

\$~52,53, &61

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

+ **W.P.(C) 919/2015**

INDIAN TEACHER TRAINING
INSTITUTE & ORS

..... Petitioners

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR
TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

..... Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 922/2015**

NEW COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

..... Petitioner

Versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER
EDUCATION & ANR.

..... Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 963/2015**

P R B S COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & ANR.

..... Petitioners

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER
EDUCATION & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through

Pr: Mr Sanjay Sharawat, Advocate with Mr Ratish Kumar, Advocate
for petitioner in item Nos. 52, 53 & 61
Mr Gaurav Sharma, Advocate with Mr T. Singhdev, Advocate for
respondent in item Nos. 52,53 & 61.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **02.02.2015**

The petitioners have filed the above petitions challenging the rejection
and return of their application for recognition of B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. courses

2

on the ground that the State of Haryana had given a general direction to return such applications. The learned counsel for the petitioners points out that a batch of similar petitions titled as 'Divine Mission Society (Regd.) v. National Council for Teacher Education & Anr.: W.P.(C) No.2889/2013' and other connected matters were disposed of by this Court by an order dated 24.11.2014 whereby this Court had directed as under:-

“6. This Court is of the view that after filing of an application, an institution is legally entitled to have it processed by the statutorily designated authority strictly in accordance with the statutorily prescribed procedure. The input of the State Government as a stake holder under the current rules is certainly relevant but it cannot be accepted as 'gospel truth' and that too, without giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

7. Keeping in view the aforesaid as well as the judgment/orders of the Madhya Pradesh and Punjab & Haryana High Courts as well as the order dated 10th September, 2013 passed by Supreme Court in SLP No. 4247-4248/2009, present writ petitions are disposed of with a direction that the petitioners shall apply afresh in accordance with new regulations if required and the same shall be considered by the NCTE/NRC for the year 2015-16 in accordance with new regulations which are to be notified in compliance with the directions of the Supreme Court. If any deficiency is found, the same shall be communicated to the petitioners, who shall remove the deficiency within the given time. In case, the deficiencies are removed within the given time, the application shall be processed in accordance with Rules and Regulations. If the deficiencies are not removed, the applications shall stand rejected. With the aforesaid observations, the present batch of writ petitions is disposed of but without any order as to costs.”

The learned counsel for the parties point out that the new regulations

have since been notified. Consequently, the present petitions are disposed of by directing that the petitioners are at liberty to apply afresh for the academic year 2015-16 in accordance with the new regulations, if required. And, the same shall be decided in accordance with the new regulations by the respondents. In the event, any deficiency is found the same shall be conveyed to the petitioner who shall be given an opportunity to remove the same within a specified time. In case such deficiencies are removed within the specified time, the applications shall be processed in accordance with the relevant regulations. Needless to mention that if the deficiencies are not cured within the specified time the applications shall stand rejected.



VIBHU BAKHRU, J

FEBRUARY 02, 2015

pkv

\$~28

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

+ W.P.(C) 922/2015

NEW COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Sanjay Sharawat, Advocate.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER

EDUCATION & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

20.02.2015

CM No.2684/2015

This is an application filed by the petitioner to correct the name of the petitioner institution. It is stated that the name of the petitioner institution was erroneously mentioned as 'New College of Education' instead of 'Hitkari College of Education'. The petitioner/applicant prays to take the amended memo of parties, which is appended to this application, on record.

I am inclined to accept the contention that the error on the part of the petitioner is inadvertent and no prejudice would be caused if the same is corrected. Accordingly, the amended memo of parties is taken on record and the order dated 02.02.2015 is modified to record the name of the petitioner as 'Hitkari College of Education'.

The application stands disposed of.



VIBHU BAKHRU, J

FEBRUARY 20, 2015

MK