

**CWP no. 16535 of 2017 (O&M)
and connected case**

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

1.CWP no. 16535 of 2017 (O&M)

Anupama Institute of Management

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

All India Council for Technical Education and another

...Respondent(s)

2.CWP no. 14301 of 2017 (O&M)

Anupama College of Engineering

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

All India Council for Technical Education and another

...Respondent(s)

Date of Decision : 23.03.2018

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT**

**Present : Mr.P.K.Chugh, Advocate for
Mr. S.K.Nehra, Advocate for the petitioner(s)**

Mr.Harkesh Manuja, Advocate for respondents

MAHESH GROVER, J.(ORAL)

**This order will dispose of two civil writ petitions bearing
CWP nos. 14301 and 16535 of 2017.**

The facts are taken from CWP no. 16535 of 2017.

The limited grievance that emerges for our consideration is as to whether the petitioner's claim for approval by the A.I.C.T.E would fall within the procedure envisaged for fresh applicants or the one intended for extension of approval. It is not in dispute that the petitioner-institution has not got any approval after 2012. It has been in business since 1996 and granted approvals for various years which was, however, withdrawn as the petitioner did not fulfill the prescribed requirements by the A.I.C.T.E which was challenged by the petitioner by way of CWP no.2710 of 2015 but in view of the fact that the session for which an approval was sought stood expired, writ petition was disposed of with liberty to it to apply afresh with a further direction to the A.I.C.T.E to consider the claim by adopting a lenient view.

The A.I.C.T.E-respondents are willing to undertake the exercise of verification on the application moved by the petitioner but as per the process intended for fresh applicants which would involve scrutiny by experts and a visit by committee.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it should be construed as an extension of approval earlier granted to it at one point of time.

We would not agree with this contention noticing the fact that earlier extension was concededly withdrawn. Petitioner's case, therefore, necessarily has to be construed as a case of a fresh applicant under the procedure envisaged for the same. In case the petitioner makes an application or the application has already been moved by it in this regard, we direct the A.I.C.T.E to conclude the process as expeditiously as

CWP no. 16535 of 2017 (O&M)
and connected case 3

possible so as not to harm the interest of the institution which may like to
embark upon the decision of the application.

Petitions stand disposed of in above terms.

(Mahesh Grover)
Judge

23.03.2018
rekha
Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No

(Rajbir Sehrawat)
Judge