

\$~27

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10547/2017**

**RAM MANOHAR SINGH SHIKSHAN PRASHIKSHAN
SANSTHAN**

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Mayank Manish & Mr.Ravi Kant,
Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Rohit Gandhi, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

% **19.03.2018**

Vide the present petition, the petitioner has prayed for quashing of order dated 02.12.2016 passed by respondent No.1 and order dated 17.06.2016 passed by respondent No.2 whereby the petitioner's application seeking recognition for running B.Ed. course has been rejected on the ground that NOC from the affiliating body i.e. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Awadh University had not been made available, when the petitioner's case was considered by respondent No.2 as also by respondent No.1.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had applied to the university vide its letter dated 17.06.2015 for grant of NOC for the B.Ed. course. He submits that the said university had however, taken an inordinately long time in deciding the petitioner's

request for grant of NOC and had finally issued the NOC to the petitioner only on 01.06.2017. He submits that in view of the NOC subsequently obtained by the petitioner, the respondents may be directed to reconsider the petitioner's application. He relies on a decision of this Court in W.P.(C) No.10445/2017 dated 21.02.2018.

At this stage, learned counsel for the respondents points out that the petitioner has not approached the respondents with the copy of the NOC and, therefore, the respondents cannot be faulted for having rejected the appeal. He submits that the respondents could not be expected to wait endlessly for the petitioner to obtain the NOC from Affiliating University.

Learned counsel for the petitioner concedes that after the receipt of the NOC, the petitioner has not approached either the respondent Nos.1 or respondent No.2 for reconsideration of its application for grant of recognition for running B.Ed. course.

In these circumstances, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be granted leave to withdraw the petition with liberty to approach the respondents with a representation for reconsideration of its case in terms of the earlier decisions of this Court.

The petition is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to file a representation to the respondents. It is made clear that in case, such representation is made within two weeks, the respondents would consider the same by duly considering the NOC dated 01.06.2017 as also the decision of this Court in LPA No.771/2017. The respondents would pass a reasoned and speaking

order within eight weeks.

Needless to say that in case, the petitioner is still aggrieved, he would be at liberty to take legal recourse as permissible under law.

MARCH 19, 2018/gm

REKHA PALLI, J