



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 – 21.08.2026

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

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

Appeal/15th (Emergent) Meeting, 2026 / E-90934

Serial No. 01 of 15th (Emergent) Meeting – 2026

Sri Thangam Periyasamy College of Education, Pennadam, Virudhachalam, Tamilnadu-606001.	<u>Vs</u>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075.
--	------------------	--

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
Date of Hearing	20.08.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.08.2026

आदेश/ ORDER**I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL**

The appeal of **Sri Thangam Periyasamy College of Education, Pennadam, Virudhachalam, Cuddalore, Tamilnadu-606001** dated -- filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the Order No. **F.SRO/NCTE/APSO9415/TN/B.Ed./2020/117623-629** dated 07.09.2020 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "1. The BCC submitted by the institution is not approved by the Competent Authority. 2. The signature of Approving Authority in LUC is in Regional Language. The institution has not submitted notarised English translated copy of the same. 3. NEC is in Regional Language. The English translation (notarized) not provided. 4. Site plan not submitted. 5. Size of MP Hall is not adequate. 6. The proforma of faculty shows the whole document typed whereas the remark "SC" in the proforma of Manikandan, Prabakaran, Barathiraja.K., and Velmurugam.E. have been made by hand. 7. Faculties for Fine Arts and Performing Arts have not been appointed."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from Sri Thangam Periyasamy College of Education, Pennadam, Virudhachalam, Cuddalore, Tamilnadu-606001 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. The institution submitted before the Hon'ble High Court that it has sent a letter dated 23.09.23 to the MS, NCTE and RD, SRC, NCTE and presented it in writ petition. The institution submitted vide letter dated 23.08.2023, the following:- "I am running an Institution for course of teacher Education, i.e., "Shri Thangam Periyasamy College of Education (B.Ed.,)" at Vriddhachalam. The College has well reputed college in cuddalore district and near district also. I had granted recognition Vide SRC(NCTE) order No. F.SRO/NCTE/B.ED./2009 dated on 25.09.2009 by the Competent Authority of National Council for Teacher Education, for conducting B.Ed. course of one year' duration with an annual intake of 100 students to run the institution after all enquiry and proceedings envisaged in the rule. competent authority. Thereafter, recognition of the institution was periodically renewed by the competent authority. On 07.09.2020, Institution received a "withdrawal order" where the shock and surprise that the recognition was withdrew by stating the certain deficiency that as follows; a. The BCC submitted by the institution is not approved by

the competent Authority. b. The signature of the Approving Authority in LUC is in Regional Language. The institution has not submitted a notarised English translation copy of the same. c. NEC is in Regional Language. The English Translation (notarized) not provided. d. Site plan not submitted. e. Size of MP Hall is not adequate. f. The proforma of faculty shows the whole document typed whereas the remark "SC" in the proforma of Manikandan, Prabhakaran, Barathiraja. K., and velmurgam.E. have been made by hand. g. Faculties for Fine Arts and performing Arts have not been appointed. Immediately, I made a Written Clarification letter for reconsidered the withdrawal order to the Regional Director, dated 27.10.2020 along with the required documents as stated in the withdrawal order through post and also submitted to the Regional Director website i.e., However, there is no reply or respond. www.ncte-india.org. In this context, I had filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble Madras High court to challenge the withdrawal order dated 07.09.2020 passed by the Regional Director. **The Writ petition (WP) in WP.No. 17989 of 2020 had disposed on 28.06.2023 with liberty and direction that as follow;** 5. *"In view of the restricted prayer as sought for by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this court without interfering with the impugned order of withdrawal of the 1st respondent dated 07.09.2020, grants liberty to the petitioner to file appropriate appeal before the Appellate Authority within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Upon receipt of such appeal, the Appellate authority shall consider the same on merits and in accordance with law and pass appropriate orders within a period of four weeks thereafter, after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. The time during which this petition has been pending before this court shall be excluded for the purpose of computation of limitation, if any. Further, the interim stay already granted by this court stands extended till disposal of the appeal to be filed by the petitioner."* In compliance of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order in WP. No. 17989 of 2020 that I have preferred this appeal under section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 against the withdrawal order dated on 07.09.2020 passed by the Regional Director."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE

The Appeal Committee in its 15th (Emergent) Meeting, 2026 held on 20th August, 2026 considered the case of the appellant institution and carefully examined, the impugned order passed by the concerned Regional Committee,

the records available on file, the documents placed on record, and the submissions made by the appellant institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students vide order dated 29.05.2009. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 the institution has submitted affidavit dt. 29.01.2015 for its willingness for adherence of provisions of new Regulations. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two units) from the academic session 2015-16 vide order dated 05.05.2015. An order vide dt. 14.09.2017 was issued to the institution for reduction of units from two to one unit. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 07.09.2020.

The Appeal Committee, at the outset, took note of the order dated 06.07.2026 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras in W.P. No.25719/2026 and W.M.P. No.28104/2026, whereby the Hon'ble Court directed disposal of the appeal stated by the petitioner institution to have been filed on 23.09.2023 under Section 18 of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993, within six weeks from the date of uploading of the web copy. The Hon'ble Court expressly recorded that it had not expressed any view on the merits of the appeal and left it open to the NCTE to consider the matter on its own merits and in accordance with law. The Appeal Committee accordingly proceeded to examine the matter within the scope of its statutory jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993.

The Appeal Committee noted that the recognition of the institution had been withdrawn by the Southern Regional Committee vide order dated 07.09.2020. The record further reflects that the withdrawal was founded upon deficiencies relating, inter alia, to the Building Completion Certificate, Land Use Certificate, Non-Encumbrance Certificate, site plan, adequacy of the Multipurpose Hall and faculty-related requirements, including non-appointment of faculty in Fine Arts and Performing Arts. The Committee further noted that the Hon'ble High Court recorded the institution's assertion that an appeal had been filed on 23.09.2023. However,

upon examination of the records available before the Appeal Committee, the institution has not established that a statutory appeal under Section 18 was filed in the prescribed manner, namely through the prescribed online appellate mechanism, accompanied by the requisite documents and prescribed fee. The current NCTE Appeal Division procedure also provides for filing of an appeal within sixty days and payment of the prescribed appeal fee. The Appeal Committee further noted that, upon receipt of the order of the Hon'ble High Court from the Southern Regional Committee by the Appeal Division on 18.08.2026, the institution was specifically addressed vide communication dated 19.08.2026 and was called upon to furnish the complete copy of the appeal stated to have been filed, proof/acknowledgement of its filing, the appeal number/reference number, proof of payment of the prescribed appeal fee, and all documents and submissions relied upon in support of its case. The institution was also contacted telephonically with a view to facilitating prompt compliance in view of the time-bound judicial direction; however, no response or requisite material was received from the institution. Despite being afforded an opportunity to substantiate its assertion that a statutory appeal had been duly preferred, the institution has failed to furnish any documentary material establishing the date, manner, receipt or reference of such filing, or compliance with the prescribed procedural and financial requirements. Consequently, on the basis of the material presently available on record, the institution has failed to establish before the Appeal Committee that a complete and duly constituted statutory appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, read with the applicable Rules, was filed and duly received by the competent appellate authority in accordance with law.

The Committee also considered the limitation aspect. Section 18 read with Rule 10 of the NCTE Rules, 1997 provides for an appeal within sixty days of the issue of the impugned order, subject to the statutory power to admit a delayed appeal where sufficient cause is established. The impugned order is dated 07.09.2020, whereas the institution relies upon a purported appeal dated 23.09.2023. The institution has not placed on record any satisfactory explanation, supported by credible material, establishing sufficient cause for the extraordinary delay. The Appeal Committee also took note of the order dated 10.01.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Suo Motu Writ Petition (Civil) No.3 of 2020*, wherein it was held:

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

Applying the aforesaid direction to the facts of the present case, even assuming its applicability, the appellant was required to invoke the statutory remedy within the period legally available after exclusion of the period covered by the aforesaid judicial directions. The institution has not established compliance within the permissible period, nor has it demonstrated sufficient cause for the subsequent extraordinary delay. The statutory power to admit a delayed appeal is discretionary and contingent upon establishment of sufficient cause; it cannot be exercised merely on the basis of a bare assertion that a communication was sent to the NCTE.

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

- (i) **The Appeal Committee noted that the institution has not substantiated, by cogent and legally acceptable documentary evidence, that the deficiencies which formed the basis of the withdrawal order dated 07.09.2020 were duly cured. In particular, the material available does not establish subsequent compliance in respect of the deficiencies concerning the Building Completion Certificate, Land Use Certificate,**

Non-Encumbrance Certificate, site plan, Multipurpose Hall and prescribed faculty requirements, including Fine Arts and Performing Arts faculty.

- (ii) The Committee further notes that the recognition of the institution stood withdrawn vide order dated 07.09.2020 and that, during the substantial period elapsed thereafter, the institution has not placed on record credible and contemporaneous material demonstrating any legally recognisable continuity of its teacher-education operations, including subsisting affiliation, duly approved faculty or other requisite regulatory compliances. The prolonged intervening period, coupled with the absence of documentary evidence establishing lawful and continuous academic functioning in accordance with the applicable regulatory framework, assumes material significance in assessing the present regulatory status of the institution. The Committee is, therefore, unable to accept any assertion of continued functioning merely on the basis of institutional claims or isolated activities unsupported by contemporaneous regulatory records. For the purposes of the present appellate determination, the institution has failed to establish a subsisting and demonstrable regulatory basis for treating its teacher-education programme as continuously operational after withdrawal of recognition. This circumstance is considered cumulatively with the other deficiencies and the prolonged failure to demonstrate compliance with the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.**
- (iii) The Appeal Committee also finds that the institution has failed to place on record reliable documentary evidence demonstrating the continued availability and approval of duly qualified teaching and non-teaching staff after withdrawal of recognition. The faculty material relied upon by the institution has not been shown to constitute duly approved faculty for the relevant period in accordance with the applicable regulatory requirements. The absence of such evidence is material, as availability of duly qualified and approved faculty constitutes a substantive component of the regulatory framework governing teacher education institutions.**
- (iv) The Committee further notes that, despite opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee and thereafter during the appellate process, the institution has failed to establish through complete, authentic and legally sustainable documentary evidence that the deficiencies forming the basis of the withdrawal order stood removed. The burden of establishing compliance with the statutory and regulatory requirements rests upon the institution seeking restoration or continuation of recognition.**

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The deficiencies forming the basis of the

withdrawal concerned substantive statutory and regulatory requirements and were not shown to have been satisfactorily cured. The Committee also records that the Appeal Division received the order of the Hon'ble High Court only on 18.08.2026, following which the institution was immediately addressed on 19.08.2026 for production of the requisite statutory appeal and supporting documents. To the extent the concerned Regional Committee had not earlier appraised the Appeal Committee of the judicial proceedings, the Committee takes note of the lapse in communication as reflected from the record. The Appeal Committee is conscious that the Hon'ble High Court directed disposal of the appeal stated to have been filed by the institution, but the Hon'ble Court expressly left the matter to be considered on its own merits and in accordance with law. The said direction does not amount to condonation of statutory delay, dispensation with the prescribed mode of filing, waiver of the prescribed fee or a direction to grant restoration of recognition. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on record, the Appeal Committee finds that the institution has failed to establish a duly filed statutory appeal in the prescribed manner, has failed to establish sufficient cause for the extraordinary delay and has, in any event, failed to demonstrate removal of the substantive deficiencies underlying the withdrawal of recognition. No legal, factual or procedural ground warranting interference with the impugned order has therefore been established. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Southern Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed, but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural

infirmary warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 07.09.2020 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the impugned order dated 07.09.2020 passed by the Southern Regional Committee, the records available on file, the documents produced by the appellant institution, and the order dated 06.07.2026 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras, the Appeal Committee, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, concludes that the appellant institution has failed to establish a statutory appeal filed in the prescribed manner within the period of limitation and has failed to establish sufficient cause warranting admission of the delayed appeal. The institution has further failed to establish removal of the substantive deficiencies forming the basis of the withdrawal order. Accordingly, the delayed appeal is not admitted and stands rejected. The impugned withdrawal order dated 07.09.2020 passed by the Southern Regional Committee remains undisturbed. The appeal stands disposed of accordingly.

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, Sri Thangam Periyasamy College of Education, Pennadam, Virudhachalam, Cuddalore, Tamilnadu-606001.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan 2, Central Secretariat, New Delhi-110001.
3. The Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Govt. of Tamil Nadu, Fort St. George, Chennai, Tamil Nadu-600009.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date – 21.08.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

Appeal/15th (Emergent) Meeting, 2026 / E-90934

Serial No. 02 of 15th (Emergent) Meeting – 2026

Shree Saraswati Gyanpeeth Shiksha Mahavidyalaya, 62, Laxman Nagar, Dist. -Dewas, Madhya Pradesh-455001.	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075.
---	------------------	---

Representative of Appellant	The Representative of the institution
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	20.08.2026
Date of Pronouncement	21.08.2026

आदेश/ ORDER**I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL**

The appeal of **Shree Saraswati Gyanpeeth Shiksha Mahavidyalaya, 62, Laxman Nagar, Dist. -Dewas, Madhya Pradesh-455001** dated 15.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the Order No. **F.No.WRC/APW04982/223549/286th /2018/194141** dated 22.01.2018 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "The matter was placed in 286th Meeting held on January 16-17, 2018, of WRC and the Committee decided that "Clarification letter was issued to the institution on 01.12.2017 regarding the approval of the faculty from Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya instead of Vikram University. The institution has not replied till date. **Hence, Recognition is withdrawn from the academic session 2018-2019. FDRs if any, be returned."**

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative of **Shree Saraswati Gyanpeeth Shiksha Mahavidyalaya, 62, Laxman Nagar, Dist. -Dewas, Madhya Pradesh-455001** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution. In the appeal report, it is submitted that "Approved faculty members list 15 plus 1 were submitted from DAVV Indore in instead off of Vikram University since its matter of shifting, we had approved list of Vikram University also, it will be make available at the time of hearing in original."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE

The Appeal Committee in its 15th (Emergent) Meeting, 2026 held on 20th August, 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. (Co-Ed) course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 04.01.2008. Thereafter, a Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two units) from the academic session 2015-16

vide order dated 31.05.2015. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the WRC vide order dated 22.01.2018.

The Appeal Committee considered the case in its present meeting, the Committee, at the outset, took note of the order dated 13.08.2026 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in W.P. (C) No. 11589/2026. The Hon'ble Court directed the Appeal Committee to hear and decide the appeal of the petitioner within one week and to communicate/upload the decision within two days thereafter. The Court also expressly recorded that it had not examined the merits of the case. The relevant portion of the order, as placed on record, reads:

“7. The appeal committee is therefore directed to hear and decide the appeal of the petitioner within 1 week from today. The same shall be communicated/uploaded within 2 days thereafter. The Court has not examined the merits of the case. The petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms.”

The Appeal Committee, in compliance with the aforesaid judicial direction, proceeded to consider the matter on the basis of the Appeal Report, the impugned withdrawal order dated 22.01.2018, the records available on file and the material placed by the appellant institution. The Committee noted that the appellant institution preferred the online appeal on 15.12.2025, against the withdrawal order dated 22.01.2018. The appeal was thus preferred after an exceptionally prolonged lapse of time. The appellant institution has not placed on record any satisfactory explanation, supported by credible material, explaining the delay in invoking the statutory appellate remedy or demonstrating sufficient cause for the delay.

The Committee also considered the limitation aspect. Section 18 read with Rule 10 of the NCTE Rules, 1997 provides for an appeal within sixty days of the issue of the impugned order, subject to the statutory power to admit a delayed appeal where sufficient cause is established. The impugned order is dated 22.01.2018, whereas the institution relies upon a purported appeal dated 15.12.2025. The institution has not placed on record any satisfactory explanation, supported by credible material, establishing sufficient cause for the extraordinary delay. The Appeal Committee also took note of the order dated 10.01.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Suo Motu Writ Petition (Civil) No.3 of 2020*, wherein it was held:

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

Applying the aforesaid direction to the facts of the present case, even assuming its applicability, the appellant was required to invoke the statutory remedy within the period legally available after exclusion of the period covered by the aforesaid judicial directions. The institution has not established compliance within the permissible period, nor has it demonstrated sufficient cause for the subsequent extraordinary delay. The statutory power to admit a delayed appeal is discretionary and contingent upon establishment of sufficient cause; it cannot be exercised merely on the basis of a bare assertion that a communication was sent to the NCTE.

The Committee also noted that the appeal record does not contain the prescribed appeal fee and that the online appeal available on the portal remains incomplete in this regard. The Appeal Division, upon receipt of the aforesaid judicial order on 20.08.2026 from the WRC, issued communication dated 20.08.2026 to the institution informing it of the Court's direction and calling upon it to furnish the prescribed appeal fee and complete the statutory requirements. The Committee noted that no satisfactory compliance in this regard is borne out from the material placed before it.

The Committee, however, having regard to the specific direction of the Hon'ble High Court to hear and decide the appeal, proceeded to examine the substantive regulatory record as well, without treating such examination as condonation of delay or as dispensing with the statutory requirements governing an appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993. The Appeal Committee, also upon exhaustive, independent, and objective scrutiny of the entire material available on record, and in strict exercise of its appellate jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, after conscious and reasoned application of mind, finds that the appellant institution has unequivocally failed to discharge the statutory onus cast upon it to establish, by cogent, credible, authentic, and legally sustainable documentary evidence, fulfillment of the mandatory and threshold recognition standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as amended from time to time. The Appeal Committee

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

- (i) **The Committee noted that the recognition of the institution had been withdrawn vide order dated 22.01.2018. The record further reflects that the withdrawal was founded, inter alia, upon the institution's failure to respond to the clarification dated 01.12.2017 regarding approval of its faculty by Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya instead of Vikram University. The Regional Committee accordingly recorded withdrawal of recognition from the academic session 2018-19.**
- (ii) **The Committee further notes that the recognition of the institution stood withdrawn vide order dated 22.01.2018 and that, during the substantial period elapsed thereafter, the institution has not placed on record credible and contemporaneous material demonstrating any legally recognisable continuity of its teacher-education operations, including subsisting affiliation, duly approved faculty or other requisite regulatory compliances. The prolonged intervening period, coupled with the absence of documentary evidence establishing lawful and continuous academic functioning in accordance with the applicable regulatory framework, assumes material significance in assessing the present regulatory status of the institution. The Committee is, therefore, unable to accept any assertion of continued functioning merely on the basis of institutional claims or isolated activities unsupported by contemporaneous regulatory records. For the purposes of the present appellate determination, the institution has failed to establish a subsisting and demonstrable regulatory basis for treating its teacher-education programme as continuously operational after withdrawal of recognition. This circumstance is considered cumulatively with the other deficiencies and the prolonged failure to demonstrate compliance with the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.**
- (iii) **The Committee also noted that no reliable documentary material has been placed on record establishing continuation of duly approved teaching and non-teaching staff after withdrawal of recognition, including approval of faculty by the competent affiliating University, appointment/approval records or satisfactory documentary proof of salary payment. The faculty material relied upon by the institution does not, by itself, establish approval by the competent affiliating authority.**
- (iv) **The Committee observed that these deficiencies are not merely procedural in character. Availability of duly qualified and appropriately approved faculty and compliance with the applicable**

regulatory requirements constitute substantive conditions governing recognition and continuation of a teacher education programme. The institution has failed, despite the opportunities available in the proceedings, to establish through reliable and legally sustainable documentary material that these requirements were duly satisfied.

The Appeal Committee, upon comprehensive, independent, and objective consideration of the entire material available on record, finds that the impugned order does not suffer from any procedural infirmity, perversity, non-consideration of relevant material, arbitrariness, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The record unequivocally demonstrates that the; reasonable, adequate, and meaningful opportunity was afforded to the applicant institution to submit its reply together with supporting documentary evidence; and the deficiencies were expressly articulated, specifically identified, and formally communicated. The deficiencies forming the basis of the withdrawal concerned substantive statutory and regulatory requirements and were not shown to have been satisfactorily cured. The Committee also records that the Appeal Division received the order of the Hon'ble High Court only on 18.08.2026, following which the institution was immediately addressed on 19.08.2026 for production of the requisite statutory appeal and supporting documents. To the extent the concerned Regional Committee had not earlier appraised the Appeal Committee of the judicial proceedings, the Committee takes note of the lapse in communication as reflected from the record. The Appeal Committee is conscious that the Hon'ble High Court directed disposal of the appeal stated to have been filed by the institution, but the Court expressly left the matter to be considered on its own merits and in accordance with law. The said direction does not amount to condonation of statutory delay, dispensation with the prescribed mode of filing, waiver of the prescribed fee or a direction to grant restoration of recognition. In the present case, despite adequate and repeated opportunities afforded by the concerned Regional Committee as well as by the Appeal Committee, the applicant institution has failed to establish fulfillment of the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Regulations framed thereunder. Accordingly, no ground for appellate interference is made out, and the impugned order warrants confirmation.

Noting the submissions contained in the Appeal Report, the documents available on record, and the arguments advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee, upon independent, objective, and comprehensive consideration of the entire material on

record, the Appeal Committee finds that the institution has failed to establish a duly filed statutory appeal in the prescribed manner, has failed to establish sufficient cause for the extraordinary delay and has, in any event, failed to demonstrate removal of the substantive deficiencies underlying the withdrawal of recognition. No legal, factual or procedural ground warranting interference with the impugned order has therefore been established. The Appeal Committee further holds that the Western Regional Committee acted strictly within the confines of its statutory jurisdiction and in faithful discharge of its regulatory mandate. The action impugned is neither arbitrary nor procedurally flawed but is firmly anchored in the applicable statutory provisions. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Appeal Committee finds no legal, factual, or procedural infirmity warranting appellate interference; the impugned order dated 22.01.2018 is hereby confirmed, and the appeal stands rejected.

IV. DECISION: -

After careful consideration of the Appeal Report, the impugned withdrawal order dated 22.01.2018, the order dated 13.08.2026 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, the records available on file and the material placed by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, concludes that the appellant institution has failed to establish a statutory appeal filed in the prescribed manner within the period of limitation and has failed to establish sufficient cause warranting admission of the delayed appeal. The institution has further failed to establish removal of the substantive deficiencies forming the basis of the withdrawal order. Accordingly, the delayed appeal is not admitted and stands rejected. The impugned withdrawal order dated 22.01.2018 passed by the Western Regional Committee remains undisturbed. The appeal stands disposed of accordingly.

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, Shree Saraswati Gyanpeeth Shiksha Mahavidyalaya, 62, Laxman Nagar, Dist. -Dewas, Madhya Pradesh-455001.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Kartavya Bhawan 2, Central Secretariat, New Delhi-110001.
3. The Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.

4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, 2nd floor, Annex-3, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh-462004.