



एनसीटीई अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-488/E-389490/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLSRC202515434 / E-89067

Deccan M.Ed. College, Survey no. 34/2, Noorani Mohalla Gulbarga, Near Peer Bangali Dargah, Ring Road, Gulbarga, Karnataka - 585104	Vs	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector - 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Manik. M. Shinde, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
Date of Hearing	16.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OFS WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of Deccan M.Ed. College, Survey no. 34/2, Noorani Mohalla Gulbarga, Near Peer Bangali Dargah, Ring Road, Gulbarga, Karnataka - 585104 dated 15.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. F. No. SRO/NCTE/APS07294/KA/M.Ed./2021/123121-3128 dated 19.01.2021 of the Southern Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting M.Ed. Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has submitted photocopy of Sale Deed. The institution has not submitted certified copy of registered land. 2. The institution has submitted an approval letter dt 05.11.2015 signed by the Registrar of Gulbarga University. But the institution has not submitted proforma of the staff in prescribed format as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 for both B.Ed. and M.Ed. courses. 3. The institution has submitted Land Use Certificate wherein the Survey No. is mentioned as 35/2A, but in the Sale Deed there is no such survey no. was mentioned. 4. The institution has not submitted notarized English version of latest encumbrance Certificate duly signed by the concerned competent authority. 5. The Building Plan & Site Plan submitted by the institution is not legible nor approved by the competent authority. 6. The institution has not submitted any details of the website being run by the institution."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Manik. M. Shinde, Principal of Deccan M.Ed. College, Survey no. 34/2, Noorani Mohalla Gulbarga, Near Peer Bangali Dargah, Ring Road, Gulbarga, Karnataka - 585104 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 16.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "The detailed reply/explanation has been given in hard form. Kindly consider all the documents and grant favorable order and remand back the matter to SRC."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 16th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for M.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 25 students vide order dated 14.08.2007. the consequent upon the notification of the National Council for Teacher Education (Amendment) Regulation, 2010 on dt. 20.08.2010 the intake of existing 25 students in M.Ed. course was increased from 25 to 35 vide order dated 30.07.2010. Thereafter, on promulgation of NCTE Regulations, 2014 the institution has submitted affidavit dt. 16.01.2015 for its willingness for adherence of provisions of new Regulations. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order was issued to the institution for conducting M.Ed. programme of two years duration with an annual intake of 100 (two basic units) from the academic session 2015-2016 vide order dated 20.05.2015. The recognition of the institution for M.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the SRC vide order dated 19.01.2021.

The instant matter placed in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 16.12.2025 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Committee further noted that the appellant institution has preferred the present appeal only on 15.11.2025, i.e., after an inordinate delay of **4 years, 7 months and 27 days** from the date of the impugned withdrawal order. The appellant institution has failed to place on record any satisfactory explanation or sufficient cause justifying such an extraordinary delay. The Appeal Committee also noted order dated 10.01.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Suo Motu Writ Petition (Civil) No. 3 of 2020, wherein it was held as under:

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

Applying the aforesaid binding judicial pronouncement, the period from 15.03.2020 to 28.02.2022 stands excluded; however, even thereafter, the appellant was required to file the appeal within 90 days from 01.03.2022, i.e., on or before 30.05.2022. The appeal

having been filed only on 15.11.2025 remains clearly and substantially barred by limitation. The Committee reiterates that under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, condonation of delay is not automatic and can be granted only upon demonstration of reasonable and sufficient cause. In the present case, no such cause has been shown. The doctrine of delay and laches squarely applies, rendering the appeal not maintainable. The Appeal Committee also finds that the withdrawal of recognition was effected by the SRC in exercise of its statutory powers under Section 17(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993, due to non-compliance with mandatory regulatory requirements. No material has been placed before the Appeal Committee to dislodge the findings recorded by the SRC.

Noting the submission made in the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council holds that the appeal suffers from gross delay and laches, is barred by limitation, the appeal is accordingly not maintainable and stands rejected. The SRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be dismissed and therefore, the impugned order dated 19.01.2021 issued by SRC is confirmed.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and oral submissions advanced during the online hearing, the Appeal Committee of the Council holds that the appeal suffers from gross delay and laches, is barred by limitation, and is therefore not maintainable and stands rejected. The SRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be dismissed and therefore, the impugned order dated 19.01.2021 issued by SRC is confirmed.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)
Appeal ID : APPLSRC 2025 15434

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Deccan M.Ed. College, Survey no. 34/2, Noorani Mohalla Gulbarga, Near Peer Bangali Dargah, Ring Road, Gulbarga, Karnataka - 585104.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-478/E- 390362/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLWRC202515441/E-89067

Gayatri Mahavidyalaya Sanchoe, Khata No. 2598, M. B. Road, Jalore, Rajasthan – 343091 APPELLANT	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075 RESPONDENT
---	------------------	--

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Narayan Ram, Vice-Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	16.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Gayatri Mahavidyalaya Sanchore, Khata No. 2598, M. B. Road, Jalore, Rajasthan - 343091** dated 20.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2526202403011959/RAJASTHAN/2024/REJC/1909** dated 26.09.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "1. With regard point regarding library books not up to the mark, the institution has uploaded a copy of accession register (02 pages) showing purchase of books in the year 2012, 2013 and 2025 signed by Principal of the institution (without date) and without proof of Voucher No. attested by the management, hence not acceptable. 2. In reply of Sitting Capacity not up to the mark, institution uploaded a photograph of classrooms (Not Geotagged), hence not acceptable. 3. With regard to query regarding library books mentioned, it is very less in number, the institution has uploaded a copy of accession register (02 pages) showing purchase of books in the year 2012, 2013 and 2025 signed by Principal of the institution (without date) without proof of Voucher No. attested by the management, hence not acceptable. The entry of these library books in the library accession register is not uploaded/shown by the institution. 4. In support of proof regarding availability of Education Encyclopedia, copy of two vouchers dated 25.06.2025 without attested by the principal/management, without sign with seal of book seller company are uploaded. Order No. of books is not indicated on the vouchers. The entry of these Education Encyclopedia in the library accession register is not uploaded/shown by the institution. 5. With regard to Electronic Publications, only photograph is uploaded (not geotagged), hence not acceptable. The entry of these Electronic Publication in the library accession register is not uploaded/shown by the institution. 6. Regarding Online Resources, institution uploaded a photograph (not geotagged), hence not acceptable. The entry of these Digital or Online Resources in the library accession register is not uploaded/shown by the institution. 7. Regarding effective arrangement of clearing of campus, water and toilet institution, photographs (not geotagged) uploaded, hence not acceptable. 8. Regarding toilet facilities, institution

uploaded photographs showing the toilet facilities (without geotagged). Deficiency regarding Library and number of books not replied by the institution. No relevant document uploaded. 9. Compliance of all conditions on institutional 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 have not been fulfilled by the institution.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Narayan Ram, Vice-Principal of Gayatri Mahavidyalaya Sanchore, Khata No. 2598, M. B. Road, Jalore, Rajasthan - 343091 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 16.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Presently institution has 9684 books with 1015 titles in its library. library books accession register in full page duly signed and verified by principal of institution is being uploaded. 2. Institution has large college building with 32 classrooms with seating capacity of 80 students per room. classrooms has been constructed as per NCTE norms. Geo tagged photo of classrooms is being uploaded. 3. The institution has 9684 library books with 1015 titles in its book stock/ copy of library books accession register in full page duly verified by principal of institution is being uploaded. 4. Copy of vouchers dated 25.06.2025 attested by the Principal, with sign and seal of book seller are being uploaded. Order No. of books has also been indicated on the vouchers. The entry of these Education Encyclopedia in the library accession register is being uploaded. 5. Geotagged photograph of digital library of institution is being uploaded. Full page electronic publications/books accession register of institution is being uploaded duly verified by principal of institute. 6. Institution avails online/digital study material to the students through YouTube channel and digital library. copy of digital library e-publication accession register is being uploaded duly signed/verified by principal of institution. YouTube channel can be visited through its link on college website-gatatricollegesanchore.net. 7. College has its effective arrangement of clearing of campus, water and toilet institution, tagged photographs of campus, toilets, water arrangements in the campus are being uploaded. 8. College has a three-story large campus with enough facility of toilets and water arrangements. geotagged photographs of toilets, water arrangements and campus is being uploaded. College has a modern

library campus with physical and digital stock of library books. copy of library books accession register is being uploaded. 9. Institution website- www.gayatricollegesanchore.net has been updated as per provisions under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 16th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Western Regional Committee on 03.03.2024 seeking recognition for running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which was refused by the WRC vide order dated 26.09.2025. The refusal was based on multiple deficiencies recorded in the Online Visiting Team report, including inadequacy of library resources, absence of authenticated accession and purchase records, non-geotagged photographic evidence of infrastructure, deficiencies in seating capacity, electronic and online learning resources, sanitation and campus maintenance, non-compliance with accessibility norms for persons with disabilities, and failure to ensure mandatory disclosures on the institutional website as required under Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended).

The Appeal Committee noted that, during the appellate proceedings, the appellant institution submitted that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order stand rectified and that supporting documentary evidence has been uploaded. It was contended that the institution presently possesses 9,684 library books comprising 1,015 titles, and that the complete library accession register, duly verified and signed by the Principal, has been uploaded. The institution further submitted that it has a large college building comprising 32 classrooms, each with a seating capacity of approximately 80 students, constructed in accordance with the norms prescribed by the NCTE, and that geo-tagged photographs of the classrooms have been uploaded. With regard to library resources, the institution stated that attested purchase vouchers dated 25.06.2025, bearing the signature and seal of the book seller and duly attested by the Principal, have been uploaded, along with

corresponding entries in the accession register, including entries relating to educational encyclopedias. It was further submitted that the institution maintains a digital library, and geo-tagged photographs of the same, along with the electronic publications/books accession register, duly signed and verified by the Principal, have been uploaded. The institution also submitted that students are provided access to online and digital study material through the institutional digital library and the official YouTube channel, the link of which is available on the college website, and that the relevant digital accession records have been uploaded. With respect to campus facilities, the institution contended that it has adequate arrangements for sanitation, drinking water, and campus maintenance, and that geo-tagged photographs of the campus, toilets, and water facilities have been uploaded. It was further submitted that the institution operates from a three-storey campus with sufficient infrastructural facilities and a modern library having both physical and digital resources. Lastly, the institution submitted that its official website (www.gayatricollegesanchore.net) has been updated in compliance with the disclosure requirements prescribed under Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended).

The Appeal Committee reiterates the settled legal position that the burden of establishing strict and demonstrable compliance with mandatory norms rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions of compliance, unsupported by authenticated and verifiable documentary evidence, cannot displace the factual findings recorded by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee, at the same time, observed that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification. The Committee further noted that documents placed on record during the appellate proceedings are relevant to the grounds cited in the refusal order and are required to be examined for fair adjudication, in terms of the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in *Rambha College of Education v. NCTE* [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016].

The Appeal Committee is of the considered view, having regard to the appellant institution's categorical claim of rectification, the nature of the deficiencies involved, and

the principles of procedural fairness, proportionality, and reasoned decision-making, that the matter warrants limited interference, strictly for the purpose of factual verification, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant's claims.

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee after careful perusal of the appeal report, documents on record and oral submissions made during the hearing, and the claims put forth by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee accordingly, and without diluting or negating the findings recorded by the Western Regional Committee, in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decides to set aside the impugned order dated 26.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee solely for the purpose of factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee as applicable under the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014. The appellant institution shall, prior to such re-verification, deposit the prescribed processing fee and submit a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon, along with certified copies of approvals issued by the competent authorities. The Online Visiting Team shall verify the infrastructural and instructional facilities specifically pointed out in the impugned order and assess overall compliance with the norms and standards prescribed for implementation of the ITEP programme. The Regional Committee shall also ensure adherence to all applicable regulatory provisions, the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, legal aspect, academic and assessment standards, and institutional eligibility for implementation of the ITEP programme. The Western Regional Committee shall thereafter examine the Visiting Team report, the affidavit, and all supporting documents, and shall pass a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations herein, and within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish compliance upon re-verification shall entail rejection of the claim strictly in accordance with law, without any further opportunity. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the

authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 26.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for factual re-verification through conduct of a Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee and strict compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Gayatri Mahavidyalaya Sanchoe, Khata No. 2598, M. B. Road, Jalore, Rajasthan - 343091.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**
3. **Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**
4. **The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Block-4, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan Shiksha Sankul, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302015.**



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-479/E- 390355/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025

APPLNRC202515436/E-89067

Islamia Faridiya College of Education, Khata No. 1770, 1771, 4985/3174 min, 3164 min near Jamia Masjid Kichloo Mohalla, Kishtwar, Jammu & Kashmir – 182204	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Mohd. Salahuddin Qazi, Assistant Professor
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	16.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Islamia Faridiya College of Education, Khata No. 1770, 1771, 4985/3174 min, 3164 min near Jamia Masjid Kichloo Mohalla, Kishtwar, Jammu & Kashmir - 182204** dated 09.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/FR-2122-NRC-91157270/JAMMU AND KASHMIR/2020/REJC/117** dated 23.09.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "The land area mentioned in the land documents differs from the documents which have been shared with Visiting Team Members. The Institution campus does not have accessible features like functional ramp & toilet for differently abled persons. The librarian and the laboratory attendant were not present at the time of the visit. The documents uploaded and produced at the time of visit are mismatched with the documents uploaded with online application. There are discrepancies in the uploaded and shown documents. The institution was required to upload certified land documents issued by the Sub-registrar along with translated English version of the same duly notarized and demarcation to each course/School being run on the same land. The institution was required to upload the building plan approved by Competent Government Authority indicating the name of institution, name of course, Khasra/plot No., total land area, total built-up area and earmarked land and built-up area for all the courses /school/other institutions being run on the above land along with approval letter for the same. The institution was required to upload the Land Use certificate issued by the Revenue Department, Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir, Govt. Order No. 138-Rev(S) of 2016 dated 07/10/2016 & Notification dated 24/10/2021 & Notification No. 01-J&K(BoR) of 2022 dated 14/01/2022. The institution has not submitted the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by the Competent Government Authority indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances. The institution was required to upload the Mutation Certificate issued by the Competent Government Authority. The institution has not submitted a Building Completion Certificate signed by the Competent Government Authority."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Mohd. Salahuddin Qazi, Assistant Professor of Islamia Faridiya College of Education, Khata No. 1770, 1771, 4985/3174 min, 3164 min near Jamia Masjid Kichloo Mohalla, Kishtwar, Jammu & Kashmir - 182204 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 16.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. The actual documents of land were Mismatched due to confusion/ misinterpretation. Land Documents are correct. Institution has once again submitted all the land documents duly signed by Revenue Officials including sub-registers, with this appeal form for your kind information. 2. Presently, both ramp and toilet for differently abled students are available in the institution. Photographs of ramp and toilet are attached here with the appeal form. 3. Both are regular appointed staff members. On that day both were out of station and were on leave, which was sanctioned by the principal. The leave applications of both the staff members are attached here with appeal form. 4. All the documents which were uploaded were available. However, due to some confusion and misinterpretation, such type of discrepancy was pointed out by the virtual team members. All the documents are again attached with the appeal form. 5. There are no discrepancies in the uploaded and shown documents but there might have been some miscommunication/misinterpretation. All the documents are again attached with the appeal form for more clarity. 6. Certified documents along translated English version documents are available, and all land documents are certified by the sub registrar and are hereby attached with the appeal form. 7. Approved building plan by the Competent Government Authority is attached and land documents are certified by the sub registrar are also attached with the appeal form. 8. Land use certificate is also available which is issued by the Revenue Officer (Sub-Registrar) of the Govt. of Jammu and Kashmir and is attached with appeal form. 9. Latest non-encumbrance certificate is available which is issued by the Competent Authority and is attached with the appeal form. 10. Mutation certificate is available and is issued by the Competent Government Authority and is attached with the appeal form. 11. Institution has the Building Completion Certificate issued by the Competent Govt. Authority and is attached along with the appeal form. 12. Institution had sent the reply of the First Show Cause Notice and is again attached here with the appeal form."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 16th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Northern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the B.Ed. Course on 31.08.2020. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 23.09.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 16.12.2025 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Committee noted that the appellant institution had applied to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) on 31.08.2020 for grant of recognition to conduct the B.Ed. programme. The NRC, after consideration of the Online Visiting Team (VT) report and the documents available on record, refused recognition vide order dated 23.09.2025 on account of multiple deficiencies.

The Appeal Committee noted that, during the appellate proceedings, the appellant institution submitted that the discrepancies recorded in the impugned order primarily arose due to confusion or misinterpretation during the inspection process and not on account of any substantive non-compliance. It was contended that the land documents are correct and complete, and that all certified land documents, duly issued and authenticated by the competent Revenue Authorities including the Sub-Registrar, along with translated English versions, have been resubmitted along with the appeal. The institution further submitted that ramp and toilet facilities for persons with disabilities are presently available on the campus, and that photographic evidence in support thereof has been enclosed. With regard to the absence of the Librarian and Laboratory Attendant at the time of inspection, it was stated that both are regularly appointed staff members who were on sanctioned leave on the date of inspection, and copies of the sanctioned leave

applications have been submitted. The institution contended that all documents were available and uploaded, and that the discrepancies noted by the Online Visiting Team arose due to miscommunication or misinterpretation. For clarity and verification, all relevant documents have been resubmitted along with the appeal. It was further submitted that there is no discrepancy between the documents uploaded and those shown during inspection, and that all supporting records have again been furnished. The institution also submitted that the approved building plan issued by the competent Government Authority, the Land Use Certificate issued by the Revenue Department, Government of Jammu & Kashmir, the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate, the Mutation Certificate, and the Building Completion Certificate issued by the competent authority are all available and have been enclosed with the appeal. It was further stated that the reply to the First Show Cause Notice had been submitted earlier and has again been attached for ready reference.

The Appeal Committee at the same time, noted that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are largely factual in nature and capable of objective verification. Having regard to the appellant institution's categorical claim that the deficiencies stand rectified and that supporting documents are available, and keeping in view the principles of procedural fairness, proportionality, and reasoned decision-making inherent in administrative law, the Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants a limited remand for fresh factual verification, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant's claims.

The Appeal Committee noting the submissions of the appellant institution and observed that subsequent documents placed on record are also required to be considered for fair adjudication. Accordingly, the concerned Regional Committee shall re-examine the matter afresh and verify the authenticity and relevance of all documents and pass a reasoned order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act and Regulations. The Committee also took cognizance of the legal precedent set by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 - Rambha College of Education vs. NCTE, wherein it was

held that any additional documents furnished by the appellant must be duly considered by the Appeal Committee while adjudicating the appeal.

The Appeal Committee without diluting or negating the findings recorded by the Northern Regional Committee, decides to set aside the impugned order dated 23.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) solely for the purpose of factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee as applicable under the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014. The Visiting Team shall verify, inter alia, the infrastructural and instructional facilities specifically pointed out in the impugned refusal order and assess overall compliance with the Norms and Standards prescribed for implementation of the B.Ed. programme. The appellant institution shall, prior to such verification, deposit the prescribed processing fee and submit a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon, along with certified copies of approvals issued by the competent authorities strictly in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The Northern Regional Committee (NRC) shall thereafter examine the Visiting Team report, the affidavit, and all supporting documents, and shall pass a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations herein, within the prescribed timeframe. It is clarified that this remand is granted only to ensure procedural fairness and factual verification, and shall not be construed as conferring any right, equity, or presumption in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to satisfactorily establish compliance on re-verification shall entail rejection of the claim for recognition without any further opportunity.

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee after careful perusal of the appeal report, documents on record and oral submissions made during the hearing, and the claims put forth by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 23.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration. The Regional Committee shall consider the case of appellant institution after factual re-verification through conduct of a Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit

of the prescribed processing fee considering all records and supplementary submissions made by the appellant, including compliance with the deficiencies noted in the original impugned order. The Appeal Committee further decided that after such examination, the Regional Committee shall take a reasoned decision in strict compliance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014 or amendments issued by the Council. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 23.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee and strict compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)
Appeal ID : APPLNRC202515436

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Islamia Faridiya College of Education, Khata No. 1770, 1771, 4985/3174 min, 3164 min near Jamia Masjid Kichloo Mohalla, Kishtwar, Jammu & Kashmir - 182204.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Mini Block Civil Secretariat, Jammu, J&K.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)

जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-481/E- 390928/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLWRC202514894/ E- 89067

Late Pundlikrao Tirpude College of Education, Khasra No. 276/1, Khedpur Road, Sawari, (Murmadi), Lakhani, Bhandara, Maharashtra – 441804	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Dhananjay Pundlikrao Tirpude, Secretary
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	16.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Late Pundlikrao Tirpude College of Education, Khasra No. 276/1, Khedpur Road, Sawari, (Murmadi), Lakhani, Bhandara, Maharashtra - 441804** dated 01.02.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/APW04613/123565/B.Ed./375th /M.H/2022/221173-221179** dated 15.12.2022 of the Western Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "1. Recognition was granted for B.Ed. course vide order dated 01.03.2008. 2. Revised Order was issued dated 31.05.2015 in pursuance of NCTE Regulations, 2014. 3. Show Cause Notice dated 03.04.2017 was issued in the matter of compliance of conditions of revised recognition order. 4. No reply submitted in response to Show Cause Notice. 5. Performance Appraisal Report for the Academic Session 2020-2021 has not been submitted by the institution. 6. Final Show Cause Notice u/s 17 of NCTE Act, 1993 was issued dated 29.09.2022. 7. No reply submitted by the institution in response to Final Show Cause Notice."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Dhananjay Pundlikrao Tirpude, Secretary of Late Pundlikrao Tirpude College of Education, Khasra No. 276/1, Khedpur Road, Sawari, (Murmadi), Lakhani, Bhandara, Maharashtra - 441804 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 16.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. It is most respectfully submitted that the institution has duly complied with the directions of the WRC meeting whereby withdrawal order was issued to the institution after the court order was submitted by the institution all the original documents are being submitted herewith for perusal and consideration. The documents are attached herewith for ready reference. 2. It is most respectfully submitted that the institution has duly complied with the directions of the WRC meeting whereby withdrawal order was issued to the institution after the court order was submitted by the institution all the original documents are being submitted herewith for perusal and consideration. The documents are attached herewith for ready reference. 3. Due to the death of the president of the society."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 16th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for Secondary (B.Ed.) course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students vide order dated 01.03.2008. 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 15.12.2022.

The Appeal Committee, in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 16.12.2025, considered the instant appeal filed by Late Pundlikrao Tirpude College of Education and perused the Appeal Report, earlier appellate records, documents available on file, and oral submissions advanced during the hearing.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was initially granted recognition for the B.Ed. programme vide order dated 01.03.2008 and was subsequently issued a Revised Provisional Recognition Order on 31.05.2015 in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The recognition of the institution was withdrawn by the Western Regional Committee vide order dated 15.12.2022 for persistent non-compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements.

The Appeal Committee further noted that the said withdrawal order had already been challenged by the appellant institution and was finally adjudicated by the Appeal Committee vide a reasoned order dated 18.07.2024, passed pursuant to deliberations held across multiple meetings, including the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th Meetings, 2024. During those proceedings, the appellant institution was repeatedly directed to submit mandatory documents relating to affiliation, approved faculty, salary payment through banking channels, submission of Performance Appraisal Reports, and statutory disclosures.

Despite being granted multiple and final opportunities, the institution failed to comply. The appellant also admitted during the proceedings that the institution was non-functional, without affiliation, and non-compliant with PAR requirements.

The Appeal Committee, in its 8th Meeting, 2024 held on 06.06.2024, conclusively held that the Western Regional Committee was justified in withdrawing recognition and confirmed the withdrawal order dated 15.12.2022. The said appellate decision attained finality. The operative part of the order is as under: -

“The instant matter placed in its 8th Meeting, 2024 held on 06.06.2024. The Appeal Committee after perusing the documents submitted by the Appellant Institution vide letter dated 22.04.2024 & 30.05.2024 in response to the Notice dt. 22.05.2024, and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing observed that the Appellant Institution has failed to comply with the directions of the Appeal Committee and still lacking on the following documents: -

- (i) The institution has failed to submit the approval letter of the concerned University/Affiliating Body approving the faculty along with the latest faculty list for B.Ed. programme approved by the Registrar of the affiliating body as per the prescribed Format with a copy of proceedings regarding selection of all the faculty members by the selection committee duly constituted and approved by the competent authority of the affiliating University/body.***
- (ii) The institution failed to submit a proof that the faculty are being paid salary through cheque/RTGS/NEFT supported with the salary statements for three months duly verified by the bank officials alongwith an Affidavit.***

Moreover, the institution also informed the Appeal Committee during the online hearing that the institution is not having any affiliation since 2022 and it has not submitted mandatory Performance Appraisal Report (PAR)

In view of above, Appeal Committee concluded that the WRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 15.12.2022 issued by WRC is confirmed.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the

Council concluded that the WRC was justified in withdrawing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 15.12.2022 issued by WRC is confirmed."


The Appeal Committee observed that the present appeal again seeks to challenge the same withdrawal order dated 15.12.2022, without any fresh action, subsequent order, or new cause of action arising from the Regional Committee. In terms of Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, and settled principles of administrative law, an appeal once finally decided cannot be reopened in the absence of a new decision by the competent authority. The Appeal Committee cannot sit in review over its own concluded decision.

The Appeal Committee, in view of the above, holds that the instant appeal is not maintainable and has rendered infructuous, as the subject matter stands conclusively decided by the Appeal Committee vide order dated 18.07.2024. The Committee finds no legal basis to re-examine the matter, and no violation of principles of natural justice or procedural fairness is made out.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee as per extant appeal rules and after due consideration of the entire record, decided since the withdrawal of recognition dated 15.12.2022 has already been upheld by the Appeal Committee vide order dated 18.07.2024, the present appeal is not maintainable and stands rejected as infructuous. The earlier appellate order dated 18.07.2024 shall continue to operate and remain in force.

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)
Appeal ID: APPL WRC 202514894

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Late Pundlikrao Tirpude College of Education, Khasra No. 276/1, Khedpur Road, Sawari, (Murmadi), Lakhani, Bhandara, Maharashtra - 441804.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Directorate of Higher Education, Elphinston Technical School premises, 3, Mahapalika Marg, Dhobi Talao, Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus Area, Fort, Mumbai, Maharashtra 400001..



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)

जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-495/E- 392218/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLERC202515452/E-89067

Nirmala College Ranchi, Khata No. 49, 18, 71, 70, Doranda Ranchi, Parastoli, Hinoo, Ranchi, Jharkhand – 834002	Vs	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Mr. Navendra Kumar Jha, Admn. Officer
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	16.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Nirmala College Ranchi, Khata No. 49, 18, 71, 70, Doranda Ranchi, Parastoli, Hinoo, Ranchi, Jharkhand - 834002** dated 29.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/ERC/2627202505275497/JHARKHAND/2025/REJC/2238** dated 27.06.2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution does not obtain a minimum of 10 points required for further processing of the application on the basis of extant norms and standards prescribed by NCTE."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Mr. Navendra Kumar Jha, Admn. Officer from **Nirmala College Ranchi, Khata No. 49, 18, 71, 70, Doranda Ranchi, Parastoli, Hinoo, Ranchi, Jharkhand - 834002** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 16.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "Respected Sir/Madam, I, Dr. Sr. Jyoti, Principal and Authorized Representative of Nirmala College Ranchi, hereby prefer this appeal against the impugned decision in respect of the Institution as contained in the minutes of the 368th meeting of the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC), NCTE held on 17.06.2025(Annexure -I) We are still waiting the refusal order issued on basis of the minutes. It is pertinent to mention that we have not received any order or any communications regarding the decision taken in respect of the Institution either through physical mode or online/portal mode. BRIEF FACTS OF THE CASE: The Appellant-institution applied for the Grant of Recognition for the ITEP course for the session 2026-27 on 27/05/2025. The ERC, in its 368th Meeting held on 17/06/2025, refused and rejected this application citing that "The institution does not obtain a minimum of 10 points required for further processing of the application on the basis of extant norms and standards prescribed by NCTE". GROUND FOR APPEAL: The appellant humbly

submits that the rejection on the basis of "insufficient points" is erroneous and liable to be set aside based on the following facts which demonstrate the institutions high standing and eligibility: 1. Verification of NAAC Accreditation (Grade A) and UGC Status: The decision taken in respect of the Institution claims a failure to meet the point threshold. However, Nirmala College Ranchi is a premier institution. As noted in the ITEP Detail Report itself, the institution is recognized as a "CATEGORY 1 INSTITUTION AS PER UGC". We are enclosing our NAAC Grade A Certificate dated 28/02/2023 herewith to substantiate our academic excellence showing CGPA 3.06 on four point scale, which should award significant weightage in the scoring matrix. As per the shortlisting criteria for processing of applications for ITEP from the multidisciplinary institutions for the academic session 2026-27, the institution must have minimum of 10 points. Since we are NAAC Grade A Certificate dated 28/02/2023 having validity upto 27.02.2027, we secure 6 points. NAAC Grade A Certificate are attached and marked as Annexure-I and Annexure-II respectively. 2. Long-Standing Academic History: The institution, Nirmala College was established in 1969 and has been serving the education sector for over 55 years. The ITEP report explicitly acknowledges that the institution has been in inception for "30 YEARS & ABOVE". This longevity demonstrates stability and experience, contradicting the assessment that we lack the requisite credentials for processing.. Since the age of the institution is more that 30 years, we secure 4 points in this regard as per the aforementioned shortlisting criteria. The affiliating letter no. P-19955 dated 30.05.1969 issued by the affiliating university i.e. Ranchi University and a letter bearing no. 2862/BSUC of the State Government concerned dated 03.09.1971 are attached and marked as Annexure-III and Annexure-IV respectively. 3. Multidisciplinary Status: The institution is already a Multidisciplinary Institution offering Undergraduate and Postgraduate courses in Arts, Science, and Commerce. The ITEP Detail Report confirms the institutions status as "Multidisciplinary: YES". Further, a letter issued by the Ranchi University shows that the Institution is a Multidisciplinary Institution where UG and PG courses are running in liberal arts, science and commerce. The documents to this effect is attached and marked as Annexure- V. 4. Existing Affiliation: The college has valid and continuous affiliation with Ranchi University for its various degree courses since 1969. The document is attached as Annexure -VI. PRAYER: In light of the above

verifiable facts—specifically our NAAC Grade A status acquiring 6 points, and over five decades of academic service since its inception i.e. acquiring 4 points, we submit that the calculation of points by the ERC was factually incorrect. The college is securing a total of 10 points [NAAC Grade A – 6 points, age of the institution (more than 30 years) – 4 points] whereas only 10 points are required for the processing the application of the Institution. We, therefore, pray that the Appellate Authority may be pleased to: 1. Quash / Set aside the decision taken in respect of the Institution as contained in the minutes of the 368th meeting of the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC), NCTE held on 17.06.2025. 2. Direct the ERC to restore the file, process the application and grant approval for the ITEP course for the session 2026-27 at the earliest. ENCLOSURES: 1. Copy of the minutes of the 368th meeting of the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC), NCTE held on 17.06.2025. 2. Annexure wise – serial number 3. Demand Draft/Online Payment Receipt for Appeal Fee. DECLARATION: I, Dr. Sr. Jyoti, declare that the facts stated above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief. Yours faithfully, Dr. Sr. Jyoti Principal Nirmla College Ranchi”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 16th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application on 27.05.2025 seeking grant of recognition for the ITEP programme for the academic session 2026–27. The application was considered by the Regional Committee in its 368th Meeting held on 17.06.2025, wherein it was decided not to process the application further on the ground that the institution did not secure the minimum 10 points required under the notified shortlisting criteria. It was further noted that subsequently, the Regional Committee issued a formal refusal order dated 27.06.2025, communicating the said decision.

The Appeal Committee noted the appellant institution's principal contention that the refusal of recognition on the ground of non-achievement of the minimum 10-point threshold is factually erroneous. The appellant asserted that it holds a valid NAAC Grade 'A' accreditation entitling it to six (6) points, and that the institution was established in 1969, entitling it to four (4) points under the criterion relating to institutional age exceeding 30 years. The appellant further submitted that its multidisciplinary character and continuous affiliation with Ranchi University stand acknowledged in the ITEP Detail Report itself.

The Appeal Committee, on a careful examination of the impugned refusal order dated 27.06.2025, observed that the refusal is founded solely on the conclusion that the institution failed to obtain the minimum qualifying points, without a clear and reasoned demonstration as to how the appellant's NAAC accreditation and institutional age were assessed or excluded while computing the shortlisting score. The Committee further observed that the refusal order does not reflect due consideration of the documentary material placed on record relating to NAAC status and year of establishment, which are objective, verifiable parameters under the notified shortlisting framework.

The Appeal Committee also took note of the settled legal position as laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 – Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, wherein it has been held that material and documents placed on record by an appellant must be duly examined during appellate scrutiny and cannot be disregarded without verification. The Committee reiterates that such consideration does not imply acceptance and must be subject to strict regulatory scrutiny by the competent Regional Committee.

Noting the submissions and oral arguments presented during the hearing, the Committee having regard to the above, is of the considered view that the impugned refusal order dated 27.06.2025 suffers from procedural and factual infirmity, in as much as the computation of shortlisting points-being the sole basis of refusal-does not reflect clear application of mind to the material placed on record and requires objective

verification within the regulatory framework. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's entitlement to recognition, and without diluting the statutory standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 27.06.2025 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme and regulatory reconsideration. The ERC shall specifically evaluate whether the institution meets the requisite shortlisting criteria and qualifies as a bona fide multidisciplinary institution. This review must ensure full compliance with the relevant regulatory provisions, legal requirements, academic and assessment standards, and institutional prerequisites necessary for implementation of the ITEP programme. The concerned Regional Committee is directed to: (i) re-examine the case of the appellant institution strictly with reference to the notified ITEP shortlisting criteria, particularly the allocation of points relating to NAAC accreditation and institutional age; (ii) verify the authenticity and validity of the documents relied upon by the appellant institution; (iii) afford reasonable opportunity of hearing, if deemed necessary; and (iv) thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and applicable guidelines, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined only to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish eligibility upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with law. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is further directed to submit all documents filed in appeal to the ERC within 15 days from the receipt of this order.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 27.06.2025 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) with a direction to reassess the eligibility of the appellant institution for recognition under the ITEP programme with the directions specified hereinabove. The ERC shall take a reasoned and speaking decision after considering all documents and subsequent submissions of the appellant, including compliance with the deficiencies cited in the impugned order. The appellant institution is also directed to forward the documents submitted in appeal to the ERC within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Nirmala College Ranchi, Khata No. 49, 18, 71, 70, Doranda Ranchi, Parastoli, Hinoo, Ranchi, Jharkhand - 834002.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher and Technical Education, Nepal house, Yojna Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Jharkhand.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)

जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-499/E- 392884/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLNRC202515462 / E-89067

MIER College of Education, Khasra No. 224, B.C. Road, Bus Stand, Jammu and Kashmir – 180001	Vs	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Prof. Adit Gupta, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **MIER College of Education, Khasra No. 224, B.C. Road, Bus Stand, Jammu and Kashmir - 180001** dated 12.12.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE/NRC/2526202404262415/JAMMU AND KASHMIR/2024/REJC/763 Dated: 06/11/2025** dated 06.11.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution was required to submit stream-wise & stage-wise list of faculty in format duly approved by the affiliating university. The number of faculty and qualifications were to be as per the Regulation 5 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations 2021 notified in the Gazette of India on 26.10.2021. As per online application, the land is situated at Khasra No. 224 with land area 8718 sq. m and built-up area as 4154 sqm. The institution is already offering 2 units of B.Ed. course and one unit of M.Ed. course and a Public School, PGDCA, B.Ed. (Special Education), Journal & Educational Studies, Certificate course of Human Rights and Values, M.A. Education, M.Phil. and B.A. (Houns.) on the aforesaid same land. The institution had applied for ITEP (B.A. B.Ed.-Secondary (2 units) B.A. B.Ed.-Middle (2 units). The institution was required to demark/earmark course-wide land and built-up area for each teacher education course, public school and other courses being offered in the same premises. The Institution has not uploaded any documents in this regard."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Prof. Adit Gupta, Principal of MIER College of Education, Khasra No. 224, B.C. Road, Bus Stand, Jammu and Kashmir - 180001 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "1. MIER College of Education has been functioning as an Autonomous College since 2014-15 under UGC Regulations for Autonomous Colleges. As per UGC regulations governing autonomous institutions, faculty appointments are made by the duly constituted Selection Committee and approved by the colleges

Governing Body, and do not require approval from the affiliating university. This is the prescribed framework for all autonomous colleges as distinct from affiliated colleges. We have prepared the faculty list in NCTEs prescribed format, showing stream-wise and stage-wise distribution for the proposed ITEP programme. All 22 faculty members meet the qualification and experience requirements under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021, for 2 Units (100 Students) of the ITEP-Secondary programme. Hard copy of the full justification is being sent through Speed Post. 2. We respectfully clarify that the infrastructure for MIER College of Education and Model Academy School operates from separate, structurally independent buildings, as officially verified through a physical inspection conducted by the Assistant Executive Engineer, PWD (R&B), Government of Jammu and Kashmir on 03-05-2025. The PWD certificate confirms that the entire 4,154 square metres of built-up area is exclusively available for MIER College of Education, with the school operating independently in a completely separate building with distinct entry and exit points. The college infrastructure comprises 16 dedicated classrooms plus 2 large halls, totalling 18 teaching spaces, with each classroom accommodating 50-60 students. Our institution operates a two-session system with teacher education programmes in the morning session and social sciences programmes in the afternoon session. Following the Letter of Intent, we revised our application scope from the originally proposed 4 units to only 2 units of B.A. B.Ed. Secondary programme (100 students total). Both morning and afternoon sessions require 16 classrooms each, which are adequately available within our 18 teaching spaces, with sessions not overlapping. The refusal order mentions programmes such as PGDCA, Journal and Educational Studies, Certificate courses, M.A. Education, and M.Phil., which we respectfully submit are not currently offered by the institution. We currently operate 8 sanctioned programmes only, which significantly reduces the infrastructure load calculation. Comprehensive documentation including the PWD inspection certificate, campus map showing clear segregation between college and school buildings, detailed floor plans with room-wise measurements, and annotated floor plans showing session-wise room allocation are being submitted via post along with the detailed appeal to facilitate complete verification of infrastructure adequacy.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Northern Regional Committee on 03.05.2024 seeking recognition for running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which was refused by the NRC vide order dated 06.11.2025. The refusal was based on multiple deficiencies recorded in the Online Visiting Team report, including inadequacy of library resources, absence of authenticated accession and purchase records, non-geotagged photographic evidence of infrastructure, deficiencies in seating capacity, electronic and online learning resources, sanitation and campus maintenance, non-compliance with accessibility norms for persons with disabilities, and failure to ensure mandatory disclosures on the institutional website as required under Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended).

The Appeal Committee noted that, during the appellate proceedings, the appellant institution submitted that MIER College of Education has been functioning as an autonomous college since the academic session 2014–15 under the UGC Regulations for Autonomous Colleges. In terms of the applicable UGC framework, faculty appointments in autonomous colleges are made through a duly constituted Selection Committee and approved by the Governing Body of the institution, without requiring approval from the affiliating university. In accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021, the institution has prepared and submitted a faculty list in the prescribed NCTE format, indicating stream-wise and stage-wise deployment for the proposed ITEP (Secondary) programme. It was submitted that all 22 faculty members possess the requisite qualifications and experience for two units (100 students) of the ITEP–Secondary programme, and a detailed justification along with supporting documents has been forwarded through Speed Post. With regard to infrastructure, the appellant institution clarified that MIER College of Education and Model Academy School function from separate and structurally independent buildings. This

segregation has been officially verified through a physical inspection conducted by the Assistant Executive Engineer, PWD (R&B), Government of Jammu and Kashmir on 03.05.2025. The PWD certificate confirms that the entire built-up area measuring 4,154 square metres is exclusively available for the College of Education, with the school operating independently in a separate building having distinct entry and exit points. The college infrastructure comprises 16 classrooms and 2 large halls, aggregating to 18 teaching spaces, each classroom having a seating capacity of 50–60 students. The institution follows a two-session system, with teacher education programmes conducted in the morning session and social sciences programmes in the afternoon session, without overlap. It was further submitted that pursuant to issuance of the Letter of Intent, the institution revised its proposal from four units to two units of the B.A. B.Ed. (Secondary) programme, with a total intake of 100 students. The institution clarified that programmes such as PGDCA, Journal and Educational Studies, Certificate Courses, M.A. Education, and M.Phil., as mentioned in the refusal order, are not presently being offered. At present, only eight sanctioned programmes are in operation, which substantially reduces the infrastructure load. The institution has submitted comprehensive documentation, including the PWD inspection certificate, campus map depicting segregation of college and school buildings, detailed floor plans with room-wise measurements, and annotated plans indicating session-wise room allocation, to facilitate verification of infrastructure adequacy.

The Appeal Committee reiterates the settled legal position that the burden of establishing strict and demonstrable compliance with mandatory norms rests squarely upon the applicant institution, and that mere assertions of compliance, unsupported by authenticated and verifiable documentary evidence, cannot displace the factual findings recorded by the Regional Committee. The Appeal Committee, at the same time, observed that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual in nature and capable of objective verification. The Committee further noted that documents placed on record during the appellate proceedings are relevant to the grounds cited in the refusal order and are required to be examined for fair adjudication, in terms

of the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in *Rambha College of Education v. NCTE* [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016].

The Appeal Committee is of the considered view, having regard to the appellant institution's categorical claim of rectification, the nature of the deficiencies involved, and the principles of procedural fairness, proportionality, and reasoned decision-making, that the matter warrants limited interference, strictly for the purpose of factual verification, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant's claims.

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee after careful perusal of the appeal report, documents on record and oral submissions made during the hearing, and the claims put forth by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee accordingly, and without diluting or negating the findings recorded by the Northern Regional Committee, in exercise of powers under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, decides to set aside the impugned order dated 06.11.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee solely for the purpose of factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee as applicable under the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014. The appellant institution shall, prior to such re-verification, deposit the prescribed processing fee and submit a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon, along with certified copies of approvals issued by the competent authorities. The Online Visiting Team shall verify the infrastructural and instructional facilities specifically pointed out in the impugned order and assess overall compliance with the norms and standards prescribed for implementation of the ITEP programme. The Regional Committee shall also ensure adherence to all applicable regulatory provisions, the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, legal aspect, academic and assessment standards, and institutional eligibility for implementation of the ITEP programme. The Northern Regional Committee shall thereafter examine the Visiting Team report, the affidavit, and all supporting documents, and shall pass a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observations herein, and within the prescribed timeframe. It is

expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish compliance upon re-verification shall entail rejection of the claim strictly in accordance with law, without any further opportunity. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 06.11.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for factual re-verification through conduct of a Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee and strict compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)
Appeal ID: APPLNRC702515462

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, MIER College of Education, Khasra No. 224, B.C. Road, Bus Stand, Jammu and Kashmir - 180001.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Mini Block Civil Secretariat, Jammu, J&K.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-443/E- 383855/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLSRC202515387 / E-89067

Chinmaya Vishwavidyapeeth, Survey No. 190/1, 190/2, 190/6, 190/7, 190/9, 190/14, 196/5, Adi Sankara road, Kanayannur, Kerala – 682313	<u>Vs</u>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Pramod D, Head of School
Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Chinmaya Vishwavidyapeeth, Survey No. 190/1, 190/2, 190/6, 190/7, 190/9, 190/14, 196/5, Adi Sankara road, Kanayannur, Kerala – 682313** dated 22.09.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE/SRC/2526202402191478/KERALA/2024/REJC/478** dated 01.08.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “The institution was issued First Show Cause Notice and Final Show Cause Notice to submit certain documents. The institution has not submitted any reply/uploaded any documents in response to Show Cause Notices issued by SRC. Therefore, the Committee decided to refuse application submitted by the institution for Transition into ITEP Courses.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Pramod D, Head of School of Chinmaya Vishwavidyapeeth, Survey No. 190/1, 190/2, 190/6, 190/7, 190/9, 190/14, 196/5, Adi Sankara road, Kanayannur, Kerala – 682313 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. The Chinmaya Vishwavidyapeeth (CVV) trust was established in the year 2015 by the Cinmaya International Foundation (CIF) vide Trust Deed no 501/IV/2015. A notarized copy of the Trust Deed is attached for your kind reference. As such CIF is the parent organization of CVV and furthermore all of Chinmaya establishments fall under the larger mission known as Central Chinmaya Mission Trust (CCMT). The same information is furnished in the Trust Deed, on page no. 8 of the pdf file attached. 2. Notarized English translation is attached for your kind review. 3. Notarized English translation is attached for your kind review. 4. An undertaking/Affidavit duly undersigned by the Registrar is attached for your kind reference.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee on 04.03.2024 seeking recognition for running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which was refused by the SRC vide order dated 01.08.2025, primarily on the ground that despite issuance of a First Show Cause Notice and a Final Show Cause Notice, the institution had not uploaded replies or supporting documents on the portal.

The Appeal Committee noted that, during the proceedings of its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 20.11.2025, the appellant institution made detailed submissions explaining its institutional status, background, and the circumstances leading to the impugned refusal. The appellant submitted that Chinmaya Vishwavidyapeeth (CVV) was established in the year 2017 as a Deemed to be University under Section 3 of the UGC Act, 1956, under the De Novo category, vide UGC Order No. 9-4/2015-U.3(A) dated 16.01.2017, with its registered address at Adi Shankara Nilayam, Adi Sankara Marg, Veliyanad Post, Ernakulam, Kerala, from where it has been functioning since the academic year 2017 onwards. It was further submitted that the Chinmaya Vishwavidyapeeth Trust was constituted in the year 2015 by the Chinmaya International Foundation (CIF) vide Trust Deed Document No. 501/IV/2015 registered on 18.09.2015, and that CIF is the parent organisation of CVV. It was also submitted that all Chinmaya establishments function under the larger mission of the Central Chinmaya Mission Trust (CCMT), Mumbai. Notarised copies of the Trust Deed and its English translation, along with an affidavit/undertaking duly sworn by the Registrar, were stated to have been submitted. The appellant further submitted that the University has been conducting four-year Integrated B.Ed. programmes (B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed.) since the academic year 2020–21 at its Veliyanad Campus pursuant to NCTE Recognition Order dated 02.09.2020, and that the University has never commenced the two-year B.Ed. programme. It was submitted that the University purchased land and commenced

construction of a new campus at Onakkoor, Ernakulam District, after obtaining building permission dated 06.03.2021, and that upon completion of the academic block, the B.Ed. programmes were shifted to the new Onakkoor campus in August 2024, with the entire fourth floor exclusively earmarked for teacher education programmes. The appellant stated that the Online Visiting Team conducted inspection on 15.04.2025 and was shown the facilities available at the Onakkoor campus, while the registered address of the University continued to remain Veliyanad. Copies of land registration deeds and tax paid receipts relating to the Onakkoor campus were stated to have been submitted in person at NCTE Headquarters on 04.11.2025. With regard to the ITEP application, it was submitted that the University applied online on 04.03.2024 pursuant to NCTE notification dated 05.02.2024, mentioning the facilities of the Veliyanad Campus, as the B.Ed. programmes were being conducted there at that time. The appellant explained that replies to the Show Cause Notices dated 01.05.2025 and 19.06.2025 were furnished through e-mail instead of uploading on the portal due to an inadvertent oversight, which was duly explained through a notarised affidavit dated 25.09.2025 sworn by the Registrar and submitted along with the appeal. The appellant further submitted that the appeal was duly filed on the NCTE portal on 22.09.2025 along with the prescribed fee, and that all supporting documents were also forwarded by speed post. It was also submitted that in view of NCTE Notification dated 06.05.2025 extending timelines for transition to ITEP, the University continued admitting students to the existing four-year Integrated B.Ed. programmes during the academic year 2025–26 and sought approval for transition to ITEP from the academic year 2026–27 onwards.

The Appeal Committee, in view of the above submissions, observed that the issue of change of site/campus after submission and processing of the application raises significant regulatory and procedural concerns under the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). Accordingly, the Committee deemed it appropriate to seek authoritative clarification from the Regulation Division, NCTE, and decided to keep the appeal pending.

The Appeal Committee, in its 15th Meeting, noted that the Regulation Division, vide its communication dated 02.01.2026, advised that the issue be examined with reference to the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder for an appropriate decision. The Committee observed that the response of the Regulation Division is generic and advisory in nature, and does not contain any specific, reasoned, or authoritative clarification addressing the precise legal and procedural issues arising in the present case. The Appeal Committee in view thereof resolved that the matter be adjudicated on merits, after due and independent consideration of the documents, submissions, and materials placed on record during the appellate proceedings, and be examined strictly within the statutory and regulatory framework governing recognition, without reliance on any generalized or non-specific advisory. The Appeal Committee upon comprehensive consideration of the material available on record, observed that the impugned order of the Regional Committee is founded predominantly on alleged procedural non-compliance, particularly relating to non-submission of replies and documents on the online portal, without undertaking a substantive and holistic examination of the relevant material subsequently furnished by the appellant institution during the appellate proceedings. The Committee further noted that additional documents submitted at the appellate stage, being specific and directly relevant to the grounds of refusal, cannot be disregarded summarily or mechanically, and are required to be examined in accordance with law, as held by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in *Rambha College of Education v. NCTE* [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016] and allied judicial pronouncements. The Appeal Committee at the same time reiterated that generic assertions or self-serving claims of compliance, unsupported by verified and authenticated records, do not confer any vested, equitable, or enforceable right upon an institution. All claims of compliance must necessarily be subjected to specific, objective, and rigorous factual verification, and to strict regulatory scrutiny by the competent authority, in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and other applicable statutory requirements.

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee after careful perusal of the appeal report, documents on record and oral submissions made during the hearing, and the claims put forth by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view, in the above factual and legal backdrop, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims, that the refusal order suffers from procedural deficiency and non-consideration of relevant material, warranting interference only to the limited extent of ensuring procedural fairness and regulatory scrutiny. Accordingly, in exercise of powers under Section 18(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 01.08.2025 and remand the matter to the Southern Regional Committee for fresh consideration and factual verification, subject to the conditions stipulated herein. The appellant institution shall, prior to such reprocessing, deposit the prescribed processing fee as applicable under the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, and submit a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon, along with certified copies of approvals issued by the competent authorities. The SRC shall verify the documents strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the applicable MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025, including examination of the permissibility and regulatory implications of the change of site/campus and the institution's claim of being a multidisciplinary institution. The SRC shall afford the institution a reasonable opportunity of hearing, independently assess compliance without being influenced by the earlier refusal, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed timeframe. It is explicitly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish compliance upon reprocessing shall entail rejection strictly in accordance with law, without any further opportunity. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of

Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 01.08.2025 and remand the matter to the Southern Regional Committee (SRC) for fresh consideration and factual verification subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee and strict compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Chinmaya Vishwavidyapeeth, Survey No. 190/1, 190/2, 190/6, 190/7, 190/9, 190/14, 196/5, Adi Sankara road, Kanayannur, Kerala – 682313.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**
3. **Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**
4. **The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, 1st Floor, Annex II, Government Secretariat, Thiruvananthapuram–1, Kerala.**



एनसीटीई अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-476/E- 389567/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLWRC202515437 / E-89067

Chaitanya Science and Art College, Khasra No. 212/67, Pamgarh, Sasaha Road, Jangir-Champa, Chattisgarh – 495554	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Amit Kumar Chandra, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Chaitanya Science and Art College, Khasra No. 212/67, Pamgarh, Sasaha Road, Jangir-Champa, Chattisgarh - 495554** dated 18.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE/WRC/2627202505144453/CHATTISGARH/2025/REJC/1876** dated 27.10.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “(i) The institution has not uploaded Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Chhattisgarh verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Chhattisgarh at URL https://firenoc.cg.gov.in/Track_Application.aspx (ii) The institution is conducting degree courses i.e. B.A. with intake of 290, B.Sc. with intake of 180, B.Com. with intake of 60, so cumulative intake (complete duration) of 1590. Further, the sanctioned intake of existing teacher education programme i.e. B.Ed. with intake of 100 in the name of CHAITANYA MAHAVIDYALAYA, cumulative intake (complete duration) of 200. The institution has applied for 08 units of ITEP programme so cumulative intake (complete duration) of 1600 in the name of CHAITANYA SCIENCE AND ARTS COLLEGE. The sufficiency of land area and built-up area for 3390 intake of multidisciplinary courses and teacher education programmes that includes proposed ITEP cannot be ascertained. (iii)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. (iv)The institution has not uploaded Building Safety Certificate in adherence of safety guidelines as prescribed by National/State Disaster Management Authority issued by Competent Government Authority. (v) The name of the institution mentioned in the NCTE recognition order for B.Ed. course does not match with the name of the applicant institution and the uploaded order is not revised order.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Amit Kumar Chandra, Principal of Chaitanya Science and Art College, Khasra No. 212/67, Pamgarh, Sasaha Road, Jangir-Champa, Chattisgarh - 495554 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1. Justification regarding point number 1: The institution has obtained fire safety certificate issue by fire safety department, Government of Chhattisgarh. Copy of fire safety certificate attached . 2. Justification regarding point number 2 : The total land of the society is in respect of Khasra Number 212/67 & 212/58 and the total land area is 40,468.60 sq.m. The total built-up area of the institution is 9,189.40 sq.m. As per NCTE Regulation 2014, for B.Ed two units, the total land area of 3000 sq.m. is required, and for ITEP eight units, the total land area of 4400 sq.m. is required. The total land area for B.Ed two units and ITEP eight units is 7400 sq.m, and the built-up area for B.Ed two units is 2000 sq.m and for ITEP eight units, 3400 sq.m. is required. The institution has already earmarked land area for ITEP & B.Ed of 7400 sq.m. and built-up area for ITEP and B.Ed of 6237 sq.m. The total land area of the institution is 40,468.60 sq.m. and the total built-up area of the institution is 9,189.40 sq.m., so the land and built-up area are sufficient for B.Ed, ITEP and BA and B.Sc.. The remaining land area and built-up area are used for degree courses, that is BA and B.Sc.. The institution is running the BA and B.Sc. courses in the name of Chaitanya College, but as per UGC approval Letter Number F. No. 8-534/2024 (CPP-I/C), dated 29 July 2024, the name of the institution for the B.A. and B.Sc.. courses has been changed from Chaitanya College to Chaitanya Science and Art College. It is clear that both colleges are running under the same society and the same land and building. 3. Justification regarding point number 3 : The website of institution has updated and maintain under Clause 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of NCTE Regulations, 2014. 4. Justification regarding point number 4 : The institution already obtained building safety certificate no. 1279 / shilp / 2025 dated 14/11/2025 and 1280 / shilp / 2025 dated 14/11/2025 issue by Public Works Department (PWD), Government of Chhattisgarh. Copy attached. 5. Justification regarding point number 5 : Previously the institution

running the B.A. and B.Sc. course in the name of Chaitanya College but as per UGC approval letter under letter number F. No. 8-534/2024 (CPP-I/C), dated 29 July 2024, change the name of institution from the Chaitanya College to Chaitanya science and art college for B.A. and B.Sc. courses it is clarify that both college are running same society same land and building.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had applied to the Western Regional Committee for grant of recognition to run the ITEP programme and that the said application was refused vide order dated 27.10.2025 on multiple grounds, including alleged non-submission or non-verifiability of Fire Safety and Building Safety Certificates, perceived insufficiency of land and built-up area in view of cumulative intake of multidisciplinary and teacher education programmes, non-compliance with mandatory website disclosures, and a discrepancy in the nomenclature of the institution vis-à-vis the existing B.Ed. recognition order.

The Appeal Committee further noted that the matter was earlier considered in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 21.11.2025, wherein the Committee examined the grounds of refusal in detail and recorded that the appellant institution had placed specific explanations and documentary material on record addressing each of the deficiencies cited by the WRC. The Committee also examined the relevant provisions of Appendix-15 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2021, particularly Clauses 1.5 and 5.1(v), which permit implementation of ITEP in a multidisciplinary academic environment. The Appeal Committee, upon such examination, had observed that the appellant institution was functioning as a multidisciplinary higher education institution. However, the Committee had also recorded that the issue relating to variation in institutional nomenclature between the ITEP applicant entity and the

already recognized teacher education institution required authoritative clarification, and accordingly, the matter was referred to the Academic Division of NCTE for a formal opinion.

The Appeal Committee, in its 15th Meeting, noted that the Academic Division, vide its communication dated 16.01.2026, merely stated that the relevant notification was “self-explanatory”. The Committee observed that the response of the Academic Division is generic and advisory in nature, and does not contain any specific, reasoned, or authoritative clarification addressing the precise academic issues arising in the present case. The Appeal Committee in view thereof resolved that the matter be adjudicated on merits, after due and independent consideration of the documents, submissions, and materials placed on record during the appellate proceedings, and be examined strictly within the statutory and regulatory framework governing recognition, without reliance on any generalized or non-specific advisory. The Appeal Committee upon comprehensive consideration of the material available on record, observed that the impugned order of the Regional Committee is founded predominantly on alleged procedural non-compliance, particularly relating to non-submission of replies and documents on the online portal, without undertaking a substantive and holistic examination of the relevant material subsequently furnished by the appellant institution during the appellate proceedings. The Committee further noted that additional documents submitted at the appellate stage, being specific and directly relevant to the grounds of refusal, cannot be disregarded summarily or mechanically, and are required to be examined in accordance with law, as held by the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi in *Rambha College of Education v. NCTE* [W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016] and allied judicial pronouncements. The Appeal Committee at the same time reiterated that generic assertions or self-serving claims of compliance, unsupported by verified and authenticated records, do not confer any vested, equitable, or enforceable right upon an institution. All claims of compliance must necessarily be subjected to specific, objective, and rigorous factual verification, and to strict regulatory scrutiny by the competent authority, in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and other applicable statutory requirements.

The Appeal Committee further noted that, during the appellate proceedings, the appellant institution submitted detailed explanations supported by documents, including Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority, Building Safety Certificates issued by the Public Works Department, updated website disclosures in compliance with Clauses 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) of the NCTE Regulations, and documentary justification demonstrating sufficiency of land and built-up area with earmarked allocation for B.Ed. and ITEP programmes. The institution also clarified, with reference to the UGC approval letter dated 29.07.2024, that the change in institutional nomenclature from “Chaitanya College” to “Chaitanya Science and Arts College” for B.A. and B.Sc. programmes was approved by UGC and that all programmes are operated by the same society on the same campus and land.

The Appeal Committee, after careful consideration, observed that the impugned order of the WRC does not reflect due consideration of the explanations and documents subsequently furnished by the appellant institution, nor does it demonstrate a reasoned analysis of the permissibility of shared infrastructure in a multidisciplinary HEI as envisaged under the ITEP norms. The Committee further observed that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are predominantly factual and verifiable in nature and that the refusal appears to have been issued without affording the appellant institution a focused and effective opportunity to clarify and substantiate its compliance with reference to the applicable regulatory provisions.

The Appeal Committee reiterated the settled legal position, as laid down inter alia in *Rambha College of Education v. NCTE* and allied judgments, that documents submitted during appellate proceedings cannot be ignored solely on the ground that they were not part of the original application and must be examined for the purpose of fair adjudication. At the same time, the Committee emphasized that compliance with the NCTE Act and Regulations must be strictly verified by the competent Regional Committee and cannot be presumed.

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee after careful perusal of the appeal report, documents on record and oral submissions made during the hearing, and the claims put forth by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee, in view of the above, and keeping in mind the principles of natural justice, proportionality, and reasoned decision-making, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 27.10.2025 is vitiated by non-consideration of relevant material and lack of adequate opportunity, warranting interference on procedural and factual grounds, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant's claims. Accordingly, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 27.10.2025 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration. The WRC is directed to verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted by the appellant institution, including those furnished during the appellate proceedings, to examine the issue of institutional nomenclature and shared infrastructure strictly within the framework of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and to afford the appellant institution a reasonable opportunity of hearing. The WRC shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with law, within the prescribed timeframe. It is clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual verification and regulatory scrutiny and shall not be construed as conferring any right, equity, or presumption in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish compliance upon reconsideration shall entail decision strictly in accordance with law, without any further opportunity. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 27.10.2025 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and strict compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Chaitanya Science and Art College, Khasra No. 212/67, Pamgarh, Sasaha Road, Jangir-Champa, Chattisgarh - 495554.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Government of Chhattisgarh, First floor, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh, 492002.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-468/E- 388355/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLWRC202515419 / E-89067

D. L. S. PG. College, Khasra No. 559/1/T, 559/ID, 559/1C, 559/1, DLS College Ashok Nagar, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh – 495006	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Sh. Vinayak Sharma, Assistant Professor
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **D. L. S. PG. College, Khasra No. 559/1/T, 559/ID , 559/1C, 559/1, DLS College Ashok Nagar, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh – 495006** dated 26.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / WRC / 2526202405203171 / CHATTISGARH / 2024 / REJC / 1414** dated 17.03.2025 of the Western Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that “The shortlisting criteria for processing ITEP applications for the session 2025-2026 has been prescribed by the Council (NCTE) in its 60th General Body meeting. The same was notified by the NCTE vide Public Notice dated 22.04.2024 to facilitate Multidisciplinary Institutions for processing their application of ITEP for academic session 2025-2026. The institutions must obtain minimum of 10 points for getting shortlisted for processing based on extant norms and standards prescribed by NCTE. On initial scrutiny of documents uploaded on the portal, the institution does not fulfill the shortlisting criteria as prescribed by the Council and has failed to fulfil the required points which are essential for processing of application for academic session 2025-2026. ”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Sh. Vinayak Sharma, Assistant Professor of D. L. S. PG. College, Khasra No. 559/1/T, 559/ID , 559/1C, 559/1, DLS College Ashok Nagar, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh – 495006 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “After thorough examination and re-evaluation of our ITEP application for the session 2025-26, we are convinced that DLS PG College, as a multidisciplinary institution, fulfils the shortlisting criteria for the processing of ITEP application, laid down by NCTE. We hereby appeal you to kindly review our application and shortlist it for processing under section 18.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Western Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the ITEP Course on 31.05.2024. The recognition of the institution for ITEP programme was refused by the WRC vide order dated 17.03.2025.

The instant matter placed in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 20.11.2025 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal the Committee noted that the WRC has withdrawn the recognition of the appellant institution vide order dated 17.03.2025 against which the appellant institution has preferred an appeal dated 26.10.2025. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant another (second) opportunity to the appellant institution with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents mentioned therein.

The appeal was thereafter taken up in the 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, the records of the Western Regional Committee, and the documents subsequently submitted by the appellant institution. During the appellate proceedings, the appellant institution submitted that, upon re-examination and reassessment of its application for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) for the academic session 2025–26, it satisfies the prescribed shortlisting criteria as a multidisciplinary institution. In support of its claim, the appellant institution also furnished an affidavit stating that: (i) D.L.S. P.G. College was established in the year 1997; (ii) the institution is functioning as a multidisciplinary higher education institution; and (iii) the institution is accredited by NAAC with a B+ grade. On the basis of the aforesaid particulars, the appellant institution contended that it secures a total of ten (10) points under the applicable NCTE shortlisting criteria for processing of ITEP applications.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with certain documents in support of its claims. At the same time, the Committee observed that these documents were admittedly not part of the original record before the Western Regional Committee at the time of passing the impugned order dated 17.03.2025. Accordingly, the refusal order cannot be held to be vitiated on merits or to suffer from arbitrariness, perversity, or lack of application of mind, having regard to the material then available before the Regional Committee.

The Appeal Committee further observed that, in terms of the settled legal position laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 – Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, additional documents furnished during appellate proceedings are required to be considered for the purpose of fair adjudication; however, such consideration does not dilute the statutory obligation of strict compliance and must necessarily be subject to rigorous factual verification and regulatory scrutiny by the competent Regional Committee in accordance with law.

Noting the submissions and oral arguments presented during the hearing, the Appeal Committee, having regard to the appellant institution's assertions of compliance, the subsequent documents placed on record, and the fact that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are primarily factual in nature and capable of objective verification, is of the considered view that the interests of justice would be served by remanding the matter to the Western Regional Committee for limited and focused reconsideration, strictly within the statutory framework. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims and without diluting or negating the findings recorded in the impugned order, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the order dated 17.03.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification. The Western Regional Committee is directed to re-examine the case of the appellant institution afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted during the appellate proceedings, and assess whether the institution satisfies the applicable shortlisting criteria, the requirements of a bona fide multidisciplinary institution, and the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Act,

1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025. The Western Regional Committee shall conduct such verification, including examination of affidavits and all supporting documents, strictly in accordance with law, afford due opportunity of hearing to the appellant institution, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed timeframe. The Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of all connected records before passing any consequential order. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to satisfactorily establish compliance upon reconsideration shall entail rejection of the claim strictly in accordance with law, without any further opportunity. The appellant institution is directed to forward to the Western Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further action in accordance with law and the directions contained herein.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 17.03.2025 and remand the matter to the Western Regional Committee (WRC) for fresh consideration and strict compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)
Appeal ID: APPLWRC202515419

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, D. L. S. PG. College, Khasra No. 559/1/T, 559/ID, 559/1C, 559/1, DLS College Ashok Nagar, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh – 495006.**
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10; Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Government of Chhattisgarh, First floor, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh, 492002.



एनसीटीई अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-474/E- 389053/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLERC202515423/E-89067

Jamshedpur Co-Operative College, Khasra No. 80a, 80b, 80c, 80d, 80 I Part, Notified Area, Jamshedpur, East Singhbhum, Jharkhand – 831001	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Amar Singh, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Jamshedpur Co-Operative College, Khasra No. 80a, 80b, 80c, 80d, 80 I Part, Notified Area, Jamshedpur, East Singhbhum, Jharkhand - 831001** dated 05.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / ERC / 2627202505265473 / JHARKHAND / 2025 / REJC / 2223** dated 09.09.2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "The institution has not uploaded requisite documents as per Final Show Cause Notice post Preliminary Scrutiny, issued to the institution on 04.08.2025".

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Amar Singh, Principal of Jamshedpur Co-Operative College, Khasra No. 80a, 80b, 80c, 80d, 80 I Part, Notified Area, Jamshedpur, East Singhbhum, Jharkhand - 831001 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "The latest land and B.Ed. building documents certified by the Competent Authority of Government of Jharkhand are being submitted (for land document certified by Circle Officer, Government of Jharkhand, Jamshedpur and for building documents certified by MD-Cum-Executive Engineer, Jamshedpur project implementation unit, JSBCCL, Government of Jharkhand, Jamshedpur)."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Eastern Regional Committee on 31.05.2025 seeking grant of recognition for the ITEP programme. Upon scrutiny of the application and the material

available on record at that stage, the Eastern Regional Committee refused recognition vide order dated 09.09.2025 on the grounds recorded therein.

The matter was first placed before the Appeal Committee in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 21.11.2025. On that date, the appellant institution did not appear online to present its case. The Appeal Committee, after examining the Appeal Report, the records of the Eastern Regional Committee, and the documents submitted along with the appeal, observed that, notwithstanding the non-appearance, the principles of natural justice warranted affording the appellant institution one further opportunity. Accordingly, the Committee decided to grant a second opportunity to the appellant institution, with a direction to submit the requisite documents and clarifications as indicated.

The appeal was thereafter taken up in the 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, the records of the Eastern Regional Committee, and the documents subsequently submitted by the appellant institution. During the appellate proceedings, the appellant institution contended that the deficiencies pointed out in the impugned order had been rectified and that updated land documents certified by the Circle Officer, Government of Jharkhand, Jamshedpur, and building documents certified by the Managing Director-cum-Executive Engineer, Jamshedpur Project Implementation Unit, JSBCCL, Government of Jharkhand, had been furnished. The appellant further asserted that it possesses adequate infrastructural and academic facilities, complies with the provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules and Regulations, and satisfies the shortlisting criteria for grant of recognition under the ITEP programme.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with certain documents in support of its claims. At the same time, the Committee observed that these documents were admittedly not part of the original record before the Eastern Regional Committee at the time of passing the impugned order dated 09.09.2025. Accordingly, the refusal order cannot be held to be vitiated on merits or to suffer from arbitrariness, perversity, or lack of application of mind, having regard to the material then available before the Regional Committee.

The Appeal Committee further observed that, in terms of the settled legal position laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 – Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, additional documents furnished during appellate proceedings are required to be considered for the purpose of fair adjudication; however, such consideration does not dilute the statutory obligation of strict compliance and must necessarily be subject to rigorous factual verification and regulatory scrutiny by the competent Regional Committee in accordance with law.

Noting the submissions and oral arguments presented during the hearing, the Appeal Committee, having regard to the appellant institution's assertions of compliance, the subsequent documents placed on record, and the fact that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are primarily factual in nature and capable of objective verification, is of the considered view that the interests of justice would be served by remanding the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee for limited and focused reconsideration, strictly within the statutory framework. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims and without diluting or negating the findings recorded in the impugned order, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the order dated 09.09.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh regulatory scrutiny and factual verification. The Eastern Regional Committee is directed to re-examine the case of the appellant institution afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted during the appellate proceedings, and assess whether the institution satisfies the applicable shortlisting criteria, the requirements of a bona fide multidisciplinary institution, and the norms and standards prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the NCTE MDI Guidelines dated 15.05.2025. The Eastern Regional Committee shall conduct such verification, including examination of affidavits and all supporting documents, strictly in accordance with law, afford due opportunity of hearing to the appellant institution, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order within the prescribed timeframe. The Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of all connected records before passing any consequential order. It is

expressly clarified that this remand is confined solely to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to satisfactorily establish compliance upon reconsideration shall entail rejection of the claim strictly in accordance with law, without any further opportunity. The appellant institution is directed to forward to the Eastern Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further action in accordance with law and the directions contained herein.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 09.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Eastern Regional Committee (ERC) for fresh consideration and strict compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Jamshedpur Co-Operative College, Khasra No. 80a, 80b, 80c, 80d, 80 I Part, Notified Area, Jamshedpur, East Singhbhum, Jharkhand - 831001.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher and Technical Education, Nepal house, Yojna Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Jharkhand.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-453/E- 386551/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLSRC202515407/E-89067

NMKRV College, Plot no. 45/1, 22nd Cross, Jayanagar, Karnataka, Bangalore – 560011	<u>Vs</u>	Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, SRC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **NMKRV College, Plot no. 45/1, 22nd Cross, Jayanagar, Karnataka, Bangalore - 560011** dated 15.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE/SRC/2627202505154607/KARNATAKA/2025/REJC/1913** dated 26.08.2025 of the Southern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting ITEP Course on the grounds that "As per the reply submitted by the Institution, it is clear that the lease deed for from Bangalore Development Authority (BDA) for College Building has expired in February 2024, Playground and Pavillion has expired in 2022 and the same has not been renewed till date. Hence, the institution is not having a valid land document in the name of institution/ society as on date."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative of **NMKRV College, Plot no. 45/1, 22nd Cross, Jayanagar, Karnataka, Bangalore - 560011** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "On behalf of NMKRV College, we sincerely submit representation regarding our application for the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) under BA-B.Ed. and BSc-B.Ed., submitted on 27th May 2025 in response to the Public Notice (F. No. NCTE-Reg1011/3/2025-Reg.Sec-HQ) dated 6th May 2025 issued by NCTE. Our application (Code: 2627202505154607), was shortlisted with a score of 10 points, has undergone all necessary scrutiny and follow-up in accordance with the established NCTE norms. We deeply value the transparent and rigorous process established by the NCTE and respectfully submit the following for your kind reconsideration. Summary of Compliance and Institutional Response • First Show Cause Notice (03.07.2025) Issued based on the 464th SRC Minutes of meeting of held on 27th June 2025. A comprehensive response with all supporting documentation was submitted promptly. • Final Show Cause Notice (31.07.2025) - issued based on the 467th SRC Minutes of meeting of held on 23rd July 2025. All observations were addressed satisfactorily except

one, which related to land documentation. Status of Land Documentation • The lease deed for the College Building (with Bangalore Development Authority) expired in February 2024, while the lease for the playground and pavilion expired in 2022. • Renewal applications have been duly submitted to the BDA, and the renewal process is actively underway. • An Affidavit from the Hon. Secretary of Rashtreeya Sikshana Samithi Trust has been submitted, affirming: o Uninterrupted and lawful possession of the premises, o Continued compliance with all terms of the lease, o Earlier renewal in the year 1992, was done by the authority only in year 2018 o Ongoing renewal efforts with the concerned authority. Copy of the letters dated 12-09-2025 and 20-05-2025 Government of Karnataka in Times of India publication dated 11-06-2025 have also come forward waiver of interest for public utility sites (copy enclosed) as there is a delay in finalizing the fee from their end. Despite our sincere and timely efforts, the Refusal Order was issued in the 470th SRC meeting on 20th August 2025, citing non-submission of valid land documents. Earnest Request for Conditional approval of ITEP to start the programme for the academic year 2026-2027. Under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, we are well within our right to file this appeal within 60 days of the order. More importantly, we make this request not merely as an appeal, but as a genuine plea for educational advancement and institutional credibility. We humbly request the NCTE to consider granting conditional approval for our ITEP application, subject to submission of renewed lease documents as soon as they are issued by the BDA. This gesture will:

- Encourage institutions striving to offer integrated teacher education with integrity and vision,
- Uphold the spirit of the NEP 2020, which envisions transformative, inclusive teacher preparation models.

We reaffirm our unwavering commitment to NCTE's standards and assure timely compliance with all pending documentation. This support from the NCTE will significantly impact the aspirations of future educators and the larger educational ecosystem we serve. We look forward to your kind consideration and positive response.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application on 27.05.2025 to the SRC seeking grant of recognition for the ITEP programme for the relevant academic session. Upon scrutiny, the SRC refused recognition vide order dated 26.08.2025, recording deficiencies relating to land possession, fire safety compliance, and other mandatory requirements under the NCTE Act and Regulations.

The appeal was first placed before the Appeal Committee in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 20.11.2025. The Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, SRC records, and the documents submitted by the appellant institution. In order to afford a reasonable opportunity and in adherence to the principles of natural justice, the Committee decided to grant a second opportunity to the appellant institution to submit valid and complete documentary evidence to substantiate compliance with the statutory requirements, particularly in respect of land possession and safety norms.

The matter was thereafter taken up in the 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 16.12.2025. The Appeal Committee again examined the Appeal Report, relevant records, and the additional documents submitted by the appellant institution pursuant to the opportunity granted. The Appeal Committee, after comprehensive consideration of the material available on record, recorded the following findings:

- (i) The appellant institution has categorically admitted that: ***(a) the lease deed for the college building expired in February 2024, and (b) the lease for the playground and pavilion expired in the year 2022.*** The Appeal Committee observed that valid and subsisting possession of land and building on the cut-off date is a mandatory pre-condition for grant of recognition under the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014. Pendency of renewal applications, affidavits asserting continued possession, references to earlier renewals, or newspaper publications regarding waiver of interest do not confer any legal right, title, or enforceable interest in favour of the institution. The Appeal Committee further observed that an affidavit, howsoever solemn, cannot substitute statutory compliance, nor can it cure the absence of a legally valid lease or renewal order issued

- by the competent authority, namely the Bangalore Development Authority (BDA).
- (ii) The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has failed to submit a Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority. This constitutes a direct violation of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, which mandates that adequate safeguards against fire hazards shall be provided in all parts of the building. The Appeal Committee reiterated that fire safety is a non-negotiable statutory requirement, particularly for a long-duration programme like ITEP, and absence of such certification goes to the root of institutional safety and student welfare.
 - (iii) In addition to the above, the appellant institution has failed to substantiate or cure other deficiencies pointed out by the SRC, despite being granted a specific and reasonable opportunity by the Appeal Committee. The Committee found that the submissions made were explanatory in nature but not evidentiary, and therefore insufficient to demonstrate compliance with the prescribed Norms and Standards.

The Appeal Committee observed that the deficiencies noted above are substantive and incurable in nature and are not mere procedural irregularities. The SRC has afforded due opportunity, examined the material available on record, and applied the statutory framework correctly. The principles of natural justice have been fully complied with, and no arbitrariness or perversity is discernible in the impugned decision.

The Appeal Committee is, therefore, of the considered view that the appellant institution has failed to satisfy the mandatory statutory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, and that the SRC was fully justified in refusing recognition.

Noting the submission made in the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned refusal order dated 26.08.2025 issued by SRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing the recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned refusal order dated 26.08.2025 issued by SRC is confirmed. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, and no further relief is granted to the appellant institution.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, NMKRV College, Plot no. 45/1, 22nd Cross, Jayanagar, Karnataka, Bangalore - 560011.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Karnataka, Secretary Establishment, Higher Education Dept., Room No. 645 A, 2nd Gate, 6th Floor, M.S.Building, Bengaluru, Karnataka-1.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-355/E-376986/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLERC202515282 / E- 89067

R.S. Teachers Training College, Plot No.-332, 333, 334, 338, 339, Street No.- 239, Vil, katras bazar, Street No.- 239, Jharkhand, Dhanbad, Pincode – 828114	<u>Vs</u>	Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Mr. Prabhash Kumar, Secretary
Respondent by	Regional Director, ERC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **R.S. Teachers Training College, Plot No.-332, 333, 334, 338, 339, Street No.- 239, Vil, katras bazar, Street No.-239, Jharkhand, Dhanbad, Pincode - 828114** dated 23/07/2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. ER-367.23/ NCTE/ ERCAPP1178/B.Ed./JH/2025/71186/71191** dated 03/07/2025 of the Eastern Regional Committee, withdrawal recognition for conducting B.Ed. course on the grounds that “The Institution has submitted Fire Safety Certificate dated 23.03.2017 issued by the Karyalaya Aghishthan Agnisham Padadhikari, Dhanbad which is very old.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Mr. Prabhash Kumar, Secretary of R.S. Teachers Training College, Plot No.- 332, 333, 334, 338, 339, Street No.- 239, Vil, katras bazar, Street No.-239, Jharkhand, Dhanbad, Pincode - 828114 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1) That, Prior to this withdrawal order dated 03.07.2025 a Final Show cause Notice was issued under section 17 vide F. No. ER.358.11/ NCTE/ERCAPP1178 /B.Ed./JH/2022 (70216 - 70217) dated 21.02.2025. Wherein mentioned in Para 4 “The Institution is required to submit Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority”. Since there is no provision in the NCTE Act for requirement of Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority. 2) That, the institution has already submitted reply of the Show Cause Notice vide Letter No. RSTTC/2025/11 dated 10.03.2025 along with copy of the Fire Safety Certificate and mentioned therein, Para 5 - “The Fire Safety Certificate in original was submitted vide letter no. RSTTC/2021/14 dated 05.03.2021. Although it is admitted by the authority in its withdrawal order dated 03.07.2025 as below: - Para 6 – And whereas the institution has submitted reply dated 10.03.2025 received in ERC office on 21.03.2025. The matter was placed before 367th meeting of the ERC held on 04th June 2025, and the committee decided as under – - The institution has submitted reply

to the final show cause notice. After carefully observing the reply to the final show cause notice the ERC concluded the following:- - The institution has submitted fire safety certificate dated 23.03.2017 issued by the Karyalaya Aghishthan Agnisham Padadhikari, Dhanbad which is very old. 3. That, the ERC had initially issued the final show cause notice dated 21.02.2025 that, Fire Safety Certificate required to be submitted. Later on, The ERC changed its own stand wherein, it has admitted that the institution had submitted the fire safety certificate, but they added a new thing that the said certificate is very old. As such in view of the facts and circumstances mentioned herein above the Final show cause notice dated 21.02.2025 issued U/Section 17 and the withdrawal order dated 03.07.2025 passed by the ERC U/Section 17(1) is not sustainable in eye of the law.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was initially granted recognition for the B.Ed. programme of one-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 31.08.2013. Subsequently, in pursuance of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, a revised recognition order was issued on 31.05.2015 permitting the institution to conduct the B.Ed. programme of two-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two basic units) from the academic session 2015-16. The Committee further noted that the Appeal Committee, vide order dated 12.07.2022, had earlier remanded the matter to the ERC with specific directions. Thereafter, upon consideration of the compliance status, the ERC withdrew recognition vide order dated 03.07.2025.

The appeal was first placed before the Appeal Committee in its 11th Meeting held on 05.09.2025, wherein the Committee, after perusing the records, granted a second opportunity to the appellant institution to submit the requisite documents, including those relating to fire safety compliance.

The matter was again considered in the 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 21.11.2025, during which the appellant institution relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Jupally Lakshmikantha Reddy vs. State of Andhra Pradesh [2025 INSC 1096], particularly paragraph 5 thereof, to contend that educational buildings below 15 meters in height do not require a Fire Safety Certificate under the National Building Code, 2016. The Committee, while taking note of the judgment, observed that the appellant institution had not furnished any confirmation from the competent Fire Safety Department certifying that its building fell within the exempted category. Accordingly, in the interest of procedural fairness, the Committee granted a third and final opportunity, directing the institution to submit a formal clarification from the competent Fire Safety Authority along with a sworn affidavit. A letter to this effect was issued on 16.12.2025.

The matter was finally taken up in the 15th Meeting of the Appeal Committee, 2025 held on 17.12.2025. The appellant institution did not appear for oral hearing despite due notice. The Committee, however, proceeded to consider the written submissions dated 17.12.2025 and the documents placed on record. In its written submissions, the appellant institution reiterated that the height of its building is 13.8 metres and, on the basis of an engineer's certificate, claimed exemption from the requirement of a Fire Safety No Objection Certificate (NOC). It was further contended that there is no express provision under the NCTE Act, 1993 mandating submission of a Fire Safety Certificate. The Appeal Committee, upon careful consideration, observed that the Norms and Standards prescribed under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, particularly Clause 6.1(v) clearly mandate that **“adequate safeguards against fire hazards shall be provided in all parts of the building.”** Compliance with fire safety norms is thus an essential and continuing statutory requirement for recognition and its continuation. The Committee further observed that institutional assertions or self-certified claims, including reliance on engineer's certificate, cannot substitute statutory compliance, unless the applicability of any claimed exemption is specifically and formally certified by the competent Fire Safety Authority of the State or local government. Determination of whether a building falls within any exemption under the National Building

Code or allied safety regulations lies exclusively within the domain of the competent fire safety authority, and not with the institution itself.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has failed to submit any valid and subsisting Fire Safety Certificate issued by the competent authority. It has also failed to produce any formal communication or certification from the competent Fire Safety Department explicitly stating that a Fire Safety Certificate is not required in its case. The Committee further noted that the Fire Safety Certificate relied upon by the institution was issued in the year 2017, and was therefore outdated, non-contemporaneous, and insufficient to establish present compliance with the mandatory safety requirements. The same was rightly found to be inadequate by the concerned Regional Committee. In view of the above, the Appeal Committee held that the appellant institution has failed to demonstrate compliance with the mandatory Norms and Standards relating to fire safety under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, and has not discharged the statutory burden cast upon it to establish adherence to essential safety requirements.

The Appeal Committee also noted that despite repeated opportunities, the appellant institution has not discharged its burden of proving compliance or lawful exemption. The plea that the ERC altered its stand is found to be without merit, as the requirement throughout was demonstrable fire safety compliance, which the institution failed to establish. The deficiencies are not technical or procedural but go to the core of institutional safety and regulatory compliance.

Noting the submission made in the Appeal Report, documents on record Appeal Committee concluded that the Eastern Regional Committee had followed due process, afforded adequate opportunity, and passed the withdrawal order after proper application of mind and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 03.07.2025 issued by ERC is confirmed. The impugned order does not suffer from arbitrariness, illegality, or violation of principles of natural justice.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, the Appeal Committee concluded that the Eastern Regional Committee was fully justified in withdrawing recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 03.07.2025 issued by the Eastern Regional Committee is hereby confirmed. This decision is rendered strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and settled principles of administrative law, and shall not confer any right, equity, or presumption in favour of the appellant institution.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, R.S. Teachers Training College, Plot No.-332, 333, 334, 338, 339, Street No.- 239, Vil, katras bazar, Street No.-239, Jharkhand, Dhanbad, Pincode - 828114.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher and Technical Education, Nepal house, Yojna Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Jharkhand.



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)

जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE)

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/

APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT

89-459/E- 388665/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025

APPLNRC202515425/E-89067

Sri Krishna Dutt Academy, Plot No. 2D/HS-1, Vrindavan Yojna Raebareli Road, Sarojini Nagar, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh – 226025	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	The Representative
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF APPEAL

The appeal of **Sri Krishna Dutt Academy, Plot No. 2D/HS-1, Vrindavan Yojna Raebareli Road, Sarojini Nagar, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh - 226025** dated 04.11.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / 2526202402231683 / UTTAR PRADESH / 2024 / RECOGNITION ORDER** dated 29.10.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, granting recognition for conducting ITEP Course and as per Appeal Report it is submitted by the Appellant Institution as the grounds of appeal that "Reason not known for Rejection"

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

The Representative of Department-Education of **Sri Krishna Dutt Academy, Plot No. 2D/HS-1, Vrindavan Yojna Raebareli Road, Sarojini Nagar, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh - 226025** appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that "We have applied for 1 unit each of B.A., B.Ed. and B.Sc., B.Ed. The inspection was conducted online and LOI has been issued accordingly. We have submitted reply to the LOI for B.A., B.Ed., and B.Sc., B.Ed. with all the required details and supporting documents thereof. We have received order of recognition in which we were allotted only one unit (B.A., B.Ed.). We have already submitted the following : 1. FDR Endowment Fund (7 Lakh + 5 Lakh) and Reserve Fund (7 Lakh + 5 Lakh). 2. Staff profile for B.A., B.Ed. and B.Sc., B.Ed. both. 3. Staff approval letter University of Lucknow for B.A., B.Ed. and B.Sc., B.Ed."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the NRC on 01.03.2024 seeking recognition for running the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) with one unit each of B.A.B.Ed. and B.Sc.B.Ed.

The NRC granted recognition vide order dated 29.10.2025; however, recognition was restricted to only one unit of B.A.B.Ed.

The Appeal Committee in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 20.11.2025, examined the appellant's contention that it had proposed two units in view of availability of faculty, infrastructure, and statutory funds. The Committee observed that the record did not clearly disclose the regulatory basis on which the NRC had limited recognition to a single unit. Accordingly, the Committee decided to grant an opportunity to the appellant institution to place relevant documents on record and simultaneously directed the Regional Director, NRC, to submit a status report explaining the reasons for granting recognition for only one unit. The matter was kept pending.

The Appeal Committee, in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025, examined the submissions made by the appellant institution. The institution contended that it had applied for one unit each of B.A., B.Ed. and B.Sc., B.Ed. programmes; that the inspection was conducted through online mode and a Letter of Intent (LOI) was issued accordingly; and that it had duly submitted a reply to the LOI in respect of both B.A., B.Ed. and B.Sc., B.Ed. programmes along with all requisite details and supporting documents. The institution further submitted that, despite the above, the recognition order granted approval for only one unit of the B.A., B.Ed. programme. In support of its claim, the institution stated that it had already submitted the prescribed Endowment Fund and Reserve Fund in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipts (₹7.00 lakh + ₹5.00 lakh for each programme), staff profiles for both B.A., B.Ed. and B.Sc., B.Ed. programmes, and staff approval letters issued by the University of Lucknow in respect of the said programmes.

The Appeal Committee observed that while such claims were placed on record, the same had not yet undergone final and focused verification by the NRC in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended).

The Appeal Committee further observed that restriction of recognition without affording a clear, final opportunity to substantiate compliance, supported by a reasoned

examination of documents, does not fully meet the requirements of procedural fairness. The Committee also took note of the settled legal principle laid down in Rambha College of Education v. NCTE, wherein it has been held that documents submitted at the appellate stage are required to be examined for fair adjudication. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claim for additional units, and without diluting the regulatory authority of the NRC, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants remand for limited factual verification and regulatory scrutiny only.

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, after careful perusal of the appeal report, documents on record and oral submissions made during the hearing, and the claims put forth by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee accordingly decides to remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC). The NRC shall afford the appellant institution a personal or virtual hearing and grant one final opportunity of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of this order to submit a comprehensive documentary explanation demonstrating compliance with the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014, including duly approved and authenticated faculty details indicating qualifications, approvals, and deployment. The NRC shall independently verify the authenticity and relevance of all documents, record clear findings against each regulatory requirement, and pass a reasoned and speaking order within thirty (30) days thereafter, strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any prior observations. It is expressly clarified that this remand is granted solely to ensure procedural fairness and factual verification and shall not be construed as conferring any right, equity, or presumption in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to establish full compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with law, without any further opportunity. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the NRC, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, all

documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the NRC shall take further action strictly in accordance with law and the directions contained herein.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. **The Principal, Sri Krishna Dutt Academy, Plot No. 2D/HS-1, Vrindavan Yojna Raebareli Road, Sarojini Nagar, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh - 226025.**
2. **The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.**
3. **Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.**
4. **The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, Room No. 03, Naveen Bhawan, U.P. Secretariat, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226001.**



एनसीटीई अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-462/E- 387995/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLNRC202515413/E-89067

Sant Mela Singh College of Education, Near Digiana, Khasra No. 413, 415, 416, Gangyal main road, Jammu & Kashmir	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Dr. Kiran Luthra, Principal
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF REFUSAL

The appeal of **Sant Mela Singh College of Education, Near Digiana, Khasra No. 413, 415, 416, Gangyal main road, Jammu & Kashmir** dated 07.10.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per refusal order no. **F. No. NCTE / NRC / FR-2122-NRC-989581102 / JAMMU&KASHMIR / 2020 / REJC / 59** dated 23.09.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, refusing recognition for conducting B.Ed. Course on the grounds that "1. The institution has not uploaded/copy certified land documents issued by the Sub-registrar along with translated English version of the same duly notarized and demarcation to each course/School being run on the same land. 2. The institution has uploaded building plan, however, the same is not approved by the Govt. Competent Authority and also not depicting the name of institution, name of course, khasra/plot no. total land area, total built-up area and earmarked land and built-up area for all the courses/ school/ other institutions being run on the above land along with approval letter for the same. 3. The institution has not uploaded land use certificate issued by the Revenue Department, Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir, Govt. Order no. 138-Rev(S) of 2016 dated 07.10.2016 & notification dated 24.10.2021 & notification No. 01-J&K(BoR) of 2022 dated 14.01.2022. Only Tehsildar certificate uploaded by the institution. 4. The institution has not uploaded non-encumbrance certificate issued by revenue department. Only a certificate issued by Punjab and Sind Bank uploaded by the institution. 5. There is no provision of playing courts like badminton, volleyball and basketball etc. in the institution. 6. The flooring of the building is in but bad shape which needs repair and renovation. 7. The room areas are inadequate and are not as per norms. 8. There is no provision for lift/ramp to access to upper floors of the building by differently abled persons. 9. STP/WTP is not available in the building camps. 10. Water harvesting pit is not available in the building campus. 11. There is no proper internet facility on the campus. It was also observed during the online VT."

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Dr. Kiran Luthra, Principal of Sant Mela Singh College of Education, Near Digiana, Khasra No. 413, 415, 416, Gangyal main road, Jammu & Kashmir appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “All the points mentioned in the show cause all the documents and facilities is available in the institution, prove the facilities documents is uploaded.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had submitted an application to the Northern Regional Committee for grant of recognition, seeking permission for running the B.Ed. Course on 31.08.2020. The recognition of the institution for B.Ed. programme was refused by the NRC vide order dated 23.09.2025.

The Appeal Committee, in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17.12.2025, perused the Appeal Report, the impugned refusal order dated 23.09.2025 issued by the Northern Regional Committee (NRC), the records placed on file, and the oral submissions advanced on behalf of the appellant institution. The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution had applied to the NRC on 31.08.2020 for grant of recognition to conduct the B.Ed. programme. The NRC, after consideration of the online Visiting Team (VT) report and documents on record, refused recognition vide order dated 23.09.2025 on multiple grounds relating to land ownership and documentation, approval of building plans, land use certification, non-encumbrance status, and serious deficiencies in infrastructural, instructional, accessibility, environmental, and ICT facilities, as specifically enumerated in the impugned order. During the appeal proceedings, the appellant institution contended that all requisite facilities exist and that relevant documents have been uploaded and sought reconsideration of the refusal. The Committee examined these submissions in light of the statutory scheme under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE

(Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended). It is a settled principle that the burden of demonstrating strict compliance with mandatory norms, particularly relating to land, building approvals, and core infrastructural and instructional facilities, rests squarely upon the applicant institution. Mere assertions of compliance, without verified and authenticated documentary support, cannot displace the findings recorded by the Regional Committee on the basis of the VT report.

The Appeal Committee at the same time, noted that the deficiencies recorded in the impugned order are largely factual in nature and capable of objective verification. Having regard to the appellant institution's categorical claim that the deficiencies stand rectified and that supporting documents are available, and keeping in view the principles of procedural fairness, proportionality, and reasoned decision-making inherent in administrative law, the Committee is of the considered view that the matter warrants a limited remand for fresh factual verification, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant's claims.

The Appeal Committee noting the submissions of the appellant institution and observed that subsequent documents placed on record are also required to be considered for fair adjudication. Accordingly, the concerned Regional Committee shall re-examine the matter afresh and verify the authenticity and relevance of all documents and pass a reasoned order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act and Regulations. The Committee also took cognizance of the legal precedent set by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 3231/2016 - Rambha College of Education vs. NCTE, wherein it was held that any additional documents furnished by the appellant must be duly considered by the Appeal Committee while adjudicating the appeal.

The Appeal Committee without diluting or negating the findings recorded by the Northern Regional Committee, decides to set aside the impugned order dated 23.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) solely for the purpose of factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee as applicable under the NCTE (Recognition Norms &

Procedure) Regulations, 2014. The Visiting Team shall verify, inter alia, the infrastructural and instructional facilities specifically pointed out in the impugned refusal order and assess overall compliance with the Norms and Standards prescribed for implementation of the B.Ed. programme. The appellant institution shall, prior to such verification, deposit the prescribed processing fee and submit a duly notarized affidavit affirming the authenticity, correctness, and completeness of all documents relied upon, along with certified copies of approvals issued by the competent authorities strictly in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The Northern Regional Committee (NRC) shall thereafter examine the Visiting Team report, the affidavit, and all supporting documents, and shall pass a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with law and uninfluenced by any observations herein, within the prescribed timeframe. It is clarified that this remand is granted only to ensure procedural fairness and factual verification, and shall not be construed as conferring any right, equity, or presumption in favour of the appellant institution. Failure to satisfactorily establish compliance on re-verification shall entail rejection of the claim for recognition without any further opportunity.

Noting the submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, the Appeal Committee after careful perusal of the appeal report, documents on record and oral submissions made during the hearing, and the claims put forth by the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 23.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration. The Regional Committee shall consider the case of appellant institution after factual re-verification through conduct of a Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee considering all records and supplementary submissions made by the appellant, including compliance with the deficiencies noted in the original impugned order. The Appeal Committee further decided that after such examination, the Regional Committee shall take a reasoned decision in strict compliance with the NCTE Regulations, 2014 or amendments issued by the Council. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time bound disposal of the case and passing the

order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 23.09.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for factual re-verification through conduct of an Online Visiting Team, subject to deposit of the prescribed processing fee and strict compliance with the directions specified hereinabove. The appellant institution is further directed to forward to the Regional Committee, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order, the documents submitted along with the appeal, whereupon the Regional Committee shall take further necessary action strictly in accordance with law and in light of the direction contained herein.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Sant Mela Singh College of Education, Near Digiana, Khasra No. 413, 415, 416, Gangyal main road, Jammu & Kashmir.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Education, Mini Block Civil Secretariat, Jammu, J&K.



एनसीटीई अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-343/E-376176/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLNRC202515297/E-89067

SSG College, 596, 597, 594, Mauhar, G.T.Road, Malwa, Fatehpur, Uttar Pradesh-212665	<u>Vs</u>	Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	Mr. Mahesh Singh Gaur, Manager
Respondent by	Regional Director, NRC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUND OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **SSG College, 596, 597, 594, Mauhar, G.T.Road, Malwa, Fatehpur, Uttar Pradesh-212665** dated 28.07.2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. NRC / NCTE / NRCAPP-5154 / B.Ed. / 442nd Meeting / SI.No. 36 / UP / 2025 / 233439-233445** dated 14.07.2025 of the Northern Regional Committee, withdrawal recognition for conducting B.Ed. course on the grounds that "The institution has not submitted the certified land documents in respect of Khasra No. 598m, 597m. The institution has submitted photocopy of land documents. The institution has submitted building plan for B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. signed by Abhiyanta, Jila Panchayat, Fatehpur. As per building plan, total built up area is only 2556.84 Sqm. which is not sufficient for offering two units B.Ed. and one unit of D.El.Ed. course. The institution has submitted NEC issued by Deputy Registrar Bindki, Fatehpur in respect of Khasra No. 596, 594, 597 for the period of 02.08.2010 to 27.02.2024. The latest NEC is not submitted by the institution. The institution has submitted site plan (Nazari Naksa). Issuing authority of the said site plan is not clear. The institution has submitted the building safety certificate dated 22.03.2015 issued by Adhishashi Abhiyanta, PWD, Fatehpur. The latest building safety certificate is not submitted by the institution. The institution has submitted photocopy of BCC which is not readable. As per BCC, total built-up area is 4000 Sqm. and as per building plan, total built-up area is 2556.84 Sqm. The built-up area mentioned is BCC and building plan does not match. The recognition was granted to the institution for B.Ed. two units (100 students). For two units, 1+15 faculty is required but the institution has submitted approval letter dated 27.02.2015 issued by CSJM University, Kanpur in respect of one HOD & Nine Assistant Professor(s). the details of the six Assistant Professors is not submitted by the institution. The institution has not submitted the latest faculty approval letter issued by affiliating body and the consolidated chart signed by affiliating body is also not submitted. The institution has not submitted faculty approval letter for D.El.Ed. course issued by affiliating body. The institution has not submitted the FDRs of Rs. 5+7 Lakh for each B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. in

original. The institution has also not filled PAR for B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. course for the session 2021-22 & 2022-2023".

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

Mr. Mahesh Singh Gaur, Manager of SSG College, 596, 597, 594, Mauhar, G.T.Road, Malwa, Fatehpur, Uttar Pradesh-212665 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, it is submitted that "The instant appeal is being filed against the 442 Minutes of meeting held between 11-12 June 2025 and Final Show Cause Notice dated 11.04.2025 issued under section 17 of the NCTE Act, 1993 by the Northern Regional Committee of the NCTE calling for the submission of reply within 15 days of issuance of Final Show Cause Notice. It is submitted herein that it has been alleged in the above said notice that the appellant institution did not submit a reply to the First Show Cause Notice dated 10.10.2023 issued by the NRC, NCTE in its 414th meeting held on 06th-7th October 2023 but the truth is that the said reply addressed to the RD, NRC was submitted in office against the proper receipt with seal and stamp issued on 03.11.2023 by the NCTE which has been made part of record of this appeal. The institution has already submitted The Documents of certified Land registry, Khasra-Khatauni No.596M, 597 & 594, Blue print of Building Plan of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed., Non-Encumbrance Certificate, Site Plan, (Naksha Najri), Building Safety Certificate, Fire Safety certificate, Building Completion Certificate, List of Faculty Approval Letter of B.Ed. & D.EL.ED., Letter regarding approval of D.EL.ED. Faculty, Copies of FDR of Rs.5 Lacs & 7 Lacs for each course of B.Ed. & D.EL.ED., Receipt of PAR Filled for B.Ed. Course for session 2021-22 & 2022-23, Change of Land Use under section 143 (CLU), Receiving of Letter of intent (LOI) issued by NRC vide Application no.13299, Reply dated 08.05.2025 to Final Show Cause Notice dated 11.04.2025 duly received by the NCTE & The Notarized Affidavit. It is submitted that the Apex Court of the Country in the case of "NCTE and Anr. vs. Vaishnav Institute of Technology and Management, (2012) 5 SCC 139, particularly to para 28 thereof which reads as under: "28. Derecognition or withdrawal of recognition of a recognised institution is a drastic measure. It results in dislocating the students, teachers and the staff. That is why, the Council has been empowered under Section 13 to have a constant vigil on the functioning of a recognised

institution. On the recommendation of the Council after inspection, if a recognised institution does not rectify the deficiencies and continues to function in contravention of the provisions of the 1993 Act or the Rules or the Regulations, the Regional Committee under Section 17 has full power to proceed for withdrawal of recognition in accordance with the procedure prescribed therein.” Section 13 of the NCTE Act 1993 has been reproduced hereunder: 13. Inspection (1) For the purpose of ascertaining whether the recognised institutions are functioning in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Council may cause inspection of any such institution, to be made by such persons as it may direct, and in such manner as may be prescribed. (2) The Council shall communicate to the institution the date on which inspection under sub-section (1) is to be made and the institution shall be entitled to be associated with the inspection in such manner as may be prescribed. (3) The Council shall communicate to the said institution, its views in regard to the results of any such inspection and may, after ascertaining the opinion of that institution, recommend to that institution the action to be taken as a result of such inspection. (4) All communications to the institution under this section shall be made to the executive authority thereof, and the executive authority of the institution shall report to the Council the action, if any, which is proposed to be taken for the purpose of implementing any such recommendation as is referred to in sub-section (3). It is submitted herein that the appellant institution has already submitted certified copies of Registry copy of Land documents, Khasra, Khatauni of 596, 597-594 with NRC, NCTE. The institution was granted recognition of B.Ed. in the year 2015 and the requisite land and built-up area was according to norms of NCTE and the same was enough for running the said course and further the institution was granted D.El.Ed. course in the year 2016 and the total land 5770 sq m. and builtup area 4016.10 sq. m. which was sufficient as per norms of the ncte to run both the courses. The institution has already submitted the latest i.e, 2025 NEC for Khasra no.596, 594,597. However, it is submitted that these documents are also treated valid as well which was submitted earlier. the institution has submitted again, a clear certified copy of the site plan duly signed and executed by the authority concerned. The latest building safety certificate has been submitted by the institution issued by Adhishasi Abhiyanta, PWD, Fatehpur. The institution was granted recognition of B.Ed. in the year 2015 and the requisite land and built-up area was according to norms of NCTE and the

same was enough for running the said course and further the institution was granted D.El.Ed. course in the year 2016 and the total land 5770 sq m. and builtup area 4016.10 sq. m. which was sufficient as per norms of the ncte to run both the courses. The institution has already submitted latest certified copies of approved faculty list by Prof. Rajendra Singh (Rajju Bhaiya) University, Prayagraj one HOD + 12 Asstt. Professors and 3 faculties already approved by CSJM University, Kanpur earlier vide Letter dated 27.02.2015 and as such, total one HOD +12+3 Faculties are there at present. The institution has already submitted the copy of Govt. letters dated 01.03.2016 & 20.04.2016 its approved faculty of one HOD +15 Asstt. Professors. However, it is submitted herein that ten faculties left the institution during covid-19 period and the institution has appointed 10 faculties and submitted the file with proper receipt for approval from PNP, Prayagraj. The same is under process. It is submitted haerein that I undertake to submit the original FDRs of Rs.5+7 Lacs for B.ED. & D.El.Ed each. It is submitted that the appellant institution has already filled PAR for B.Ed. course and the proof of the same has been submitted as well and further, the institution has also filed W.P.(C) bearing no.10088/2025 titled as "S S G COLLEGE Versus NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR" before Delhi High Court and the matter has been directed to be Re-notified on 20.08.2025 alongwith W.P.(C) 8133/2025. The hon'ble Delhi High Court has passed the following order on 17.07.2025 relevant portion of the said order has been reproduced as under:- "15. In the meanwhile, having regard to the submissions noted hereinabove, which prima facie appears to have substance, and further regard being had to the fact that in similar matters stay has been granted while issuing notice, the operation of the impugned withdrawal orders/decisions is stayed till the next date of hearing and the petitioners are permitted to participate in the counselling and admit students in the academic session 2025-26. 16. It is further directed that respondent/NCTE will issue a necessary public notice and upload the list of institutes on its website thereby intimating all concerned, including State authority, affiliating authorities and counselling authorities that operation of the impugned withdrawal order/decisions in respect of such listed institutes have been stayed by this Court and they have been permitted to participate in the counselling and admit the students for the academic session 2025-2026, which shall be complied with. This may be done by the NCTE latest by 24.07.2025." Apart from the

above, it is submitted herein that our institution may kindly be allowed to participate in the counselling process proposed to be scheduled later for academic session 2025-26.”

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records and heard oral arguments advanced during the Meeting.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was granted recognition for the B.Ed. programme of two-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students (two units) vide order dated 03.03.2015 from the academic session 2015-2016. Subsequently, the recognition of the institution for the B.Ed. programme was withdrawn by the NRC vide order dated 14.07.2025 under Section 17 of the NCTE Act, 1993 on the grounds recorded therein.

The instant matter was placed in its 10th Meeting, 2025 held on 08.08.2025 and 13th Meeting, 2025 held on 24.09.2025 before the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, relevant records and the documents submitted by appellant institution. The Appeal Committee in order to consider the case of the appellant institution on merits, decided to grant opportunities to the appellant institution etc. with the direction to submit the aforesaid documents/report mentioned therein.

The matter was thereafter taken up in the 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025. The Appeal Committee carefully examined the Appeal Report, the records of the Northern Regional Committee (NRC), and the documents subsequently submitted by the appellant institution. During the appellate proceedings, the institution contended that the allegation regarding non-submission of reply to the First Show Cause Notice dated 10.10.2023, issued by the NRC in its 414th Meeting held on 06–07 October 2023, is factually incorrect. It was stated that a reply addressed to the Regional Director, NRC, was duly submitted on 03.11.2023 and acknowledged by the NCTE with proper receipt, seal, and stamp, a copy of which has been placed on record. The appellant institution further submitted that it had furnished certified copies of land registry documents, Khasra and Khatauni records

pertaining to Khasra Nos. 596M, 597 and 594; approved building plans for B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. programmes; Non-Encumbrance Certificate; site plan (Naksha Najri); Building Safety Certificate; Fire Safety Certificate; Building Completion Certificate; faculty approval letters for B.Ed. and D.El.Ed.; copies of Fixed Deposit Receipts towards Endowment and Reserve Funds; receipts evidencing submission of Performance Appraisal Reports (PAR) for the academic sessions 2021–22 and 2022–23; Change of Land Use (CLU) under Section 143; Letter of Intent (LOI) issued by the NRC; reply dated 08.05.2025 to the Final Show Cause Notice dated 11.04.2025 duly acknowledged by the NCTE; and a notarized affidavit. The appellant institution also relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in NCTE & Anr. v. Vaishnav Institute of Technology and Management, (2012) 5 SCC 139, particularly paragraph 28 thereof, to contend that withdrawal of recognition is a drastic measure and must be preceded by due opportunity and verification. Reference was also made to the inspection provisions under Section 13 of the NCTE Act, 1993. It was further submitted that recognition for the B.Ed. programme was granted in the year 2015 and for the D.El.Ed. programme in 2016, and that the total land area of 5770 sq. metres and built-up area of 4016.10 sq. metres were sufficient as per NCTE norms for running both programmes. The institution stated that the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate for the relevant Khasra numbers had been submitted and that certified copies of site plans and building safety certificates issued by the competent authority, PWD, Fatehpur, were also furnished. With regard to faculty, the appellant institution submitted that it has placed on record the latest approved faculty list issued by Prof. Rajendra Singh (Rajju Bhaiya) University, Prayagraj, comprising one Head of Department and twelve Assistant Professors, along with three faculty members earlier approved by CSJM University, Kanpur. It was further stated that although certain faculty members left during the COVID-19 period, replacements have been appointed and proposals for approval have been submitted to the competent authority and are under process. The appellant institution further undertook to submit the original Fixed Deposit Receipts towards Endowment and Reserve Funds for both B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. programmes. It was also submitted that Performance Appraisal Reports (PAR) for the B.Ed. programme have been duly filled and proof thereof has been submitted. The Appeal Committee further noted that the appellant institution submitted an affidavit dated 18.12.2025 stating that it has not

filed any case before any Hon'ble High Court or other Court. The institution also submitted a subsequent affidavit dated 08.01.2026 stating that the forms relating to Khasra No. 598M have not been attached anywhere in respect of the recognition granted for the B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. (BTC) programmes of the institution.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution has placed on record a compliance report along with various documents in purported fulfilment of the deficiencies cited in the withdrawal order. At the same time, the Committee observed that a substantial part of the material relied upon by the appellant institution was either not before the NRC at the time of passing the impugned order dated 14.07.2025 or requires authentication and factual verification by the competent Regional Committee.

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

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 submission and verbal arguments advanced during the hearing, having regard to the above judicial pronouncements and the factual matrix of the case, the Appeal Committee is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 14.07.2025 warrants interference to the limited extent that subsequent material placed on record by the appellant institution has not been subjected to verification and consideration by the competent Regional Committee. The Committee is further of the view that the ends of justice would be met by remanding the matter for limited factual verification and regulatory scrutiny, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appellant institution's claims. Accordingly, without diluting the statutory authority of the Northern Regional Committee and without creating any equity in favour of the appellant institution, the Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned withdrawal order dated 14.07.2025 solely for the purpose of fresh factual verification and regulatory reassessment. The Northern Regional Committee is directed to re-examine the case of the appellant institution afresh, verify the authenticity, correctness, and regulatory compliance of all documents submitted, afford reasonable opportunity of hearing to the institution, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the guidelines issued by the Council from time to time, within the prescribed timeframe. It is expressly clarified that this remand is confined only to factual and regulatory reassessment, does not create any presumption, equity, or vested right in favour of the appellant institution, and that failure to establish full compliance upon reconsideration shall entail action strictly in accordance with law. The concerned Regional Committee, being the custodian of its records, shall also ensure the authenticity and genuineness of the impugned order and all connected records before passing any consequential order. It shall also ensure time

bound disposal of the case and passing the order after verifying the documents presented in the Appeal in a time bound manner for which the responsibility shall be of Regional Committee only. The appellant institution is directed to forward all documents relied upon in the appeal to the Northern Regional Committee within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this order.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the online hearing, Appeal Committee of the Council concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 14.07.2025 and remand the matter to the Northern Regional Committee (NRC) for fresh consideration strictly in accordance with the directions specified hereinabove.

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


उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, SSG College, 596, 597, 594, Mauhar, G.T.Road, Malwa, Fatehpur, Uttar Pradesh-212665.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, Room No. 03, Naveen Bhawan, U.P. Secretariat, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226001.



एनसीटीई अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में/ IN THE NCTE APPELLATE AUTHORITY

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक शिक्षा परिषद् (एन.सी.टी.ई.)
जी-7 सेक्टर-10 द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075

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

दिनांक/ Date - 23.01.2026

एनसीटीई अधिनियम की धारा 18 के तहत दायर अपील/
APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 18 OF NCTE ACT
89-356/E-376997/2025 Appeal/15th Meeting, 2025
APPLWRC202515316/E-89067

Smt Rukma Devi Mahila Shikshan Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1463, Veer Durga Dass Nagar, Village Pali, Rajasthan, Pincode – 306401	<u>Vs</u>	Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector – 10, Dwarka, New Delhi -110075
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT

Representative of Appellant	No one appeared
Respondent by	Regional Director, WRC
Date of Hearing	17.12.2025
Date of Pronouncement	23.01.2026

आदेश/ ORDER

I. GROUNDS OF WITHDRAWAL

The appeal of **Smt Rukma Devi Mahila Shikshan Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1463, Veer Durga Dass Nagar, Village Pali, Rajasthan, Pincode - 306401** dated 02/08/2025 filed under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 is against the decision as per withdrawal order no. **F. No. WRC/NCTE/CF-84877/RJ-623-B.Ed./425th MEETING/2025/6598** dated 10/07/2025 of the Western Regional Committee, withdrawal recognition for conducting B.Ed. course on the grounds that “1) The institution has submitted the color photocopy of CLU certificate dated 05.02.2021 signed by Patwari, Dist. Pali, Rajasthan. Total built-up area mentioned as 2038 sqm. Total land area is not mentioned. As per VT remarks, the land is on private lease having total land area 1694.58 sq. mts. which is less per NCTE norms for 100 intake (two units) of B.Ed. course. 2) The institution has not submitted the latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate and indicating the Khasra No. and total area of the land. 2) The institution has submitted Building Plan signed/approved by PWD Engineer and Architect without showing date of approval. The same is not certified by Local Government. Khasra No. is not shown in the building plan. 3) Submitted Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Chief Officer, Pali, Rajasthan vide letter No. Fire/2024/4192 dated 02.05.2024 having general mistakes in the Hindi language. No Khasra/Plot No. and total area of the land has been mentioned in the NOC. The institution has not submitted copy of online fire certificate issued by LSG portal of Govt. of Rajasthan. 4) Submitted Building Completion Certificate with floor wise issued by Junior Engineer Municipal Corporation, Pali, Rajasthan signature without date. Total land area mentioned as 1694.58 sq. mtr. which is less against required 2500 sq mts. And built up area 2038.92 sq. mtr. Date of construction in 2016. As per VT remarks dated 02.05.2024, one school is running on the same patch of land but in a separate building. 5) With regard to point regarding the college campus lacks accessibility features viz. lift, ramp, dividing toilets (there is only one toilet in the entire 4-storied building of the college, the institution mentions that these facilities are under construction. 6) With regard to point

raised that most of the land documents were unclear and could not be viewed properly (during online presentation by the college team), the institution has not submitted land documents and attached copy of land possession certificate dated 05.02.2021 signed by Patwari, Pali mentioning that land bearing Chak No.2, total land area 6678 sq. mts. and allotted land area to the institution 3640 sq. mts. Has been purchased from Nagar Vikas Nyas dated 09.02.1977 and related document not attached. 7) With regard to point raised that latest approved faculty list by the affiliating body needs to be provided, the institution submitted photocopy of faculty list comprising 1+ 15 faculties without approval of affiliating body. The faculty at Sl. no. 1 namely Sh. Satya Prakash, Perspectives in Education is not having PG in Social Science or PG (M.A) degree in education as per NCTE, norms.”

II. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY APPELLANT: -

No one from Smt. Rukma Devi Mahila Shikshan Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1463, Veer Durga Dass Nagar, Village Pali, Rajasthan, Pincode - 306401 appeared online to present the case of the appellant institution on 17.12.2025. In the appeal report, the appellant institution submitted that “1) The CLU certificate dated 05.02.2021 issued earlier by Patwari, District-Pali, Rajasthan inadvertently mentioned factually incorrect built-up area and land area. Accordingly, institute submitted request to Patwari for issuance of correct/revised CLU Certificate. Therefore, Patwari, Pali, Rajasthan subsequently issued another CLU certificate dated 02.01.2025 which clearly mentions the total built up area of building as 2062.45 sq. mtr and total land area as 5929.34 sq. mtr at Khasra No.1463. Thus, there is no deficiency in respect of built up area and land area of the institute. A copy of CLU certificate dated 02.01.2025 is enclosed as ANNEXURE 1. 2) The latest Non-encumbrance Certificate (NEC) dated 02.01.2025 has been issued by Patwari, Rajasthan, which contains the total built up area of land (5929.34 sq. mtr), total built up area of building (2062.45 sq mtr) and Khasra number of land bearing 1463. A copy of latest NEC dated 02.01.2025 issued by Patwari, Pali is enclosed as ANNEXURE 2. 3) In 2004, Shiksha Samiti Bal Niketan (Sponsoring Body) submitted an application to NRC for recognition of B.Ed course in our institute namely Smt Rukma Devi Mahila Shikshan Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya. The said recognition was

sought in the permanent building existing on the land bearing Khasra No.1463 in the name of Shiksha Samiti Bal Niketan. The building plan duly approved by competent authority as applicable in 2004 was submitted to NRC and after thorough evaluation of application including building and inspection by visiting team, upon being fully satisfied with existence of all physical infrastructure and availability of relevant documents including approved building plan, NRC granted recognition to our college for running B. Ed. course After notification of NCTE Regulation, 2014, NRC issued revised recognition order dated 12.06.2015 and in para 4 of the said order institute was directed to create additional facilities/infrastructure. In compliance of revised recognition order dated 12.06.2015 institute constructed additional built up area and also renovated its existing building. It is submitted that in order to construct additional built of area, institute submitted the building plan for approval to the competent Government of Authority but unfortunately, the said approval was delayed. Finally, the Executive Engineer PWD, Division Pali by his letter dated 28.06.2024 issued the approved building plan along with Building Safety Certificate which was submitted to WRC in response to show cause notice. But unfortunately, WRC looked at letter dated 28.06.2024 and approved building plan attached therewith separately and wrongly concluded that building plan does not contain date of approval. It is submitted that approved building plan was provided to the institute along with letter dated 28.06.2024 of the Executive Engineer, PWD, Division Pali and therefore, both documents have to be seen together. Accordingly, thus, our institute has duly approved building plan along with building safety certificate dated 28.06.2024 and deficiency pointed out by WRC factually incorrect. A copy of building safety certificate dated 28.06.2024 along with attached approved building plan is enclosed as ANNEXURE 3. 4) Upon request made by institute, Assistant Fire Officer (Office of Municipal Corporation Pali) after due inspection, issued NOC dated 02.05.2024 regarding Fire Safety in our institute. The said certificate was valid for a period of one year. After completion of one year, institute has further applied for Fire NOC to the Department by Application No. LSG/Pali/fire NOC/2025-26/57170. A copy of NOC dated 02.05.2024 issued by Assistant Fire Officer along with certificate dated 02.08.2025 of Secretary of Our College and screen shot of submission of request for renewal of Fire NOC are annexed as ANNEXURE 4. 5) The building completion certificate in favour of institute

duly approved by Junior Engineer, Nagar Nigam, Pali has been issued, which is the competent government authority in this regard. The said Building Completion Certificate records the total land area and total built up area (in para 14) as 3058.82 sq. mtr. and 2062.45 sq. mtr. respectively. The observation of Regional Committee regarding less land area is incorrect. Though the Building Certificate is approved by Competent Government Authority, however, signing authority has not put any date along with signature for which our institution cannot be faulted. A copy of Building Completion Certificate is annexed as ANNEXURE 5. 6) The building of the institute is having ground floor + three floors. In order to make building of the institute disabled friendly, institute has now installed lift in the building. Additionally, a ramp has also been provided at the ground floor for accessibility. Further, institute has also constructed disabled friendly toilet at ground floor of the building. The said facility is clearly reflected in the approved building plan which was forwarded by the Executive Engineer, PWD, Pali Division by his letter dated 28.06.2024 in respect of Building Safety Certificate. It is submitted that as the building safety certificate issued on 28.06.2024 was valid for one year, institute by its letter dated 01.08.2025 has applied for renewal of the building safety certificate. A copy of application dated 01.08.2025 for renewal building safety certificate is annexed as ANNEXURE 6. 7) The land was allotted by Nagar Vikas Nyas, Pali (Rajasthan) by its letter dated 09.02.1977 and possession thereof was granted in favour of our institution. The area of the said land is 7091.50 sq. yard which is 5929.34 sq mtr. Further, institute has obtained latest land possession certificate dated 05.02.2021 from Patwari. A copy of letter dated 09.02.1977 along with land possession certificate dated 02.01.2025 as enclosed are annexed as ANNEXURE 7. 8) The institute is having 1+15 faculty as required under Appendix-4 of NCTE Regulation, 2014. The faculty list is duly approved by Affiliating University on 26.06.2024. so far as faculty at Sr. No.1 namely Sh. Satay Prakash is concerned, he is a faculty in the subject 'English' and is qualified as per norms of NCTE and is also having PG (MA) Degree. A copy of faculty list approved by Affiliating University along with PG (MA) Degree of Sh. Satya Prakash is enclosed as ANNEXURE 8."

III. OUTCOME OF THE CASE: -

The Appeal Committee in its 15th Meeting, 2025 held online on 17th December 2025 took up this Appeal and perused the Appeal Report, documents available on the records.

The Appeal Committee noted that the appellant institution was initially granted recognition for the B.Ed. programme of one-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students vide order dated 08.11.2006, followed by permission for change of name vide order dated 03.06.2009 and corrigendum dated 05.06.2009. A Revised Provisional Recognition Order (RPRO) was thereafter issued on 12.06.2015 under the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014, permitting conduct of the B.Ed. programme of two-year duration with an annual intake of 100 students from the academic session 2015–16. The Committee further noted that recognition was withdrawn vide order dated 14.12.2020, which was remanded by the Appellate Authority vide order dated 02.06.2021. Upon failure of the institution to comply with the directions of the Appellate Authority, recognition was again withdrawn vide order dated 14.08.2021. The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, vide order dated 10.09.2021, permitted the institution to participate in counselling for the academic session 2021–22, which was duly complied with by the WRC. Subsequently, the Appellate Authority again remanded the matter vide order dated 31.08.2023, pursuant to which a restoration order dated 19.09.2023 was issued and a Visiting Team inspection under Section 13 of the NCTE Act, 1993 was conducted on 02.05.2024. Based on the Visiting Team report, a Show Cause Notice dated 03.07.2024 and a Final Show Cause Notice dated 20.12.2024 under Section 17(1) of the Act were issued. After considering the replies submitted by the institution, the WRC, in its 425th Meeting held on 29–30 May 2025, withdrew recognition vide order dated 10.07.2025.

The appeal was placed before the Appeal Committee in its 11th Meeting, 2025 held on 26.08.2025 and again in its 14th Meeting, 2025 held on 21.11.2025. On both occasions, the appellant institution did not appear to present its case. In the interest of natural justice, the Committee granted multiple opportunities and directed the institution to submit requisite documents.

The Appeal Committee took note of the communication dated 11.09.2025 received from the Regional Director, WRC, conveying the decision of the WRC taken in its 433rd (Part-I) Meeting held on 18-20 August 2025, including the fact that the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, vide order dated 11.08.2025 in W.P.(C) No. 11998/2025 & CM No. 49014/2025, had directed as under:

“...12. In view of the above, it is directed that the operation of the impugned order dated 10.07.2025 passed by WRC whereby recognition of petitioners' institution was withdrawn, shall remain stayed during the pendency of petitioners' appeal before the Appellate Committee.

13. Consequently, respondent no.2/WRC is also directed to update its website reflecting the status of the petitioner as recognized institution.

14. The Petition along with pending application is disposed of in the above terms.”

The Appeal Committee observed that the Hon'ble High Court has consciously confined its directions to interim protection during pendency of the appeal and has not adjudicated upon the merits of the withdrawal order, thereby leaving the statutory jurisdiction of the Appellate Authority intact.

The appeal was finally taken up in the 15th Meeting, 2025 held on 17.12.2025. The appellant institution again failed to appear for oral hearing. Nevertheless, the Appeal Committee examined the written submissions and documents placed on record. The appellant institution contended that deficiencies relating to land, built-up area, infrastructure, safety, and faculty had been rectified. It relied upon revised CLU and Non-Encumbrance Certificates issued in January 2025, building plans and Building Safety Certificate allegedly approved by the competent authority, a Fire Safety NOC dated 02.05.2024 (with an application for renewal), building completion certificate, accessibility provisions, land allotment documents, and a faculty list claimed to be approved by the affiliating University in terms of Appendix-4 of the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

The Appeal Committee considered the documents submitted along with the Appeal Report and, after careful and comprehensive examination of the records and submissions made by the appellant institution, recorded the following findings: -

- (i) The faculty list submitted by the appellant institution is not approved by the competent authority of the affiliating University, as mandatorily required under the provisions of the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014. The operation of a teacher education programme without duly approved and qualified faculty constitutes a grave, substantive, and continuing violation of statutory norms and strikes at the very foundation of teacher education. Such non-compliance cannot be treated as procedural or curable in nature.
- (ii) The Change of Land Use (CLU) certificates and land-related documents relied upon by the appellant institution have been issued by a Patwari, Patwar Mandal, who is not a competent statutory authority to grant CLU or certify land use under the applicable legal framework. The Appeal Committee observed that reliance on approvals or certifications issued by a Patwari does not meet the statutory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Regulations, 2014, which clearly mandate certification by the competent statutory authority. Documents issued by an incompetent authority are void in law, lack legal sanctity, and cannot be relied upon for establishing compliance with NCTE norms.
- (iii) The institution has failed to substantiate the land and building-related deficiencies pointed out by the Visiting Team, particularly the observations that the land is held on private lease, with insufficient land area and inadequate built-up area as prescribed under the NCTE norms. Several documents placed on record are self-certified copies, or not authenticated by the competent authority, and therefore lack evidentiary value. Compliance under the NCTE Act, 1993 must be demonstrated through legally valid, authenticated, and verifiable documents, which the appellant institution has consistently failed to produce.

The Appeal Committee, upon careful examination of the Appeal Report and documents on record, found that the deficiencies noted in the withdrawal order continue to subsist. In particular, despite being recognized since 2006, the institution has failed to demonstrate the availability and appointment of regular, duly approved, and qualified faculty in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, which constitutes a fundamental and incurable non-compliance. The continued reliance on certifications issued by a Patwari in place of approvals from competent statutory authorities further reflects serious regulatory irregularities. The Appeal Committee further noted that the appellant institution was

afforded multiple opportunities over several years, including remands by the Appellate Authority, to rectify deficiencies relating to land status, faculty, and other statutory requirements. Despite such repeated indulgence, the institution has failed to bring itself into compliance with the regulatory framework. The deficiencies are neither technical nor isolated, but form part of a pattern of repeated, continuing, and deliberate non-compliance, notwithstanding multiple opportunities granted in the interest of natural justice. The operation of a teacher education programme without duly approved faculty constitutes a grave breach of statutory obligations and undermines the core academic and regulatory standards governing teacher education. The Committee is constrained to record that continuation of the programme under such circumstances borders on misrepresentation and regulatory impropriety. Granting any further indulgence would erode regulatory discipline and set a manifestly untenable precedent, contrary to the objectives of the NCTE Act, 1993.

The Appeal Committee is satisfied that the Western Regional Committee followed due process, afforded adequate and reasonable opportunity to the appellant institution, and passed the impugned withdrawal order dated 10.07.2025 after due application of mind. The impugned order does not suffer from arbitrariness, perversity, or violation of the principles of natural justice.

Noting the submissions and arguments advanced by the appellant institution, and after careful perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and the claims put forth, the Appeal Committee concluded that the appellant institution has failed to establish compliance with the mandatory statutory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The deficiencies are substantive, fundamental, and go to the root of recognition, and therefore cannot be condoned on equitable, sympathetic, or humanitarian considerations. The Appeal Committee further concluded that the Western Regional Committee has followed due process, afforded adequate opportunity, and passed the impugned withdrawal order dated 10.07.2025 after due application of mind. The said order does not suffer from arbitrariness, perversity, or violation of principles of natural justice.

IV. DECISION: -

After perusal of the Appeal Report, documents on record, and the entire factual and legal matrix of the case, the Appeal Committee holds that the Western Regional Committee was fully justified in withdrawing recognition and decided that the instant appeal deserves to be rejected and therefore, the impugned withdrawal order dated 10.07.2025 issued by WRC is confirmed. This decision is rendered strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, 1993, the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and established principles of administrative law, and shall not confer any right, equity, or presumption in favour of the appellant institution.

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



उप सचिव (अपील) / Deputy Secretary (Appeal)

Copy to :-

1. The Principal, Smt Rukma Devi Mahila Shikshan Prashikshan Mahavidyalaya, Khasra No. 1463, Veer Durga Dass Nagar, Village Pali, Rajasthan, Pincode - 306401.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Western Regional Committee, Plot No. G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110075.
4. The Education Secretary, Higher Education Department, Block-4, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan Shiksha Sankul, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302015.