



\$~225

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9895/2026 & CM APPL. 46022/2026**

VIVEK DEGREE TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vinod Pawar, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

22.07.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers :-

“i. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondents to reopen and activate the online portal of the petitioner institution and permit the petitioner to upload all requisite documents and submit its reply/representation in response to the Show Cause Notice dated 16.06.2026 (Annexure P/19) within such time as may be fixed by this Hon'ble Court;

ii. Issue a writ of mandamus directing the Respondents to accept the petitioner's documents and compliances through the portal or through any other mode including e-mail or



physical submission;

iii. Issue a writ of mandamus directing the Respondents to constitute a Visiting Team and conduct physical or virtual inspection of the petitioner institution for verification of its infrastructural and instructional facilities and multidisciplinary status;

iv. Direct the Respondents to consider and decide the petitioner's application dated 03.10.205 (Annexure P/15) for transition of its B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. programme into ITEP for the academic session 2026-27 after considering the Visiting Team Report;

v. Restrain the Respondents from passing any adverse order against the petitioner institution till completion of inspection and consideration of the petitioner's compliances...”

2. The case of the petitioner is that:

a. Pursuant to invitation of application by respondent No. 1, petitioner submitted its application seeking recognition of B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed course.

b. After scrutiny/evaluation of petitioner's application, inspection of petitioner institution, Western Regional Committee (“WRC”) vide its order dated 29.06.2019 granted recognition for conducting B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed 4-years integrated course with an annual intake of 100 Seats (two basic units) from academic session 2019-20.

c. As things stood, the NCTE issued guideline dated



15.05.2025 for transforming NCTE recognized standalone teacher education institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institution and issued public notices dated 25.08.2025 & 12.09.2025 enabling existing recognized institutions running 4 years integrated B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed course to submit fresh application for transition to Integrated Teacher Education Programme (**“ITEP”**).

d. Accordingly, pursuant to aforesaid public notices issued by respondent No. 1, petitioner submitted fresh online application to respondent No. 1 on 03.10.2025.

e. The petitioner also 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. Pawar, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that despite the fact that petitioner is an existing institute duly recognized by WRC for running 4 years integrate B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed course, WRC *vide* order dated 29.01.2026 refused the said application dated 03.10.2025 without issuing any Show Cause Notice (**“SCN”**).

4. Aggrieved by the aforesaid order, the petitioner approached this Hon'ble Court by filing W.P. (C) No. 2790/2026 and praying as under:-

a. *quash the Refusal Order dated 29.01.2026 issued by the Respondent No.2 (through email dated 29.01.2026), 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 I.T.E.P., 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 I.T.E.P., for the session 2026-27; within a reasonable time & in accordance with the provisions made therefore."

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner, has drawn my attention to order dated 27.02.2026, passed in W.P. (C) No. 2790/2026 wherein this Court disposed of the petition by setting aside refusal order dated 29.01.2026 with direction to process petitioner's application. The relevant observations read as under:

"16. In view of the above, without examining the merits of the deficiencies noted in the impugned order, the writ petition is allowed to the limited extent of setting aside the order dated 29.01.2026 on the ground of violation of principles of natural justice. The respondents are at liberty to issue a show cause notice to the petitioners specifying the alleged deficiencies and affording them an opportunity to submit a written representation. Upon receipt thereof, the petitioners shall file their response within a period of two weeks. Thereafter, the respondents shall pass a reasoned order in accordance with law within two weeks and communicate the same to the petitioners. It is clarified that



the petitioners shall remain at liberty to avail appropriate legal remedies, if aggrieved by the decision so rendered.”

6. He further submits that pursuant to the aforesaid order dated 27.02.2026 passed by this Court, the WRC resolved to reconsider the petitioner Institute’s application *vide* the 456th (Part-1) meeting of the WRC held on 02.04.2026.
7. Thereafter, the petitioner-institute's application was reconsidered by Respondent No. 2 in its 457th (Part-IIA) Meeting held on 20/22.04.2026. During the said meeting, various deficiencies were observed by Respondent No. 2, and it was resolved to issue a SCN to the petitioner-institute, providing it with an opportunity to submit its reply, along with supporting documents, in respect of the deficiencies so identified. The deficiencies observed by respondent No. 2 for the issuance of the first Show Cause Notice are reproduced below:

“i. 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.

ii. 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.

iii. The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence that both institutions proposed for collaboration are



affiliated with the same university.

iv. 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.

v. The institution has not uploaded documentary evidence confirming that both the institutions are situated within the radius of 10 Kilometers, as required under Clause 4.3(a) of the NCTE Guidelines for transforming into Multidisciplinary Institutions.

vi. Hence, the institution doesn't fulfil the criteria stipulated vide NCTE Public Notice No.NCTE-Reg1012/7/2025-Reg. Sec-HQ dated 12.09.2025. 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.

vii. The institution has NOT uploaded authorization letter on stamp paper as per admissible government rate

viii. The institution has required to upload affiliation order no. acad.-ii/2025/9191 dated 28.06.2025.

ix. The institution is required to upload the not-for-profit certificate issued by government competent authority

x. The institution has filled information of Chairman/president, Treasurer and Secretary with PAN & Aadhar no. only. It is required to mention PAN & Aadhar



no. of all Society members.

xi. It is an ITEP transition application, hence student admitted information for B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed course is required to upload for all programme/courses run by institution in the campus and the institution. It is required to upload list of year-wise admitted students in respect of all running programme(s) countersigned by Affiliating University

xii. The institution has uploaded copy of Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by Sub- Registrar, Teh. Jaipur dated 18.09.2024. The institution is required to upload latest non-encumbrance certificate (nec) issued by competent authority of state government indicating that the land is free from all encumbrances issued by competent government authority

xiii. Uploaded Building Plan has NOT approved by the Gov. Competent Engineer. 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. The 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 is also required.

xiv. The institution is required to upload geotag photos of Ramp, Safe Drinking Water and Accessible Toilet with date of photographs with different angles and required to upload



Building Safety certificate, Fire Safety Certificate issued by Govt. Competent Authority.

xv. The institution is required to upload geotag photos of the institution building Front view, Rear View, Multipurpose Hall, Library, Library, Lab 1, Lab 2, Lab 3 and playground with date of photographs.”

8. Pursuant to the SCN, a reply was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner. Thereafter, the application was reconsidered by the WRC in its 462nd (Part- 3) meeting held on 03/04.06.2026. The deficiencies observed by the WRC for the issuance of the Final Show Cause Notice are reproduced below:

“i. As per online portal, institution website is “www.vivekttcollege.in”, however, this website opens under the name 'Vivek Teacher Training College'. But the applicant institution name is Vivek Degree Teacher Training College. The institution is required to upload the proper website and maintain and update the website 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.

ii. The letter uploaded by the institution is No Objection Certificate, 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. The institution is required to upload the same.

iii. The name of the applicant college is 'Vivek Degree



Teacher Training College, Kalwar', whereas the uploaded building plan is in the name of another college. hence, 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.

iv. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the seating capacity of Library reading room is not sufficient and Library is not as per NCTE norms. It is necessary to upload documents demonstrating that the library complies with NCTE norms. “The library shall cater to the requirements of the programme and shall have a seating capacity for at least fifty persons equipped with minimum 1000 (one thousand) titles and 4000 (four thousand) books. These include text and reference books related to all courses of study, readings and literature related with the approaches delineated in the programme; educational encyclopaedias, electronic publications and digital or online resources and minimum five referral professional research journals. The institutions shall create digital library with relevant and adequate resource materials” “Library resources shall include books and journals



published and recommended by NCTE, National Council of Educational Research and Training and other statutory bodies, Education Commission Reports and Policy documents. At least one hundred titles of quality books shall be added to the library every year. The library shall have photocopying facility and computer with Internet facility for the use of faculty and students.”

v. The multipurpose hall should measure 2,000 square feet and must have a seating capacity for 200 students. This hall shall be equipped for conducting seminars and workshops with installation of an audiovisual system. The uploaded geotagged photographs indicate that the multipurpose hall does not comply with NCTE norms and standards. The furniture within the multipurpose hall is insufficient and falls short of the required seating capacity for 200 students. The institution should provide a clarification in this regard and attach the relevant evidence.

vi. The geotagged photographs uploaded show that the college does not have adequate playgrounds and sports facility.

vii. Computer lab and ICT related facilities are not visible in the uploaded geotagged photographs.

viii. The institution is required to upload the proof of this, “A minimum number of four toilet blocks shall be earmarked by the Institution, two for students (one each for women and men) and two for staff members, including



persons with disabilities. One common hand washing station, with four taps, in an open area shall be provided. “

ix. The institution is required to upload the proof of this “Classrooms: The Institution shall have six earmarked classrooms for one unit with an area of 500 sq. ft. (five hundred square feet) for each classroom.”

x. The uploaded geotagged photographs show that, the laboratory, and other laboratories the latitude and longitude in each photo are different. The uploaded geotagged photographs show that laboratory, and other laboratories are not proper.

xi. The institution has provided the following information regarding its geographical location in the online application: "Geographical location - Latitude 26.9832756 Longitude 75.5950753" (as verified on Google Maps). The institution has uploaded geotagged photos of the building's front and rear views, but the latitude and longitude coordinates for the two photos are different.

xii. Transition institution is running from last 8 years. Hence, 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

xiii. The institution has uploaded some geotagged photos,



but the psychology laboratory, language laboratory and the geography laboratory are not visible in them.

xiv. The uploaded geotagged photos show that, the RAMP is not proper. The institution uploaded geotag photos of Ramp, Safe Drinking Water and Accessible Toilet. However, the latitude and longitude in each photo are different. A clarification from the Institution is required regarding this matter.

xv. The Institution has uploaded a copy of the 'Non-Encumbrance Certificate,' which has been issued without an outward reference number and the office date. Therefore, the validity of this certificate is questionable. The institution is required to explain the same.”

9. At this juncture, Mr. Pawar, learned counsel, submits that the grounds raised/deficiencies observed for the issuance of the two SCNs are such that they can be ascertained only after carrying out an inspection, and certain grounds mentioned in the SCNs can be clarified only after the issuance of a Letter of Intent (“**LoI**”) under Regulation 7(13). He, therefore, seeks a direction to the respondents to conduct an inspection of the petitioner-institute and decide its application for recognition of the conversion/transition of its existing four-year integrated B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed. programme to the ITEP course.
10. In addition, he relies upon Annexure P-19 and submits that although the 462nd (Part-3) meeting was held on 03/04.06.2026, its minutes were circulated only on 16.06.2026 and were uploaded to the website only thereafter. He further submits that the online portal for uploading



the response to the deficiencies was activated only on 22.06.2026 and remained open until 25.06.2026. On this basis, he contends that the petitioner-institute was unable to submit its response on the online portal due to the inadequate time provided for the same. In the alternative to the prayer for inspection, he prays that the petitioner-institute be permitted to submit its response through email or any other appropriate mode, as sufficient time was not provided to respond, and that the Institute thereafter be subjected to inspection.

11. For the said reasons, issue notice.
12. Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. He vehemently opposes the present petition and on instructions, submits that the present writ petition is wholly premature and is not maintainable at this stage.
13. 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.
14. Learned counsel further submits that the principal relief sought by the petitioner is a direction to the respondents to conduct an inspection of the institution. According to him, such a direction would amount to compelling the respondents to depart from the statutory procedure governing the consideration of applications for recognition.
15. In this regard, he submits that an inspection is neither an automatic consequence of filing an application nor a matter of right, but is



undertaken only after the competent authority is prima facie satisfied that the applicant fulfils the threshold eligibility requirements prescribed under the Act, the 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, learned counsel submits that the petitioner is, in substance, seeking to rewrite the prescribed procedure by requesting that an inspection be directed even before the deficiencies pointed out in the SCNs are examined and adjudicated upon. He submits that such a course would render the preliminary scrutiny envisaged under the statutory framework otiose.

16. Specifically, Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel, 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 scrutinise 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 an inspection merely because an application has been submitted.
17. With regard to the grounds invoked in the SCNs, Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel, submits that all the deficiencies are such as can be satisfactorily and adequately considered on the basis of the documents submitted by the applicant-institution, and that there is no requirement for an inspection to be conducted.



18. He further submits that the writ petition deserves to be dismissed as premature, leaving it open to the petitioner to participate in the proceedings initiated pursuant to the Show Cause Notice. In the event that an adverse final order is ultimately passed, it would be open to the petitioner to avail themselves of the statutory remedy of appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993, as available in law.
19. Lastly, he submits that adequate time was provided to the petitioner to respond to the deficiencies and, therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief, either in the form of a direction to the respondents to conduct an inspection or by way of an extension of time to submit a response to the deficiencies pointed out in the minutes of the 462nd (Part-3) Meeting held on 03/04.06.2026.
20. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.
21. This Court has dealt with a similar set of facts in W.P.(C) 8633/2026 titled ***Dr. Radhakrishan TT College & Anr. v. National Council of Teacher Education & Anr.***, wherein the primary grievance of the petitioner was that no final decision had been taken on its application. On my query, Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel does not dispute that the petitioner institute's application in the present case is still pending a final outcome.
22. In this view of the matter, the reasoning and observations made by this Court in ***Dr. Radhakrishan (supra)*** are pertinent and are reproduced as under:

“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:

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."

23. A perusal of the deficiencies observed in the meetings of the 456th (Part-1) meeting of the WRC held on 02.04.2026 as also minutes of the 462nd (Part-3) Meeting held on 03/04.06.2026, which have already been reproduced above, make it clear that what this Court observed in relation to the deficiencies/SCN grounds in **Dr. Radhakrishan (supra)** is equally applicable to the present case.
24. Hence, a similar outcome must follow. The present petition is accordingly allowed.
25. The respondents shall conduct an inspection of the petitioner-institute within four weeks from today and shall thereafter take all necessary steps to ensure that the guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court are scrupulously complied with. The entire exercise, including the completion of the inspection, issuance of any further SCN, if required, consideration of the petitioner's response, and passing of a reasoned order, shall be completed on or before 07.09.2026.
26. In view of the aforesaid directions, there is no necessity to deal with the petitioner's prayer seeking enlargement of time for submitting a response to the deficiencies pointed out in the minutes of the 462nd (Part-3) Meeting held on 03/04.06.2026.
27. As indicated in **Dr. Radhakrishan (supra)**, 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 further clarified that the direction for inspection shall not be construed as invalidating the deficiencies pointed out by respondent No. 2 on two earlier occasions in the respective minutes of its meetings. Moreover, the respondents shall remain at liberty to require compliance with all the extant norms and conditions prescribed under the applicable regulatory framework, including the deficiencies already pointed out, if any such deficiency is found to persist upon inspection.

28. A copy of the inspection report shall be furnished to the petitioner upon its preparation.
29. The writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms, along with all pending applications, if any.

JASMEET SINGH, J

JULY 22, 2026/sp