



\$~82

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 8633/2026

DR. RADHAKRISHAN TT COLLEGE & ANR. Petitioners

Through: Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari
Vipasha Jain, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor and Mr. Shivom
Sethi, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

06.07.2026

%

1. The petitioners have approached this Hon'ble Court seeking the following prayers:

“a. Issue a Writ of mandamus or any other suitable writ or order or direction to respondents to conduct inspection of petitioner institute and decide its application for recognition of conversion/transition of existing 4 year integrated B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed to ITEP course from present academic session 2026-27 expeditiously and in time bound manner: and/or

b. Pass any such other orders/directions as this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case...”

2. The case of the petitioners is that:

- a. Pursuant to invitation of application by NCTE, petitioner No.2 submitted its application seeking recognition of B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed course.



- b. After scrutiny/evaluation of petitioners' application, inspection of petitioners institution, Western Regional Committee ("**WRC**") *vide* its order dated 27.10.2021 granted recognition to conduct B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed 4-year integrated course with an annual intake of 100 Seats (two basic units) from academic session 2022-23.
 - c. As things stood, the NCTE issued guidelines dated 15.05.2025 for transforming NCTE recognized standalone teacher education institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institution and pursuantly issued public notices dated 25.08.2025 & 12.09.2025 directing existing recognized institutions which have been running 4 years integrated B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed course to submit fresh application for transition.
 - d. Accordingly, pursuant to aforesaid public notices issued by NCTE, the petitioners submitted fresh online application to NCTE on 03.10.2025.
 - e. Alongwith the application, the petitioners submitted all relevant documents pertaining to physical and academic infrastructure of the institute such as certified copy of land documents, mutation certificate of land, land use certificate, non-encumbrance certificate, approved building plan, site plan, building safety certificate, fire safety certificate etc.
3. Mr. Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that despite the fact that the petitioners institute is an existing institute duly recognized by WRC for running 4 year integrated B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed course, WRC *vide* its order dated 18.11.2025 refused the said application dated 03.10.2025 without issuing any Show Cause Notice.
 4. That being aggrieved, the petitioners approached this Hon'ble Court by filing W.P. (C) No. 18844/2025 praying as under:-



- a. *“quash the Refusal Order dated 18.11.2025 issued by the respondent No.2 (through email dated 18.11.2025), whereby, the respondent No.2 has refused the application of the petitioner Institution submitted for transition of its B.A. B.Ed./ B.Sc. B.Ed. course to ITEP, for the academic session 2026-27; without following the mandatory procedure; and*
 - b. *direct the respondent No.2 to restore, reconsider & decide the aforesaid application of petitioner Institution, submitted for transition of its B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. course to ITEP, for the session 2026-27; within a reasonable time & in accordance with the provisions made therefore.”*
5. The Learned Counsel for the petitioners has shown me the order passed by this Hon'ble Court, which vide its final order dated 11.12.2025 disposed off the aforesaid writ petition by setting aside refusal order dated 18.11.2025 with direction to process petitioners' application with following observations:-

“Accordingly, without going into the merits of the case, this writ petition is allowed to a limited extent of setting aside impugned order dated 18.11.2025 on the ground that it was passed without affording reasonable opportunity to the Petitioner to make a written representation. It will be open to the Respondents to issue a show cause notice to the Petitioner pointing out deficiencies/shortcomings and calling upon the Petitioner to make a written representation. On receipt of the show cause notice, Petitioner shall submit its response within two weeks from the date of receipt and thereafter, it will be open to the Respondents to pass a fresh order in accordance with law and after considering the representation. The order shall be passed within two weeks and communicated to the Petitioner. Needless



to state, the Petitioner will be at liberty to take recourse to regular remedies in case it is aggrieved by the order."

6. He submits that though this Court had directed respondents to decide petitioners' application within a period of two weeks after submission of response to show cause, still, no order was passed by WRC in view of aforesaid order dated 11.12.2025.
7. Mr. Kumar further submits that subsequent to this Court's order dated 11.12.2025, the petitioners institute submitted a representation dated 23.01.2026 along with copy of order dated 18.11.2025 to WRC requesting for compliance of the order. The petitioners further claim that despite directions of this Court, the WRC did not take timely steps to process the petitioner's application. It is only after a delay of nearly seven months that the WRC after considering the petitioner's application issued the First Show Cause Notice dated 18.06.2026. Admittedly, this show cause notice has been issued without any inspection having been carried out. The contents of the Show Cause Notice dated 18.06.2026 are copied below:

Sr. No.	SCN Ground(s)
1	Authorization letter on the stamp paper as per admissible government rate is not uploaded.
2	The institution has expressed its intention to become a multidisciplinary institution through collaboration, as stipulated in the NCTE Guidelines for transforming NCTE recognized stand-alone teacher education institutions into multidisciplinary higher education institutions.
3	The institution has not uploaded the certificate issued by the Government of Rajasthan justifying the requirement for a teacher education programme in the area, as required under Clause 4.3(i) of the



	NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions.
4	The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence that both institutions proposed for collaboration are affiliated with the same university.
5	The proposal for collaboration between the institutions has not been approved by their affiliating university, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions.
6	The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence i.e. affidavit in NCTE prescribed proforma related to collaboration (as per online application) and not confirmed the name of any institution running multidisciplinary programme with whom collaboration is made and institution has not informed that both institution are situated within the radius of 10 Kilometres, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions.
7	The website of the institution has not been compliance as per NCTE Regulations, 2014 of para 7(14)(i), 8(6), 8(14) and 10(3) as amended from time to time. The institution is required to update the website as per NCTE regulations
8	The institution is required to upload Copy of not-for-profit certificate issued by the Competent Government Authority.
9	The institution is required to upload Exemption Certificate (12A) certificate issued by the Competent Government Authority.
10	The institution is required to upload the complete details of Society/Trust/Members with Aadhar and PAN number issued by the Competent Government Authority.
11	The institution is required to upload the details of student admitted year-wise for all running programmes issued by the Competent Government Authority.
12	For confirming the institution's eligible for transition into ITEP course as it is Collaboration, institution is required to upload the affiliation order of liberal arts, science and commerce all programmes run by them with approved intake capacity and present intake capacity as a Multi-Disciplinary Institution.
13	The institution is required to upload Complete Certified land documents mentioning all Khasra No. issued by the Competent Government Authority. The institution is required to upload land related Affidavit on Rs.100/- non-judicial stamp paper issued by Competent Authority of State Government.
14	The institution is required to upload Mutation (Jamabandi) Certificate mentioning Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Authority of State Government.
15	The institution is required to upload Land Use Certificate (CLU) as per Rajasthan Urban Areas (Permission for use of Agricultural Land for Non-Agricultural Purposes and Allotment) Rules, 2012 in Form-11 of Rule 7(1) while mentioning all Khasra/Plot/Survey No. issued by Competent Government Authority.
16	The institution is required to upload latest Non-Encumbrance Certificate (NEC) issued by Competent Authority of State Government.
17	The institution is required to upload Building Safety Certificate in adherence of safety guidelines as prescribed by National/State Disaster Management Authority issued by Competent Government Authority.
18	The institution uploaded Fire NOC on the fire portal which is expired on 11-04-2024. The institution is required to upload Fire Safety Certificate issued by Fire Safety Department, Government of Rajasthan verifiable on the official portal of the Fire Department, Government of Rajasthan at URL https://fsgonline.rajasthan.gov.in/track_application.aspx 0
19	The institution is required to upload geotag photos from different angles of Lift, Ramp, Electricity, Safe Drinking Water and Accessible Toilet indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph.
20	The institution is required to upload the list of teaching staff of all Education Faculty Programmes duly approved and countersigned by its affiliating body. The institution is required to upload the bank statement of last six months indicating the transaction of the salary / remuneration to its teaching staff.
21	The institution is required to upload Building Plan approved by the Competent Authority of State Government mentioning the name of institution, Khasra/Plot/Survey No. and mentioning the total land area and total built-up area earmarked for each course being run in the premises and the demarcated land and built-up area for the teacher education programmes including multi-disciplinary programmes.
22	The institution is required to upload geotag photos with different angles of front view, rear view, multipurpose hall, library, lab 1, lab 2, lab 3, Class rooms and playground indicating the longitude and latitude with date of photograph.
23	The institution is required to upload latest Building Completion Certificate (BCC) in the prescribed format of NCTE (17 points) issued by the Competent Government Authority for all the courses being conducted in the premises.



8. Mr. Kumar submits that the grounds raised in the Show Cause Notice are such that same can only be ascertained only after carrying out inspection and some grounds in the Show Cause Notice can be clarified only after issuance of Letter of Intent (**“LoI”**) under Regulation 7(13). He, thus, seeks a direction to respondents to conduct inspection of petitioner institute and to decide its application for recognition of conversion/transition of existing 4 year integrated B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed to ITEP course.
9. That notice was issued in the aforesaid matter on 03.07.2026. Mr. Kapoor, learned Counsel for the respondents, vehemently opposes the present petition and on instructions, submits that the present writ petition is wholly premature and not maintainable at this stage.
10. He contends that the petitioners have approached this Court at a stage where only a Show Cause Notice has been issued and no final decision has yet been taken on the petitioners’ application.
11. He submits that the issuance of a Show Cause Notice is merely an intermediary step in the decision-making process and does not, by itself, give rise to any enforceable cause of action warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution. According to him, unless the proceedings culminate in a final adverse order, no legal prejudice can be said to have been caused to the petitioners.
12. The learned counsel further submits that the principal relief sought by the petitioners is a direction to the Respondents to conduct an inspection of the institution. Such a direction, according to him, would amount to compelling the Respondents to depart from the statutory procedure governing consideration of recognition applications. In this regard, he further submits that the inspection is neither an automatic consequence of filing an application, nor a matter of right but is undertaken only upon the competent authority being prima facie



satisfied that the applicant fulfils the threshold eligibility requirements prescribed under the Act, Regulations and the applicable Standard Operating Procedure (“SOP”). Placing reliance upon the Scheme of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 and the SOP governing the processing of transition applications, the learned counsel submits that the petitioners are in substance, seeking to rewrite the prescribed procedure by requesting that inspection be directed even before the deficiencies pointed out in the Show Cause Notice are examined and adjudicated upon. He further submits that such a course would render the preliminary scrutiny envisaged under the statutory framework otiose.

13. Specifically, Mr. Kapoor further places reliance upon Regulation 7(7) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 and submits that the Regional Committee is empowered to consider an application on its own merits. According to him, the expression “on its own merits” necessarily confers discretion upon the Respondents to independently scrutinize the application and satisfy themselves regarding compliance with the prescribed norms before directing any inspection. Consequently, no vested or indefeasible right accrues in favour of an applicant to seek inspection merely because an application has been submitted.
14. On the grounds invoked in the Show Cause Notice, Mr. Kapoor submits that all the grounds are such that can be satisfactorily and adequately considered even on the basis of documents submitted by the applicant institute and that there is no requirement for a direction to conduct inspection.
15. He submits that the writ petition deserves to be dismissed as premature, leaving it open to the petitioners to participate in the proceedings initiated pursuant to the Show Cause Notice. In the event



when an adverse final order is eventually passed, it would be open to the petitioners to avail the statutory remedy of appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, as available in law.

16. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.
17. The principal objection raised by the Respondents is that the present writ petition is premature since only a Show Cause Notice dated 18.06.2026 has been issued and no final decision has yet been taken on the petitioner's application.
18. On my query, Mr. Kapoor does not dispute that the petitioner institute's application is still pending a final outcome. It is a matter of record that by the order dated 11.12.2025 passed in W.P.(C) 18844/2025, the WRC was directed to reconsider the case of the petitioner institution after giving it a reasonable opportunity to make a written representation. Even though the said order did not specify a time period within which this exercise was required to be done, I find it unreasonable on part of the WRC that after its consideration, the First Show Cause Notice was issued as late as 18.06.2026.
19. Despite a clear direction by this Court in the said writ petition, there has been an unexplained delay in processing the petitioner's application in a timely manner.
20. It is a matter of record that the petitioner is a running institution already having recognition for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes, and is seeking transition to ITEP. It is also an admitted position that both B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed., on one hand, and ITEP, on the other hand, are integrated courses of teacher education.
21. In my common order dated 29.05.2026 passed in W.P.(C) 4860/2026, titled ***Vision College of Teacher Training v. NCTE & Anr.***, I have



already observed that the infrastructural requirements of these two programmes are not substantially different.

22. This Court is also mindful of the fact that recognition and transition matters under the NCTE regime are required to be processed within strict timelines. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya v. State of U.P. (2013) 2 SCC 617*** has emphasized that the statutory schedule governing recognition of teacher education institutions is mandatory and must be scrupulously adhered to by all stakeholders. Delay in processing such applications has a direct bearing on admissions and the academic calendar, thereby affecting not merely the institution but also prospective students.
23. In this light, I am of the opinion that even though no institution can claim inspection as a matter of right just because they submit an application; however, in paragraph No. 12 of the order in ***Vision College (supra)*** this Court has already observed as under:

“12. Regulation No. 7(1) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, reproduced above, shows that an application made by the institute can be rejected only (a) if it is not complete and/or (b) requisite documents are not attached to the application. In the present case, the same is not the situation. The Show Cause Notices show various non-compliances by the petitioner institution, which according to my mind can only be done after inspection. Before inspection and issuance of Letter of Intent (“LOI”), the respondents cannot be in a position to require the petitioner to show cause against deficiencies such as shortage of teaching staff, lack of physical infrastructure etc. While the respondents are right in contending that two show cause notices can be issued, but the show cause notices are in violation of Regulation No. 7 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as explained.”



24. Therefore, in the circumstances of the present case where the petitioner is running institute and is seeking transition from the earlier course to the new course wherein the infrastructural requirements are not substantially different, it deserves a timely and reasonable consideration of its application.
25. The learned counsels for the parties have, at the Bar, unanimously accepted that the entrance exam for admission into ITEP programme was conducted by the National Testing Agency (NTA) on 17-18.04.2026, and the results have been notified by NTA on 04.06.2026.
26. It is also noteworthy that after the common order dated 29.05.2026, several petitions similar to W.P.(C) 4860/2026 have been filed and allowed on various dates during the summer-vacation by respective Coordinate Benches of this Court following the common order dated 29.05.2026. The last of such similar petitions was allowed by me on 03.07.2026, whereby it was directed that entire exercise including completion of inspection, issuance of any further Show Cause Notice, if required, consideration of the petitioner's response, and passing of a reasoned order, shall be completed on or before 10.08.2026.
27. As such, without commenting on the validity or otherwise of the grounds invoked in the Show Cause Notice, I am of the opinion that the WRC is required to carry out a timely and expedited consideration of the petitioner institute's application. For such an expedited consideration, it is necessary that WRC is directed to inspect the petitioner institute and to notify deficiencies, if any found in one consolidated show cause notice.
28. For the said reasons, the present petition is allowed. The respondents shall conduct inspection of the petitioner college within 4 weeks from today and shall thereafter take necessary steps to ensure that the guidelines of the Hon'ble Supreme Court are scrupulously complied



with. The entire exercise including completion of inspection, issuance of any further Show Cause Notice, if required, consideration of the petitioner's response and passing of a reasoned order shall be completed on or before 20.08.2026, keeping in view the timelines prescribed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court for the academic session 2026-2027.

29. It is clarified that this order has been passed in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case and shall not be construed as expressing any opinion on the merits of the petitioner's application, which shall be considered independently by the respondents in accordance with law. It is also clarified that the direction for inspection shall not be construed so as to invalidate the grounds invoked in the Show Cause Notice dated 18.06.2026. Moreover, the respondents shall remain within their powers to seek the compliance of all the extant norms and conditions prescribed by it as per the applicable regulatory framework, including the grounds invoked in the Show Cause Notice dated 18.06.2026, if any deficiency is found to be persisting, subsequent to the inspection.
30. A copy of the inspection report shall be furnished to the petitioner institute upon its preparation.
31. The writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms, along with all pending applications, if any.

JASMEET SINGH, J

JULY 6, 2026/Ni