



\$~136

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010386742026
+ **W.P.(C) 12002/2026 & CM APPL. 55696/2026**
SHRI DR RATILAL KANJIBHAI PATEL AND SHRI KANTIBHAI
PATEL B ED COLLEGE & ANR.

.....Petitioner

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

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hardik Rupal, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
19.08.2026

%

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

“A. issue a writ of certiorari or any other suitable writ or order quashing & setting aside the impugned order dated 22.04.2026 passed by appellate authority of NCTE and also impugned decision taken by western regional committee (WRC) in its 415th meeting held on 10th - 12th March, 2025;and/or

B. issue a writ of mandamus or any other suitable writ, order or direction directing respondents to issue order of restoration of recognition of B.Ed course with intake of 100 seats (two basic units) and to include the name of



petitioner institution in the list/category of recognised institutions for conducting B.Ed course on their website and to inform the Affiliating University and Department of Higher Education, Government of Gujarat regarding recognized status of petitioner institution enabling inclusion and participation in the counselling & admission process for B.Ed. course;....”

2. For the reasons stated in the petition, issue notice.
3. Mr. Rupal, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
4. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner No. 1 is an institute running B.Ed. course for about last 20 years.
5. The Western Regional Committee (**“WRC”**) in its 415th meeting held on 10th – 12th March, 2025 passed order withdrawing the recognition of the petitioner No. 1 Institute for the B.Ed. course.
6. As per Mr. Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners, the said action was done without considering the reply of the petitioners and on grounds entirely different from the Show Cause Notice.
7. Mr. Rupal, learned counsel for the respondents states that the deficiencies pointed out in the order of the Appeal Committee is stated to have now been rectified by the petitioners and the petitioners are stated to have been complied with the same. Hence, it will be appropriate that the WRC reconsiders application of the petitioners in view of the documents attached with the writ petition and pass a speaking order within 1 week from today.
8. I am of the view that the suggestion of the counsel for the respondents



is fair and reasonable.

9. Accordingly, the WRC is directed to reconsider the case of the petitioner in view of the additional documents/ compliances filed by the petitioner. The needful shall be done by the respondents within 1 week days from today.
10. Since the matter is being remanded back to the WRC for reconsideration, the impugned orders are accordingly set aside.
11. As the impugned orders have been set aside, the consequential benefits including issuance of order of restoration (as per the judgment of ***Arihant College & Anr. v. National Council for Teacher Education & Anr., W.P. (C) 7260/2021***) shall ensue to the benefit of the petitioner.
12. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms along with pending applications, if any.

JASMEET SINGH, J

AUGUST 19, 2026 / (MS)