

\$~47

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4208/2018**

SRM COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Sanjay Sherawat with Mr.Divyank
Rana, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR

..... Respondent

Through Ms.Arunima Dwivedi, S.C. with
Ms.Preeti Kumra, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

% **25.04.2018**

Vide the present petition, the petitioner/Institute has prayed for a direction to the respondents to reconsider its application dated 29.12.2012 for the grant of recognition to conduct D.El.Ed. course, which application was returned by respondent No.2 vide letter dated 27.08.2013.

Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that the said application was returned unactioned only on the ground of the ban imposed by the State of Haryana for opening of new institutes for the D.El.Ed. course during that period.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it being an admitted position that the respondents in its meeting held on 20.11.2017 had decided to process the applications of those institutes, which were submitted before the imposition of the State ban and were covered by the un-amended NCTE Regulations 2009, there is no reason why the petitioner's application should also not be considered on its own merits. He places reliance on the various subsequent

orders passed by this Court, directing the respondents to process the application of those institutions, which had been submitted before the imposition of the State ban.

Issue notice. Ms.Arunima Dwivedi, Advocate, who appears on advance notice, for the respondents, fairly submits that she does not wish to file any counter affidavit and is unable to dispute the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the respondents, however, submits that keeping in view the fact that the petitioner's application was returned over 4 years ago, the respondents may be given adequate time to examine and process the same as per law.

Subject to the petitioner depositing Rs.25,000/- with Delhi High Court Bar Association Advocates Welfare Trust, the writ petition is allowed and the matter is remanded back to the respondent no.2.

Subject to the petitioner meeting all other prescribed eligibility criteria, the respondents are directed to reconsider the petitioner's application dated 29.12.2012 and dispose of the same by passing a reasoned and speaking order within twelve weeks from today.

It is made clear that the petitioner's application would not be rejected on the ground of there being a ban imposed by the State of Haryana for opening of such educational Institutions.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to an inadvertent mistake on the part of his office, memo of parties filed with the present petition does not reflect the petitioner's name correctly, even though the same is correctly mentioned in all

documents including the 'index' and the 'writ petition'. He hands over a copy of the amended memo of parties duly reflecting the petitioner's correct name, i.e. SRM College of Education, which is taken on record.

The registry is directed to carry out the necessary corrections in the record. It is further directed that, while issuing a copy of the order to the petitioner, the corrected name be duly reflected in the order sheet.

The petition stands disposed of with the above directions.

REKHA PALLI, J

APRIL 25, 2018

sr