

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10534 of 2017

- =====
1. Secretary, Prakash B. Ed. Teachers Training College, Chetan, Chhapra Baniyapur, P.S.- Baniyapur, District- Saran at Chhapra.
 2. Ramnath Singh, aged about 58 years, S/o Late Rameshwar Singh, Secretary, Prakash B. Ed. Teachers Training College, Chetan, Chhapra Baniyapur, P.S.- Baniyapur, District- Saran at Chhapra.
- Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. J. P. University, Chhapra, through its Registrar, J.P. University, At+ P.S. and District- Chhapra.
3. The Vice- Chancellor, J. P. University, Chhapra.
4. Finance Officer, J.P. University, At+ P. S. and District- Chhapra.
5. The Chairman University Grants Commission, Bahadur Sah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

... .. Respondents

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12496 of 2017

- =====
1. Association Of Teachers Training College, Bihar, registered Office NH 28, Silorh, Near Marwan Chowk, P.S.- Marwan, Distt.- Muzaffarpur, through its President Dr. Uma Shankar Roy.
 2. Dr. Uma Shankar Roy, son of late Deo Narayan Roy, Resident of 504, Angad Apartment, New Patliputra Colony, G. D. Mishra Path, P.S.- Patliputra, District- Patna, Present President, Association of Teachers Training College, Bihar.
- Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Joint Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director, Higher Education, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. National Council of Teacher Education through its Member Secretary Hans Bhawan, Bahadur Sah Jafar Marg, New Delhi.
6. The Regional Director, Eastern Regional Committee, NCTE, Bhuwaneshwar, Orissa.
7. The Vice Chancellor, Tilka Manjhi University, Bhagalpur through its Registrar.
8. The Vice Chancellor, Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur through its Registrar.
9. The Chairman, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Sah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :



(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. **10534 of 2017**)

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Rajendra Prasad Singh, Sr. Adv. Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh Mr. Ravi Kumar Singh
For the U.G.C.	:	Mr. Deepak Kumar Mr. Amarnath Verma
For the NCTE	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh
For the State of Bihar	:	Ms. Shilpa Singh, GA 12 Mr. Ranjan Kumar, AC to GA 12
For J. P. University	:	Mr. Anjani Kumar, Sr. Adv. Mr. Nagendra Kumar Singh
For B. R. University	:	Mr. Vikas Ratan Bharti Ms. Deepika Sharma
For T. M. B. University	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. **12496 of 2017**)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. P. K. Sahi, Sr. Adv. Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh
For U. G. C.	:	Mr. Amrendra Nath Verma
For NCTE	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh
For the State of Bihar	:	Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Singh, AC to AAG 15
For T. M. B. University	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

JUDGMENT AND ORDER
ORAL

Date : 09-11-2017

In the present two writ applications, challenge is to the decision of the State Government, whereby the course fees, chargeable by non-aided privately managed institutions, offering course of Training in Teacher Education have been fixed. The State Government, by the impugned notification has fixed annual fees at the rate of Rs. 50,000/- per student. Thus, the course fee for two-year programme, leading to B. Ed. Degree, which is a two-year course has been fixed at Rs. 1,00,000/-.

2. The petitioners are non-aided privately managed institutions, offering courses/training in Teacher Education.



3. The challenge is on the ground that the State Government, while taking the decision, has not adhered to the mandatory statutory provisions prescribed in University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, read with National Council for Teacher Education (Guidelines for regulation of tuition fees and other fees chargeable by unaided teacher education institutions) Regulations, 2002, as amended from time to time. The teacher education programme, which these petitioners offer, admittedly, leads to University degree. There cannot be any dispute that these institutions are governed by the provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993. The said National Council for Teacher Education (Guidelines for regulation of tuition fees and other fees chargeable by unaided teacher education institutions) Regulations, 2002, has been framed in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 12 (h) read with Section 32 (2) of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993. Regulation 11 of the said 2002 Regulations is at the core of the issue and is, therefore, being re-produced herein below:-

“11. Regulation of fees for teacher education programmes leading to a university degree



For teacher education institutions and such other bodies offering a teacher education programme leading to a university degree, the provisions contained in the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in private non-aided professional institutions) Regulations, 1997, as amended from time to time, will apply mutatis mutandis, subject to the condition that while determining the fee structure for a teacher education programme leading to a university degree, the Standing Committee of the University Grants Commission or the State Level Committee, as the case may be, will take into account the facilities required to be provided as per the NCTE Regulations laying down the norms and standards for the relevant teacher education programme.”

4. It is evident from the said provision that the provisions contained in University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, shall have to be applied for regulation of the fees for teacher education programmes, leading to a University degree. It mandates that while determining the fee structure of teacher education programme, leading to a University degree, the Standing Committee of the University Grants



Commission or the State Level Committee, as the case may be, may be, will take into account the facilities required to be provided, as per the regulations laid down by the National Council for Teacher Education about the norms and standards for relevant teacher education programme.

5. Evidently thus, the provisions contained in University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, are to be applied for determination of the fee structure of such institutions and the facilities required to be provided, as per the regulations of the National Council for Teacher Education, are to be taken into account for fixation of the fee structure.

6. This is to be noted that earlier the Chancellor, Universities of Bihar, had temporarily fixed the fees, chargeable by such institutions in the State of Bihar through “Regulation and Ordinance for Two-year Bachelor of Education (Secondary Programme)” under the Universities of Bihar, which was put to challenge before this Court, in a batch of writ applications. This Court found the fixation of fee structure not to be supported by any material basis and, accordingly, held the said part of the regulations to be unsustainable. A Division Bench of this Court, in the case of **Mirza Ghalib T. T. College, Patna and Others v. the State of**



Bihar and Others, reported in **2017 (1) PLJR 259**, held, in paragraphs 80 and 81 as follows:-

“**80.** We do not find any material on record, which can demonstrate that these considerations had been kept in mind while deciding the fee structure and any adequate exercise was at all done in this direction.

81. We are mindful of the fact and it has been mentioned in the letter, dated 02.09.2015, through which the Regulation/ Ordinance is being sought to be implemented that the said fee structure has been fixed provisionally and a State Level Committee is proposed to be constituted for deciding the fee structure. Since we do not find any material basis on record for arriving at the fee structure, as prescribed, we intend to hold the said fixation of fee, which has been made a part of the Ordinance itself, to be without any basis and, therefore, unsustainable.”

7. Evidently, the fee structure, as indicated in the regulation framed by the Chancellor, Universities of Bihar, was provisional and the State Level Committee was proposed to be constituted for deciding the fee structure.

8. It seems that the State Government has now prescribed the said fee structure, through the notification impugned



in these cases, purportedly in accordance with the provisions of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, and National Council for Teacher Education (Guidelines for regulation of tuition fees and other fees chargeable by unaided teacher education institutions) Regulations, 2002.

9. In view of the categorical stand taken on behalf of the petitioners that the State Government, while taking decision on fixation of the fee structure before issuance of the impugned notification, did not at all act in accordance with the statutory provisions, this Court had called for the original records of the concerned file, leading to fixation of the fee structure by the State Government. The original records have, accordingly, been produced and have been perused by me.

10. I have heard learned Senior Counsel, Mr. Rajendra Prasad Singh and Mr. P. K. Shahi, for the petitioners, Ms. Shilpa Singh, learned Government Advocate appearing for the State of Bihar, Mr. Deepak Kumar and Mr. Amrendra Nath Verma, learned Counsel for the University Grants Commission, Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, learned Counsel for the National Council for Teacher Education and Mr. Anjani Kumar, learned Senior Counsel, Mr.



Vikas Ratan Bharti, and Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, learned Counsel representing the Universities.

11. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, have firstly drawn my attention to Regulation 5 (3) (i) and (ii) of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, to submit that the said regulation contemplates constitution of State Level Committee by the University Grants Commission. They submit that the State Government constituted the State Level Committee in breach of the requirement under Regulation 5 (3) (i) and (ii) of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, which rather contemplates constitution of the said Committee by the University Grants Commission only and, therefore, the entire action undertaken for the purpose of fixation of fee structure of these institutions, based on the decision of the said State Level Committee, constituted by the State Government, is void. They have emphasized that in that event, the Committee, so constituted by the State Government, does not satisfy the mandatory requirements of Regulation 5 (3) (ii) of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-



aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, and its decision is unauthorized, illegal, having no legal effect at all.

12. Their next contention is that Regulation 6 provides for the procedure to be adopted by the State Level Committee and Regulation 7, the procedure for determining fees. According to them, the State-respondents have given a complete go-bye to these provisions while determining the fee structure, which is under challenge.

13. It is their contention that with the requirement of facilities for an institution offering teaching in education, as prescribed by the National Council for Teacher Education, it will be impossible for these institutions to run the courses with the meager amount of fees, prescribed by the State Government, through the impugned notification.

14. Ms. Shilpa Singh, learned Government Advocate for the State of Bihar has submitted the State of Bihar has given due regard to the provisions contained in Regulation 5 (3) (ii) of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, in constitution of the said State Level Committee. She has submitted that the State Government had requested the University Grants Commission to nominate experts as required under the said



regulations and had sent reminders too, but because of absence of any response, the State Level Committee was left with no other option but to proceed for completing the exercise of fixation of fee with the Members as notified by the State Government.

15. Before I proceed further, I must take note of Regulation 5 of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, which deals with constitution of committee for fixation of fees payable. The said regulation contemplates a Central Level Standing Committee for fixation of fees for the professional institutions affiliated to Central Universities, any professional institutions which are deemed to be Universities, Universities not receiving grant-in-aid from the Central Government or any State Government or any grant disbursing statutory bodies of such Governments for the maintenance or development expenditure of such Universities and Universities established as joint ventures between a private trust or society and a State Government.

16. Sub-Regulation (3) of Regulation 5 speaks of State Level Committee for fixing the fees in professional institution affiliated to the State Government Universities. These institutions surely fall within the scope of sub-Regulation (3) of Regulation 5. Clause (ii) of said sub-Regulation (3) of Regulation 5 provide



constitution of State Level Committee by the Commission in the following terms:-

- (a) Vice-Chancellor of one of the Universities in the State nominated — Chairperson; by the State Government concerned
- (b) Secretary in charge of Higher Education of the State Government — Member; concerned
- (c) Secretary of the Finance Department — Member; of the State Government Concerned
- (d) Three experts, one each in Institutional Finance, Cost Accountancy & Economics —Member; to be nominated by the Commission
- (e) A Finance Officer of one of the Universities to be nominated by the — Member; & State Government
- (f) Director in charge of Higher or Collegiate Education of the State — Member Government concerned

17. There should not be any dispute that the word ‘Commission’, in Clause (ii) of sub-Regulation (3) of Regulation 5 means the University Grants Commission, as contemplated in the definition, Clause 3 (c) of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997.



18. I have perused the original records to see as to whether there had been compliance of the statutory provisions, as contemplated in Regulation 5 (3) of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997. It is clearly evincible from the records that the constitution of the State Level Committee is not by the University Grants Commission. The records suggest that a committee had been constituted by the State Government by a notification, issued by the Education Department, Government of Bihar, issued under the signature of the Joint Secretary of the Department, consisting of the following members:-

- (1) Shri Ras Bihari Prasad Singh, Vice-Chancellor,
Nalanda Open University, Nalanda
- (2) The Principal Secretary, Education Department,
Bihar, or any Officer nominated by him
- (3) The Principal Secretary, Finance Department,
Bihar, or any Officer nominated by him
- (4) Three Experts in Institutional Finance, Cost
Accountancy and Economics to be nominated by the
University Grants Commission.
- (5) The Finance Officer, Patna University, Patna



(6) The Director, Research and Training, Education Department, Bihar, Patna.

19. It appears that after constitution of the said State Level Committee, through notification, dated 19.11.2015, the Principal Secretary, Education Department, had written to the Secretary, University Grants Commission, regarding constitution of the committee for fixation of fee structure in non-aided privately managed professional institutions imparting courses in Teaching in Education. A request was made to nominate three experts. From the said letter, dated 25.11.2015, it also appears that the Government of Bihar was not seeking approval of the constitution of the State Level Committee; rather, the State Government informed the University Grants Commission about the constitution of State Level Committee and requested the University Grants Commission to nominate three Experts, as indicated above.

20. At this stage, I consider it apposite to deal with the challenge made on behalf of the petitioners to constitution of the State Level Committee by the State Government.

21. As has already been noted, Regulation 5 of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, provides constitution of State Level Committee by the University



Grants Commission. In such circumstance, the State Government did not have the jurisdiction to do what was essentially required to be done by the University Grants Commission in terms of the provisions of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997.

22. From the original records, I find that the University Grants Commission did not respond to the communication made by the State Government, dated 25.11.2015, and rightly so, because the State Government did not have any business to constitute the State Level Committee and there would have been no purpose for the State Government of informing the University Grants Commission about the constitution of the State Level Committee by the State Government.

23. In my view, strict adherence to the statutory provisions without any departure is necessary for, at least, the following two reasons – firstly, it will achieve the desired salutary purpose of accomplishing and furthering the objectives and goals of such provisions; and secondly, it will ensure integrity, uniformity and consistency in the decision making process. It is, therefore, desirable that all statutory actions should be in conformity with the procedure prescribed and not otherwise.



24. It is settled principle of law that if a power is required to be exercised by a body under statutory provisions in a particular manner, then such power has to be exercised in that manner alone or not at all. The Supreme Court, in the case of **Hukam Chand Shyam Lal v. Union of India (AIR 1976 SC 789)**, has held that any other mode of exercise of such jurisdiction is necessarily forbidden. In my view, thus, the constitution of the State Level Committee, by the State Government, cannot be said to be in accordance with the provisions of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, referred to above, and I am, therefore, constrained to hold that decisions based on the report of the so-called State Level Committee is illegal, being contrary to the mandatory provisions of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, as noted above.

25. After having held thus, I would have, in normal circumstance, simply disposed of these writ applications after quashing the impugned notification with a direction to the functionaries under the relevant Acts and Regulations to act and proceed strictly in terms of the provisions therein. However, after



having gone through the original records, before doing that, I intend to make certain observations.

26. From the original records, I find that the so-called State Level Committee, so constituted by the Education Department, Government of Bihar, held its meetings, on 22.12.2015 and 23.12.2015. Thereafter, the meetings were held on 02.01.2016, 09.01.2016, 25.01.2016 and 27.01.2016. Subsequent meetings were held on 08.03.2016 and 11.03.2016, when the final decision was taken by the so-called State Level Committee for determination of fee structure. The meetings were mostly attended by three persons, in addition to the Chairperson of the said Committee, namely, (i) Shri Anil Kumar Verma, Finance Officer, Patna University, Patna, (2) Shri Arun Kumar Mishra, Joint Secretary, finance Department, Bihar, (3) Shri Akhilesh Kumar Pandey, Director, Research and Training, Education Department. The importance, which has been attached to the State Level Committee for the purpose of determination of fee structure, is evident and clear from Regulation 5 (3) (ii) of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997. The said provision contemplates the Secretary in charge of the Higher Education of the State Government and Secretary of the Finance



Department of the State Government to be Members of the Committee. These officers could not have been substituted by any other officer(s), junior in rank. The Regulation provides for these persons to be the ex-officio members of the State Level Committee. Such ex-officio members did not have the jurisdiction to nominate any officer of their choice to be the members of the State Level Committee. It is evident that as a matter of fact, there was no participation of the Education Department in the meetings so held, inasmuch as no officer of the Education Department participated in most of the meetings held on the above noted dates. Though the Regulation specifically provides that three Experts, one each in Institutional Finance, Cost Accountancy and Economics, are to be nominated by the Commission, there was no expert member available in the Committee to give opinion on the point of determination of fee structure. There is specific purpose behind placing the experts, of the Institutional Finance, Cost Accountancy and Economics, to be the members of the State Level Committee, because the exercise requires deliberation and determination of fee structure, keeping in mind the requirements laid down by the National Council for Teacher Education for the institutions imparting courses in Teaching in Education, involving issues of institutional accountancy, finance and planning.



27. There is yet another aspect of the matter. Regulation 7 of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, specifically provides the procedure for determining fees, which are as follows:-

“7. Procedure for determining fees–

(1) (i) Fees or the scales of fees once prescribed under these regulations shall be valid for a period of three years.

(ii) The fees when revised shall be applicable only to new entrants.

(2) (i) A professional institution shall submit to the Commission at least six months before the advertisement for admission, authentic data on the basis of which the tuition and other fees are to be determined.

(ii) The concerned Committee may seek any data or clarification from the concerned professional institutions and may also allow the institution to supplement or modify the data submitted by it originally.

(iii) While deciding the fee structure for Free Seats, Payment Seats and NRI, Foreign students, the concerned Committee shall, take into consideration, the parameters which affect the cost, the total expenditure of the institution for running the professional course as computed on the basis of audited



Ethernet (eth2) statements of the previous two years and reasonable projected estimation for the next three years.

(iv) The fees to be charged shall have two broad categories, namely, tuition fee and development fee.

(v) The management of the institution may realise the actual cost of board and lodging from the students subject to the relevant Committee being satisfied about the reasonableness of such costs.

(vi) The tuition fee shall be to meet the actual cost of imparting education.

(vii) While assessing a fair tuition fee, the Committee shall take into account the following, namely:

(a) Salary and allowances including bonus, if admissible, payable to teaching and non-teaching employees;

(b) expenditure on administrative services;

(c) cost of maintenance of laboratories including consumables;

(d) contingent expenditure including statutory requirements like audit fee, and the like;

(e) cost of acquisition of books and journals for libraries;

(f) maintenance of buildings and other assets including rents and tariffs; and any



other recurring expenditure to be determined by the competent authority, from time to time.

(viii) Having due regard to the parameters mentioned in this sub-regulation, suitable rates may be fixed for holders of Free Seats, Payment Seats and NRI, Foreign students.

(3) (i) The Commission shall specify norms relating to staffing and scales of expenditure for other items wherever such norms have not been laid down till the date of commencement of these regulations.

(ii) In case the Commission finds it difficult to lay down specific quantified norms, the relevant Committee shall satisfy themselves about adequacy and the reasonableness of the expenditure involved.

(iii) While specifying the norms, the Commission shall ensure that the projected expenditure does not become a source of profit to the management of the professional institutions.

(4)(i) The Commission shall at an interval of three years determine the development fee and different rates of development fee may be specified for students of Free Seats, Payment Seats and Foreign, NRI seats.

(ii) The development fee may be at flat rates.



(iii) Based on intelligible and objective criteria, the Commission may classify the institutions into different categories for the purpose of prescribing different slabs or rates of development fees.

(iv) While determining the rates of development fees, the Commission shall take into account the views and suggestions of the Ethernet (eth2)private professional institutions, the State Governments and interested members of the general public.

(5) No management of a professional institution shall, in the first ten years of its establishment, appropriate more than fifty per cent of the proceeds of the development fee levied or the actual capital cost, whichever is lower, for the recovery of the capital cost. The remaining amount shall be utilized for up-gradation and replacements in the said first ten years and, thereafter, the entire proceeds may be utilized for up-gradation and replacement purposes.

(6) The Commission shall communicate the approved rates of development fee chargeable by the professional institutions to the Committees well in advance so as to enable them to suitably incorporate such rates in their notification.”



28. I do not find, from the original records of the file maintained by the State Government in this regard, that the so-called State Level Committee ever cared to notice or follow the said procedure for determining the fee structure.

29. Accordingly, the Notification No. 12/Estb. 03/2014, dated 14.03.2016, brought on record by way of Annexure A/1 to the supplementary affidavit filed on behalf of the petitioners in CWJC No. 12496 of 2017, is hereby quashed, as illegal, having been issued in violation of the mandatory statutory provisions prescribed in University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997, read with Regulation 11 of the National Council for Teacher Education (Guidelines for regulation of tuition fees and other fees chargeable by unaided teacher education institutions) Regulations, 2002. Any decision taken at the level of the respective Universities of the State of Bihar on that basis shall not be given effect to.

30. Considering desirability of the situation, I direct the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, to make a request to the University Grants Commission for constitution of the State Level Committee, strictly in terms of Regulation 5 (3) (ii) of the University Grants Commission



(Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997. Such request must be made within a period of one week from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order. The Secretary, University Grants Commission, is directed to ensure that a Committee is constituted within a fortnight from the date of receipt of the letter of request from the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar.

31. Considering the urgency of the matter, the Court directs that once the State Level Committee is constituted, it shall proceed towards determination of fee structures strictly in accordance with Regulation 7 of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997. The Committee shall keep in mind the criteria laid down under Regulation 11 of the National Council for Teacher Education (Guidelines for regulation of tuition fees and other fees chargeable by unaided teacher education institutions) Regulations, 2002, while doing its exercise of the fixation of the fee structure.

32. Since, it is the specific case of the petitioners that it is rather impossible for them to maintain the requirements of National Council for Teacher Education, as laid down under the



Regulations, with the fee structure, as prescribed in the notification, which has been set aside, the State Level Committee, constituted under the present orders of this Court and Regulation 5 (3) (ii) of the University Grants Commission (Regulation of Admission and Fees in Private Non-aided Professional Institutions) Regulations, 1997 shall consider this aspect also.

33. These applications are, accordingly, allowed with the directions and the observations as above.

34. Considering the urgency of the matter and since the issue of fixation of course fee has got considerably delayed, in order to ensure that the committee is constituted and starts functioning in terms of the order of this Court, I direct the matter to be listed under the heading “To Be Mention” on 08th December, 2017, on which date, the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, will be required to inform this Court as regards compliance of the present order.

35. Let the original records be returned to learned Counsel for the State of Bihar.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	14-11-2017
Transmission Date	N/A

