

---

**Re: FINAL MINUTES OF 464 (PART-1) MEETING OF WRC HELD ON 23-24 JUNE 2026**

---

**From** Shailesh Zala <shaileshzala@yahoo.co.in>  
**Date** Mon 29-Jun-26 10:34 AM  
**To** Western Regional Committee, NCTE <wrc@ncte-india.org>

Approved

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

On Mon, Jun 29, 2026 at 10:33 AM, Western Regional Committee, NCTE <wrc@ncte-india.org> wrote:

**Dear Sir/Ma'am,**

-----

For more information or query, Please revert on the same mail <[wrc@ncte-india.org](mailto:wrc@ncte-india.org)>.



**Warm Regards**  
**Western Regional Committee**  
**NCTE**  
**Dwarka**  
**New Delhi**

---

**From:** Western Regional Committee, NCTE <wrc@ncte-india.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2026 10:13 AM  
**To:** Shailesh Zala <shaileshzala@yahoo.co.in>  
**Subject:** FINAL MINUTES OF 464 (PART-1) MEETING OF WRC HELD ON 23-24 JUNE 2026

**Respected Sir,**

Please find attached the Revised Final Minutes of 464 (Part-1) meeting of WRC held on 23rd-24th June 2026 for consideration and approval please.

Thanks and regards  
Rashmi Shukla  
RD-WRC

-----

For more information or query, Please revert on the same mail <[wrc@ncte-india.org](mailto:wrc@ncte-india.org)>.



Warm Regards  
Western Regional Committee  
NCTE  
Dwarka  
New Delhi

राष्ट्रीय शिक्षक शिक्षा परिषद की पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय समिति (WRC) की 464वीं भाग (1) बैठक कार्यवृत्त बैठक 23 जून 2026 से 24 जून 2026 हाइब्रिड मोड के माध्यम से आयोजित की गई।

I. निम्नलिखित सदस्य बैठक में उपस्थित थे:

	सदस्य का नाम	पदनाम	Mode
1.	प्रो. शैलेश नारनभाई जाला	अध्यक्ष	व्यक्तिगत
2.	डॉ. पाठक कल्पेशकुमार हर्षदराय	सदस्य	व्यक्तिगत
3.	डॉ. अश्विनी हलबे करवंदे	सदस्य	व्यक्तिगत
4.	डॉ. करणम पुष्पनाधाम	सदस्य	आभासी
5.	डॉ. सुहासकुमार रूपराव पाटिल	सदस्य	व्यक्तिगत
6.	श्रीमती रश्मि शुक्ला	क्षेत्रीय निदेशक एवं संयोजक पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय समिति	व्यक्तिगत

II. निम्नलिखित सदस्य और राज्य सरकार के प्रतिनिधि बैठक में उपस्थित नहीं हुए:

	सदस्य का नाम / पदनाम	राज्य / केंद्र शासित प्रदेश
1.	प्रो. भरत भक्तिभाई रामानुज	सदस्य
2.	राज्य सरकार के प्रतिनिधि	गोवा
3.	राज्य सरकार के प्रतिनिधि	छत्तीसगढ़
4.	राज्य सरकार के प्रतिनिधि	दादर एवं नागर हवेली
5.	राज्य सरकार के प्रतिनिधि	दमन एवं दीव
6.	राज्य सरकार के प्रतिनिधि	मध्यप्रदेश
7.	राज्य सरकार के प्रतिनिधि	महाराष्ट्र
8.	राज्य सरकार के प्रतिनिधि	राजस्थान
9.	राज्य सरकार के प्रतिनिधि	गुजरात

- II. अध्यक्ष की अनुमति से, श्रीमती रश्मि शुक्ला, क्षेत्रीय निदेशक व संयोजक, पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय समिति ने समिति के समक्ष कार्यसूची प्रस्तुत की। प्रत्येक कार्यसूची पर मदवार निर्णय निम्नानुसार है:-

**Subject: Consideration of filing Letters Patent Appeal (LPA) against the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in the matters relating to refusal of applications for transition to Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP).**

The WRC considered the directions of the Hon'ble High court of Delhi vide dated 17<sup>th</sup> June 2026 in the writ petitions filed by certain Teacher Education Institutions challenging the refusal orders issued by WRC in respect of their applications for transition to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP). The matter was deliberated in detail and the following observations emerged:

1. WRC had considered the applications of the concerned institutions strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act, the applicable Regulations, the ITEP Transition Regulations/Guidelines and the policy decisions taken by NCTE relating to transition of existing institutions to ITEP.
2. The refusal orders were passed after examining the eligibility of the institutions on the basis of the statutory provisions and the material available on record. The decisions were reasoned, speaking and in conformity with the prescribed regulatory framework.
3. The Hon'ble High Court, while disposing of the writ petitions, has issued directions which, in effect, substantially curtail the statutory discretion vested in the Regional Committee to examine compliance with the mandatory requirements prescribed under the NCTE Act and Regulations.
4. The directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court have the effect of restricting the regulatory powers of the Regional Committee and may create a precedent whereby the statutory scrutiny envisaged under the NCTE Act and the applicable Regulations becomes ineffective in matters relating to ITEP transition.
5. During the discussions, it was specifically noted that the judgment places reliance upon the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya v. State of Uttar Pradesh & Others. It was observed that the factual and legal context of the said decision is materially distinguishable from the present cases.
6. The Supreme Court judgment in Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya principally dealt with applications for grant of recognition to new teacher education institutions and the timelines governing processing of such applications. The present matters, however, concern transition of already recognised institutions to the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), which involves an altogether different statutory and regulatory exercise requiring examination of eligibility, infrastructure, multidisciplinary requirements, institutional readiness and compliance with the specific provisions governing ITEP transition.
7. It was further noted that the subsequent order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 07.04.2022 passed in Miscellaneous Application No.116 of 2022 only took on record proposed amendments relating to Clauses 7(4), 7(5) and 7(6) concerning timelines and expressly clarified that no opinion had been expressed on other proposed changes and that the order would not affect pending litigation. Therefore, the applicability of the said decision to the present ITEP transition matters requires authoritative examination by the appellate court.
8. It was further observed that the Hon'ble High Court has disposed of a batch of writ petitions by passing a common judgment applicable to all the petitioner institutions. However, the refusal orders issued by WRC were not founded upon a common ground.

Each institution had been considered independently and the refusal orders were passed based on institution-specific deficiencies, non-compliances and factual circumstances, as recorded in the respective speaking orders. Consequently, the legality and sustainability of each refusal order required independent judicial scrutiny. A common or umbrella direction, without examining the distinct factual and legal issues pertaining to each institution separately, may have resulted in overlooking material differences which were germane to the decision-making process.

9. The members also observed that important legal issues relating to the scope of judicial review in matters involving academic and statutory expert bodies, interpretation of the ITEP Transition framework and the extent of regulatory discretion vested in NCTE/WRC require consideration by the Division Bench.
10. It was also apprehended that if the judgment is allowed to attain finality, similar claims may be raised by other institutions across the jurisdiction of WRC, thereby seriously affecting uniform implementation of the ITEP transition policy and diluting the statutory regulatory mechanism established under the NCTE Act.
11. Considering the above legal and regulatory implications, including the apparent application of a common judicial direction to institution-specific refusal orders founded on different factual and legal grounds, the members unanimously concluded that the matter involves substantial questions of law having wider ramifications for the functioning of WRC as the statutory regulatory authority and, therefore, warrants consideration by the Hon'ble Division Bench in a Letters Patent Appeal.

**After detailed deliberations, it was unanimously resolved that:**

- (i) **WRC shall recommend filing of a Letters Patent Appeal (LPA) before the Hon'ble Division Bench against the judgment of the Hon'ble Single Judge.**
- (ii) **The Legal Section-WRC shall immediately coordinate with the Standing Counsel/Government Counsel for preparation and filing of the LPA within the prescribed limitation period.**
- (iii) **While preparing the appeal, specific emphasis shall be laid upon:**
  - **the distinction between grant of recognition to new institutions and transition of existing institutions to ITEP;**
  - **the statutory autonomy and expert jurisdiction of NCTE/WRC under the NCTE Act;**
  - **the mandatory nature of the eligibility conditions governing ITEP transition;**
  - **the adverse precedential effect of the impugned judgment on future regulatory actions; and**
  - **the legal distinction between the present cases and the decision in Maa Vaishnov Devi.**

बैठक का समापन अध्यक्ष को धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव के साथ हुआ।

(प्रो. शैलेश नारनभाई जाला)  
अध्यक्ष