

\$~16

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9982/2015**

**THE INSTITUTE OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
AND SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND ANR** Petitioners
Through: Mr Amitesh Kumar, Adv.

versus

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR** Respondents
Through: Mr Anil Soni, Adv.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER**

ORDER

29.10.2015

%

1. Captioned petition is directed against the impugned decision of the respondents taken in its 195th meeting held on 28th-29th September, 2015. By this decision, the petitioners' application for grant of recognition for running a two-years B.Ed. course, filed under Section 14 of the NCTE Act, 1993 (in short the NCTE Act), was rejected.

1.1 The reason for rejecting the application for recognition is simply this, which is, that the application was not duly signed on every page.

2. The petitioner being aggrieved, has filed the instant writ petition to assail the impugned order, inter alia, on the ground that no opportunity for correcting the deficiency, if any, was given. It is the submission of the petitioner that principles of natural justice were violated. In this behalf, the petitioner relies on both, the provisions of Section 14(3)(b) of the NCTE Act and Regulation 7(17) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 (in short the 2014

Regulation).

3. Notice in this petition was issued on 20.10.2015. On that date, Mr Soni entered appearance on behalf of the respondents. Since the connected matters were listed today i.e. 29.10.2015, the instant petition was also renotified for the same date.

4. It is in this background that the matter has come up for hearing today.

5. Mr Soni, learned counsel for the respondents, has reverted with instructions. He has placed on record extracts of the “corrigendum for 194th and 195th Minutes of ERC Meeting”, which is indicative of the fact that a decision has been taken that the application for recognition filed, by the petitioners, would be processed.

5.1 Mr Soni, based on the aforesaid, has stated that the application for recognition will be examined afresh, on merits, in accordance with the provisions of the NCTE Act and 2014 Regulations.

6. Mr Amitesh Kumar, who appears for the petitioners, says that in view of the stand taken by the respondents, he does not wish to press the instant writ petition any further as it has worked itself out. His only apprehension is that, there may be delay in the application being processed on merits, and thereby, the chances of the petitioner to obtain recognition for the academic year 2016-2017, may get jeopardized.

6.1 Mr Soni, on the other hand, assures the court that the needful will be done with due expedition.

7. Having regard to the above, the writ petition is disposed of, in view of the stand taken by the respondents that the petitioners’ application for recognition will be processed on merits. The respondents are thus directed to process the application on merits, with due expedition, though not later

than ten (10) weeks from today.

8. The petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

OCTOBER 29, 2015

kk