



\$~173

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010395922026
+ **W.P.(C) 12311/2026 & CM APPL. 56997/2026**
SWAMI VIVEKANAND COLLEGE FOR PROFESSIONAL STUDIES Petitioner
Through: Mr. Vishant Singh, Ms. Mreeganka Goyal and Mr. Pranav Goyal, Advs.
versus
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION Respondent
Through: Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

% **24.08.2026**

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

*“A. Pass an ex-parte ad-interim order to stay the operation and effect of the impugned Refusal Order dated 15.04.2026 passed by Respondent/WRC till the disposal of the present petition;
B. Direct the Respondent to conduct a physical inspection of the Petitioner institution within a time-bound period, pending final disposal of the present writ petition. ...”*

2. For the reasons stated in the petition, issue notice.

3. Mr. Nanda, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent and has addressed arguments.

4. Mr. Nanda, learned counsel for the respondent states that the present case is different as two show cause notices dated 13.01.2026 and 23.02.2026



have been issued and admittedly, the petitioner did not reply to any show cause notices and hence due to the same, the application of the petitioner for transition was rejected.

5. My attention has been drawn to paragraph No. 12 of the judgment dated 29.05.2026 passed in W.P.(C) 4860/2026 where this Court has already taken a view. The same reads 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.”

6. A perusal of the same shows that the application cannot be rejected for non-reply of show cause notices. The respondent is required to conduct an inspection and only thereafter an application can be rejected.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the impugned refusal



order dated 15.04.2026 issued by the Western Regional Committee is set aside. The respondents shall conduct inspection of the petitioner's institute within a period of three weeks from today and shall thereafter take all appropriate and necessary steps to ensure that the guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya v. State of U.P., (2013) 2 SCC 617***, are scrupulously complied with.

8. The entire exercise, including the issuance of show cause notices pointing out the deficiencies, furnishing of replies thereto, adjudication of such show cause notices, and all ancillary activities connected therewith or flowing therefrom, shall be completed on or before 24.09.2026 for the Academic Session 2026-2027.

9. Let a copy of the inspection report be also supplied to the petitioner.

10. The present petition, along with the pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

JASMEET SINGH, J

AUGUST 24, 2026/AS