

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE FOURTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN
PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.5420 of 2015

BETWEEN

Mother Theresa Vidyalayam.

... PETITIONER

AND

National Council for Teacher Education and another.

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR. D.V. RAMANA SARMA

Counsel for the Respondents: MR. K. RAMAKANTH REDDY

The Court made the following:

-
-
-

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. K. Ramakanth Reddy, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. Petitioner's application for establishing D.El.Ed course was considered by the second respondent and by order dated 14.06.2012 the said application, being not found in order, was rejected.

Petitioner questioned the said order in appeal before the first respondent, however, with a delay of 18 months. The first respondent has considered the said appeal along with an application for condonation of delay and by the impugned order dated 16.09.2014 dismissed the same on being not satisfied with the explanation submitted by the petitioner in support of the delay. Questioning the said order, the present writ petition is filed.

3. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner urges that the matter may be remitted back for fresh consideration by the respondents, I am not inclined to accept the said contention in view of the fact that the application of the petitioner for recognition was originally made online on 30.09.2011 and by now over three years lapsed. Reviving of the old application necessarily involves compliance by the petitioner of the Regulations of the National Council for Teacher Education including the latest regulations in force. That apart,

the delay of 18 months was found to be not satisfactorily explained, as per the order of the appellate authority. Hence, no interference with the impugned proceedings is called for at this stage.

4. However, as and when the second respondent issues fresh notification, petitioner is at liberty to apply afresh and if such an application is made, the second respondent shall consider the same on its own merits and in accordance with law and pass appropriate orders.

The writ petition is disposed of. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

March 4, 2015
DSK