

\$~3

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

+ W.P.(C) 3561/2018

MAA KASTURBA GANDHI MAHILA COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Sanjay Sharawat, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR.
..... Respondent

Through Mr.Shivam Singh with Mr.Aditya
Raina, Advs for NCTE.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

%

25.04.2018

Vide the present petition, the petitioner has sought quashing of the order dated 15.02.2018 passed by respondent no.2, whereby the respondent No.2 rejected the petitioner's application for recognition of its D.El.Ed Course.

Mr.Sanjay Sharawat, learned counsel for the petitioner, points out that, aggrieved by the respondent No.2's rejection of the petitioner's application for grant of recognition for the four year integrated B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed. course, the petitioner had approached this Court by way of W.P.(C)No.4211/2017, which was allowed vide order dated 26.07.2017, and the matter was remanded back to the respondent no.2 to consider the petitioner's case after

taking into account the No Objection Certificate (NOC) issued to the petitioner by Maharaja Surajmal Brij University, Bharatput.

Mr.Sharawat submits that, though the respondents purport to have passed the impugned order in compliance of the directions issued by this Court vide its order dated 26.07.2017, a perusal of the impugned order shows that it refers not only to a wrong application number but also to a wrong course i.e., D.El.Ed. Course, and also refers to the order passed by this Court as an order passed by a Bench of the Jaipur High Court.

He further submits that in view of the aforesaid mistakes in the impugned order, the petitioner is unable to exercise the statutory remedy of appeal as provided under the NCTE Act.

At this stage, learned counsel for the respondents fairly admit that there are mistakes in the said order and undertakes to provide a corrected copy thereof to the petitioner within a week.

The learned counsel for the respondents undertakes to supply a copy of the corrected refusal order to the petitioner with a copy to the learned counsel for the petitioner, to enable the petitioner to exercise his appellate remedy as per the NCTE Act.

Needless to say, in case the petitioner files an appeal against the corrected order to be supplied by the respondent, the same would be decided expeditiously by respondent no.1 by passing a reasoned and speaking order by duly considering the various decisions of this Court on the subject. In case, the petitioner is still aggrieved by the order passed by the respondents on his appeal, it will be open for the petitioner to take legal recourse as permissible under law.

The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

APRIL 25, 2018/sr

REKHA PALLI, J