculty list duly approved by the affiliating university in the prescribed format had been furnished. The institution further clarified that the built-up area earmarked for teacher education programmes is separate from the infrastructure

allocated to other programmes under the Trust and placed on record the Master Plan/Layout Plan showing programme-wise demarcation of land and built-up area. The institution submitted that salaries of teaching and non-teaching staff are being disbursed through banking channels in accordance with the applicable norms and furnished supporting salary records and bank statements. The institution also clarified the variation in land area reflected in different documents and submitted a consolidated explanatory statement together with supporting land records. It further submitted a revised certified site plan and an approved building plan issued by the competent authority indicating the Khasra details, total land area, built-up area and programme-wise earmarked infrastructure.

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee, in its 10th Meeting, 2026 held online on 06th & 7th July, 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 06.10.2025. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 30.04.2026.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in the present meeting and noted the submissions of the appellant institution, Seth Sushil Kumar Bihani S.D. Shiksha Mahavidyalaya, preferred against the order refusing recognition/transition on account of deficiencies relating to submission of documents, Building Completion Certificate, multidisciplinary status, institutional website, faculty, adequacy of built-up area, salary payment, land particulars, site plan and approved building plan. The appellant submitted that all requisite documents had already been uploaded on the NCTE portal within the prescribed time and have been re-submitted along with the appeal, contending that the institution should not be prejudiced on account of any technical or portal-related issue. It was further submitted that the revised Building Completion Certificate was issued after verification and measurement by the competent authority and clarifies the actual built-up area and construction details. The appellant further submitted that both Seth Sushil Kumar Bihani S.D. Shiksha Mahavidyalaya and Seth G.L. Bihani S.D. P.G. College have always been managed by the same sponsoring body, namely Seth Girdhari Lal Bihani Sanatan Dharma Shiksha Trust, Sri Ganganagar. It was stated that Maharaja Ganga Singh University, Bikaner, vide letter dated 30.05.2026,

approved the merger of the two institutions and that the Government of Rajasthan, vide order dated 19.06.2026, also approved the merger. The appellant contended that these approvals resolve the issue relating to the identity of the multidisciplinary institution and establish compliance with the requirements under the NCTE Regulations, NEP 2020 and the ITEP Guidelines. The appellant also submitted that the institutional website has been updated with all mandatory disclosures prescribed under the NCTE Regulations; the teaching faculty list, duly approved by the affiliating university in the prescribed format, has been furnished; and the institution fulfils the prescribed faculty norms. It was further submitted that the built-up area of 7056 sq. metres relates exclusively to teacher education and allied educational programmes and not to the entire campus, and that the Trust possesses additional land and infrastructure separately earmarked for multidisciplinary and other programmes. In support thereof, the appellant submitted the master/layout plan, revised site plan, approved building plan, consolidated explanatory statement and supporting land documents showing programme-wise demarcation of land and built-up area. The appellant further submitted that salaries are regularly disbursed to teaching and non-teaching staff through banking channels in accordance with the norms of the affiliating university and other applicable authorities, supported by salary records and bank statements. On the basis of the above submissions and documents, the appellant sought reconsideration of the refusal order. The Appeal Committee also noted that the appellant institution submitted an affidavit stating that it had complied with the applicable provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the Guidelines for Transformation into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions, and undertook that all documents furnished before the Appellate Authority are genuine, valid and capable of independent verification. The institution submitted that the Fire Safety Certificate, Building Safety Certificate, Building Completion Certificate, CLU, Mutation/Jamabandi, Not-for-Profit Certificate and staff salary records had already been uploaded on the NCTE portal and were again placed on record along with the appeal. It further stated that the revised Building Completion Certificate had been issued by the competent authority after due verification and reflected the actual built-up area. The institution clarified that the teacher education institution and the multidisciplinary institution are managed by the same sponsoring trust and submitted that the merger of the institutions had been approved by Maharaja Ganga Singh University, Bikaner and the Government of Rajasthan. The institution further submitted that its website had been updated in accordance with the disclosure requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. It stated that the faculty list, duly approved by the affiliating university in the prescribed format, had been furnished. The institution further clarified that the built-up area earmarked for the teacher education programmes is distinct from the infrastructure allocated to other programmes under the Trust and placed on record the Master Plan/Layout Plan indicating the programme-wise

demarcation of land and built-up area. It also submitted that salaries of the teaching and non-teaching staff are being disbursed through banking channels in accordance with the applicable norms and furnished the relevant salary records and bank statements. The institution further clarified the variation in the land area reflected in different documents and placed on record a consolidated explanatory statement together with supporting land records. It also submitted a revised certified site plan and an approved building plan issued by the competent authority indicating the Khasra details, total land area, built-up area and programme-wise earmarked infrastructure. 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 30.04.2026 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 30.04.2026 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, Seth Sushil Kumar Bihani S. D. Shiksha Mahavidyalya, Khasra No. 12 and 13, Near Sukhadiya Circle, Suratgarh Road NH 62, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan-335001.
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.