



2024 : DHC : 3370



\$~61

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 11210/2021 and CM APPL. 34513/2021 and
18822/2023

B.K. COLLEGE Petitioner
Through: Mr. Mayank Manish, Advocate
versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER
EDUCATION AND ANR Respondents
Through: Mr. Puneett Singhal, Advocate
for NCTE

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

J U D G M E N T (O R A L)
25.04.2024

%

1. The petitioner provides teacher education. It was issued a recognition order by the Western Regional Committee (WRC) under the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) on 15 April 2009 recognizing D.Ed. (Co.Ed.) course conducted by it from the 2009-2010 academic session with an annual intake of 50 students.

2. At the time when the recognition was granted to the petitioner, the petitioner was operating from the land which was taken by the petitioner on lease. The petitioner continues to operate from the same premises till date.

3. The National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition, Norms and Procedures) Regulations 2007 (hereinafter referred to as

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 1 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024: DHC: 3370



“the 2007 Regulations”) were substituted by the National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition, Norms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2009 Regulations”).

4. The 2009 Regulations required Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) to be situated in the premises owned by the institution and proscribed running of such institution from the rented premises.

5. In these circumstances, the petitioner submitted an application on 24 May 2012 to the WRC seeking permission to shift from the erstwhile rented premises to the new premises owned by the petitioner. Mr. Mayank Manish, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the old and new premises were both situated in Jaura, Morena, Madhya Pradesh, though the new premises are situated in the Jafrabad area.

6. Instead of either accepting or rejecting the petitioner’s application for permission to shift, the WRC claims to have issued a deficiency letter to the petitioner on 9 July 2012. The petitioner denies having received the said letter.

7. Thereafter, according to the respondent, the WRC, in its 255th meeting held on 22 to 24 June 2016, decided to issue a show cause notice to the petitioner. Said show cause notice came to be allegedly issued to the petitioner on 1 July 2016. The petitioner denies having received the said show cause notice as well.

8. As the petitioner purportedly did not receive the show cause

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 2 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024 : DHC : 3370



notice dated 1 July 2016, no reply was submitted by the petitioner thereto.

9. On 8 August 2019, the WRC issued an order withdrawing the recognition of the petitioner. Mr. Mayank Manish submits that the issuance of this withdrawal order was obviously completely unjustified as the letter seeking permission to shift to new premises could not result in an order withdrawing recognition of the petitioner institution. According to Mr. Manish, the WRC had the jurisdiction either to accept the prayer for shifting or to reject the prayer for shifting. In no case could the WRC have decided to withdraw the petitioner's recognition.

10. Be that as it may, the withdrawal order dated 8 August 2019 reads thus :

“File No. WRC / NCTE / APW05772 / 222293 / 309th / D.El.Ed. / 2019/205265 To 205274
Dated 08/08/19

WITHDRAWAL ORDER

WHEREAS, recognition was granted to the institution namely B.K. COLLEGE, RUN BY LATE SHREE BAL KISHAN YADAV SHIKSHA PRASAR, MADHYA PRADESH vide Order No. WRC/5-6/116th/2008/54170-54175 dated 18.04.2009 for D.El.Ed. course of two years duration with an annual intake of one unit (s) of 50 students in rented premises.

AND WHEREAS, the matter was considered by the WRC in its 255th meeting held on June 22-24 2016 and the Committee decided as under:-

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 3 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024 : DHC : 3370



"This is a case of shifting. Deficiency letter 09/07/2012 was issued by WRO after examining the documents submitted no reply has been received to the deficiency letter.

Hence, Show Cause Notice be issued on this ground."

AND WHEREAS, the institution has submitted shifting premises application in WRC office on 24.05.2012. The deficiency letter was issued to the institution on the following points:-

- Application form for shifting of premises not submitted in triplicate in the prescribed format.
- Original certified copy of the registered land documents as required under provision of section 8 (7) (1) of NCTE, Regulations, 2009 issued by the Registrar or Sub Registrar not submitted.
- Original notarized copy of change of land use certificate issued by the Tehsildar/SDO/Collector not submitted.
- Original blue print of approved building plan issued by the Competent Authority i.e. Panchayat Sarpanch & Sachiv, if rural or Municipal Corporation, if city, not submitted.
- Resolution of the society shifting to new premises not submitted.
- Non-Encumbrance Certificate issued by Talathi/Tehsildar/SDO not submitted.
- Search Report from the Advocate in respect of land & building.
- Certified copy of Khasra, Khatoni B-1, Demarcation Map and Mutation order from Tehsil office.
- NOC of country & Town Planning Department from Jt. Director/Deputy, Director/Asstt. Director if land is in urban area; and from Gram Panchayat if land is in rural area.
- Building Completion Certificate including proof of inspection of the location from Sarpanch & Secretary of Gram Panchayat/Revenue Inspector.
- Certified copy of the Resolution of Panchayat+Permission

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 4 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024 : DHC : 3370



from local authority (Gram Panchayat, including and Sachiv both if case belong to rural area), from Municipal Corporation, if the case belongs to urban area.

AND WHEREAS, Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution dt. 01.07.2016.

AND WHEREAS, the Institution has not submitted reply of show cause notice.

AND WHEREAS, the matter was considered by the WRC in its 309th meeting held on July 23-26 2019 and the Committed decided as under :

“The Show Cause Notice was issued to the Institution vide letter dated 01/07/2016. The reply of the Show cause Notice of the Institution has not been received.

Hence, the committee decided to withdraw the recognition under Section 17(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993 for D.El.Ed. programme with effect from the end of the academic session next following the date of communication of the said order.”

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers vested u/s 17(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993, the Western Regional Committee now hereby withdraws recognition of B.K. COLLEGE, RUN BY LATE SHREE BAL KISHAN YADAV SHIKSHA PRASAR, MADHYA PRADESH granted for D.El..Ed. course on the grounds mentioned above from the end of the academic session next following the date of communication of the said order.

Further, if the institution is not satisfied with the Order, it may prefer an Appeal u/s 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 through “online mode” available on NCTE’s website www.ncte-india.org within 60 days from the date of issue of this order. The guidelines for filing appeal may be seen on NCTE’s website.”

11. According to the petitioner, it was only on receipt of the aforesaid withdrawal order dated 8 August 2019 that the petitioner came to learn of the alleged deficiencies in the premises to which the petitioner desired to shift. The petitioner addressed a representation to

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 5 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024:DHC:3370



the WRC on 25 October 2019, stating, clearly, that the petitioner had not received either the deficiency letter dated 9 July 2012 or the show cause notice dated 1 July 2016. On merits, the reply stated that the new premises to which the petitioner desired to shift were entirely in conformity with the norms of the NCTE and were not deficient in any regard.

12. The WRC, however, *vide* letter dated 5 November 2019, declined to entertain the petitioner's representation and advised the petitioner that if it was aggrieved by the order of withdrawal of recognition, it could prefer an appeal to the Appellate Committee in the NCTE.

13. Accordingly on 11 November 2019, the petitioner submitted an appeal to the Appellate Committee of the NCTE in accordance with Section 18 of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 (hereinafter referred to as "the NCTE Act"). In the appeal, the petitioner, *inter alia*, submitted that it was not in receipt either of the deficiency letter dated 9 July 2012 or the show cause notice dated 1 July 2016. It was further reiterated in the said appeal that the premises to which the petitioner desired to shift were in accordance with the prescribed norms and that any minor deficiencies which might have existed stood removed.

14. As the appeal was not being decided, the petitioner instituted WP (C) 10366/2020 before the Gwalior Bench of the High Court of

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 6 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024:DHC:3370



Madhya Pradesh which, *vide* order dated 18 August 2020, directed the Appellate Committee in the NCTE to decide the appeal on merits after grant of hearing to the petitioner.

15. Personal hearing, in terms of the order of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh, was granted by the Appeal Committee in the NCTE to the petitioner on 3 September 2020.

16. The appellate order which came to be passed thereafter on 13 October 2020 reads thus :

“NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
G-7, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110 075

Date: 13/10/2020

ORDER

WHEREAS the appeal of B.K. D.Ed. College, Imiliya, Joura Road, Joura, Morena, Madhya Pradesh dated 11/11/2019 is against the Order No. WRC/NCTE/APW05772/222293/309th/D.El.Ed./2019/205267 dated 08.08.2019 of the Western Regional Committee, withdrawing recognition for conducting for D.El.Ed. Course on the grounds that "the Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution vide letter dated 01.07.2016. The reply of the Show Cause Notice of the institution has not been received. Hence, the Committee decided to withdraw the recognition under Section 17(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993 for D.El.Ed. programme with effect from the end of the academic session next following the date of communication of the said order."

AND WHEREAS No one from, B.K. D.Ed. College, Imiliya, Joura Road, Joura, Morena, Madhya Pradesh presented the case of the appellant institution on 30/01/2020. In the appeal memoranda it was submitted that "i) the impugned order is contrary to law in as much as the withdrawal of same on the non-existent ground is nothing but without application of mind. ii) That, it is mentioned here that without proving proper opportunity of hearing to the

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 7 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024 : DHC : 3370



petitioner institute the NCTE has acted without application of mind which runs contrary to law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court of India reported in 1997 Vol. 7 SCC 622 (23) so also contrary to law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court of India reported in 2013 Vol. 1 SCC 403, iii) That, earlier when recognition was granted to the petitioner institute same was in rented premises there after society has purchase the land for establishment of own building of institute and vide registered sale deed no. 2715 and therefore with due permission of all the concerning authority building of institute constructed as per the NCTE Norms in which petitioner incurred huge expenses. iv) That, petitioner institute after completion of own building same has to be shifted therefore, institute has applied the same for shifting the institute in own building vide dated 24-05-2012 and therefore, application of shifting was submitted before the authority on 24-05-2012. v) That, when petitioner institute has shifted his institute in their own building on 24-05-2012 thereafter as per allegation leveled by the respondents they have issued one deficiency letter on 09-07-2012 by WRC BHOPAL but the fact remains that aforesaid show cause notice 09-07-2012 was ever not received by the institute therefore no occasion arises to file the reply of aforesaid show cause notice. vi) That, the matter was considered by the WRC BHOPAL in its 255 meeting held on 22-24 June 2016 in aforesaid meeting it was decided dated deficiency letter dated 09-07-2012 no reply received from the petitioner institute therefore show cause notice was issued however again show cause notice was not received to the petitioner institute. vii) That, it is state here that show cause notice dated 01-07-2016 as well as deficiency letter dated 09-07-2012 was ever not received by the petitioner institute. Therefore, petitioner institute have no occasion to file the reply of the aforesaid deficiency letter as well as Show Cause Notice before the respondent authority. viii) That, when petitioner institute has not submitted the composite plan vide dt. 30-05-2015 then there is no question arising for admitting the case of the petitioner institute. However, petitioner institute has also cured the aforesaid deficiency and even tough before rejecting the case of the petitioner institute further notice was not issued to the petitioner institute." The appellant, in their letter dt. 30/01/2020, requested another opportunity as their Secretary, who was authorised to attend the hearing was reported unwell. The Committee decided to give the appellant another opportunity i.e. the second opportunity to present their case."

AND WHEREAS Sh. Vikas Singh Yadav, President and Sh. Prem Pal Singh Yadav, Secretary appeared before Appellate Authority on 03/09/2020 and re-iterated to what is earlier submitted in the appeal memoranda. Appeal Committee noted that appellant

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 8 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024: DHC: 3370



institution was recognised to conduct D.El.Ed. programme since 2009. Appeal Committee further noted from the regulatory file that initial address of applicant institution as mentioned in the form of application was: Panch Mukhi Hanuman Gali, Purana Jaura, Dist.-Morena, Madhya Pradesh. Applicant after grant of recognition submitted a letter dated 24/05/2012 seeking change in the address of applicant institution. Appeal Committee noted that WRC by its letter dated 09/07/2012 sought from applicant institution information on certain points for grant of permission for shifting. Further Show Cause Notice (SCNs) dated 01/07/2016 and 22/09/2017 were issued to applicant institution. Appeal Committee noted that appellant in its appeal memoranda has denied having received the SCNs.

AND WHEREAS Appeal Committee noted from the communications available on relevant regulatory file that appellant institution has sent a number of communications to WRC and WRC has also issued Show Cause Notice (SCNs) addressed to institution at the address mentioned on the letter head of society. Appellant should be well aware of the regulatory provisions which require inspection and consequent suitability of the instructional and infrastructural facilities for conducting the course. Institution as such was not supposed to shift without seeking prior approval of Regional Committee. Onus lies on applicant to have made regular enquiries with the Regional Committee to know further developments and progress of its case relating to permission for shifting. Appeal Committee considers that no teacher education institution can be allowed to conduct the programmes from a place which was not inspected and declared conducive for conducting the programme. Appeal Committee decided to confirm the impugned order of withdrawal dated 08/08/2019.

AND WHEREAS after perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, Appeal Committee concluded to confirm the impugned order of withdrawal dated 08/08/2019.

NOW THEREFORE, the Council hereby confirms the Order appealed against.

The above decision is being communicated on behalf of Appeal Committee.

Sd
(T. Pritam Singh)
H.O.D”

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 9 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024 : DHC : 3370



17. Aggrieved by the aforesaid order, the petitioner has approached this Court by means of the present writ petition seeking quashing and setting aside of the withdrawal order dated 8 August 2019 as well as the Appellate Order dated 13 October 2020, and a direction to the NCTE to reflect the status of the petitioner on its website as recognised.

18. This court observed, in its order dated 18 April 2023 in the present proceedings, that the respondents could consider conducting inspection of the petitioner College. The respondents, however, did not chose to do so.

19. I have heard Mr. Mayank Manish, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Puneet Singhal, learned counsel for the respondent, NCTE at length.

20. Mr. Manish submits that the impugned order is completely unjustified. As already noted, one of his primary contentions is that an application for permission to shift from the rented to self-owned premises could not be visited by a show cause notice proposing withdrawal of recognition followed by an order withdrawing recognition of the petitioner Institution. He submits that the NCTE/WRC could either have accepted or rejected the prayer for shifting. Were the prayer to be rejected, the petitioner would have had an opportunity either to ensure that the premises to which the



2024 : DHC : 3370



petitioner desired to shift were made to conform to the prescribed norms, or find out another place to which the petitioner could shift. Instead of doing so, the respondent, however, chose to withdraw the recognition of the petitioner Institution, which he submits is, completely without authority of law.

21. Secondly, Mr. Manish submits that the impugned order travels beyond the show cause notice. The ground on which the impugned order has been passed finds no place either in the show cause notice dated 1 July 2016 or withdrawal order dated 8 August 2019.

22. The third submission of Mr. Manish is that the impugned order of the Appeal Committee has been passed only on one consideration, which is factually incorrect. The Appeal Committee has presumed that the petitioner had shifted to the new premises and, on the ground that the new premises have not been inspected by the respondent, has upheld the decision to withdraw the petitioner's recognition, observing that a TEI could not function from premises which were not inspected by the NCTE. He submits that there are two essential errors in this finding. The first is that the premises to which the petitioner desired to shift were in fact inspected by the WRC of the NCTE. As such, the finding that they were not inspected is erroneous. The second error is that the petitioner has never shifted to the said address at all, as no permission for shifting to the said premises was granted by the WRC. The petitioner continues to function in the erstwhile premises which were in the petitioner's occupation at the time when it sought



2024 : DHC : 3370



permission to shift.

23. As such, Mr. Manish submits that the impugned order being contrary to law and facts, and having been passed in excess of the allegations contained in the show cause notice and in the withdrawal order, cannot sustain and deserves, therefore, to be set aside.

24. He also submits that the withdrawal order can also not sustain as the NCTE has no power to withdraw the recognition merely on the ground that the premises desired to shift were deficient.

25. Mr. Singhal, learned counsel for the NCTE, reiterates the findings in the impugned order.

Analysis

26. I have considered the submissions made by both sides in the backdrop of the material on record.

27. There is complete and abject non-application of mind in the passing of the impugned order. Mr. Manish is correct in his submission that the impugned order proceeds only on one ground. It does not cite any of the grounds on which the show cause notice dated 1 July 2016 was issued as a justification for withdrawing recognition of the petitioner Institution. The only ground on which the impugned appellate order justifies withdrawal of recognition of the petitioner

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 12 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024 : DHC : 3370



Institution is that the petitioner is functioning from the new premises which have not been inspected by the NCTE.

28. As Mr. Manish points out, this finding is erroneous on two counts. In the first place, the new premises to which the petitioner desired to shift were in fact inspected by the WRC and the NCTE, which is what, in fact, resulted in the issuance of the show cause notice dated 1 July 2016, culminating in the withdrawal order dated 8 August 2019. Secondly, the petitioner has till date not shifted to the new premises as no permission for shifting was granted by the WRC or the NCTE.

29. The sole ground on which the Appeal Committee has dismissed the petitioner's appeal being thus unsustainable on facts, the impugned appellate order is required to be set aside.

30. Mr. Singhal submits that, if the impugned order is being set aside, the matter may be remanded to the Appeal Committee for a *de novo* consideration.

31. I am not inclined to accede to this submission.

32. The present petition has been pending since 2021. The impugned order of withdrawal was passed almost four years back on 8 August 2019. The show cause notice which culminated in passing of



2024 : DHC : 3370



that order was purportedly issued in 2016. None of the grounds urged in the show cause notice, on the basis of which the recognition of the petitioner was proposed to be withdrawn, finds place in the impugned appellate order. The order has based its approval of the decision to withdraw the petitioner's recognition solely on the ground that the petitioner is functioning from the new premises which have not been inspected by the NCTE.

33. The Appeal Committee has not endorsed the decision to withdraw the petitioner's recognition on the basis of the allegations contained in the show cause notice dated 1 July 2016.

34. This is also manifest from the fact that there is no discussion, in the impugned Appeal order, of any of the contentions advanced by the appellant on merits with respect to the allegations in the show cause notice. The Appeal Committee, therefore, apparently did not find the decision to withdraw the petitioner's recognition justifiable on the grounds which were contained in the show cause notice dated 1 July 2016.

35. That apart, a perusal of the grounds contained in the show cause notice dated 1 July 2016, which stand reiterated in the withdrawal order dated 8 August 2019, reveal that they are all grounds which seek to point out formal deficiencies with respect to the premises to which the petitioner desired to shift its activities. If that were so, the sequitur, as Mr. Manish correctly points out, would only be that the prayer for



2024 : DHC : 3370



shifting could be rejected. If thereafter, the petitioner did not cure the deficiencies in the new premises or did not shift to alternate premises which were not deficient, then further action could have been contemplated. The petitioner's recognition could not have been withdrawn merely on the ground that the premises to which the petitioner desired to shift were deficient. Any such deficiency, to reiterate, could only have resulted in refusal of the petitioner's application to shift its premises and not in anything more than that, much less in an order withdrawing recognition.

36. The power to withdraw recognition is conferred on the concerned Regional Committee by Section 17(1)¹ of the NCTE Act, which envisages withdrawal of recognition if a recognised institution contravenes any of the provisions of the NCTE Act, or of any Rules or Regulations issued thereunder, or any condition subject to which it was granted recognition under Section 14(3)² or permission under

¹ 17. **Contravention of provisions of the Act and consequences thereof –**

(1) Where the Regional Committee is, on its own motion or on any representation received from any person, satisfied that a recognised institution has contravened any of the provisions of this Act, or the rules, regulations, orders made or issued thereunder, or any condition subject to which recognition under sub-section (3) of Section 14 or permission under sub-section (3) of Section 15 was granted, it may withdraw recognition of such recognised institution, for reasons to be recorded in writing:

Provided that no such order against the recognised institution shall be passed unless a reasonable opportunity of making representation against the proposed order has been given to such recognised institution:

Provided further that the order withdrawing or refusing recognition passed by the Regional Committee shall come into force only with effect from the end of the academic session next following the date of communication of such order.

² (3) On receipt of an application by the Regional Committee from any institution under sub-section (1), and after obtaining from the institution concerned such other particulars as it may consider necessary, it shall,—

(a) if it is satisfied that such institution has adequate financial resources, accommodation, library, qualified staff, laboratory and that it fulfils such other conditions required for proper functioning of the institution for a course or training in teacher education, as may be determined by regulations, pass an order granting recognition to such institution, subject to such conditions as may be determined by regulations; or

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 15 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024 : DHC : 3370



Section 15(3)³ of the NCTE Act.

37. The withdrawal order dated 8 August 2019 does not allege that the petitioner had contravened any condition subject to which he was granted recognition under Section 14(3) or permission under Section 15(3) of the NCTE Act. Nor is there any specific allegation of contravention by the petitioner of any of the provision of the NCTE Act, Rules and Regulations or orders made or issued thereunder. If one reads the withdrawal order, it is indeed surprising to note that the show cause notice which was issued to the petitioner was by way of response to the application submitted by the petitioner seeking permission to shift to the new premises. When the new premises were found to be deficient, according to the withdrawal order, the deficiency letter dated 9 July 2012 was issued to the petitioner by the WRC. The petitioner denies having received the said communication.

38. Be that as it may, even if the petitioner did not respond to the

(b) if it is of the opinion that such institution does not fulfil the requirements laid down in sub-clause (a), pass an order refusing recognition to such institution for reasons to be recorded in writing:

Provided that before passing an order under sub-clause (b), the Regional Committee shall provide a reasonable opportunity to the concerned institution for making a written representation.

³ (3) On receipt of an application from an institution under sub-section (1), and after obtaining from the recognised institution such other particulars as may be considered necessary, the Regional Committee shall,—

(a) if it is satisfied that such recognised institution has adequate financial resources, accommodation, library, qualified staff, laboratory, and that it fulfils such other conditions required for proper conduct of the new course or training in teacher education, as may be determined by regulations, pass an order granting permission, subject to such conditions as may be determined by regulation; or

(b) if it is of the opinion that such institution does not fulfil the requirements laid down in sub-clause (a), pass an order refusing permission to such institution, for reasons to be recorded in writing:

Provided that before passing an order refusing permission under sub-clause (b), the Regional Committee shall provide a reasonable opportunity to the institution concerned for making a written representation.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 16 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024:DHC:3370



communication, the consequence could only have been that the prayer to shift to the new premises could have been declined. The WRC could not justifiably have decided to withdraw the recognition granted to the petitioner merely because there were certain deficiencies found in the premises to which the petitioner desired to shift its activities.

39. No doubt, had the petitioner shifted its activities to the new premises, the decision to withdraw the petitioner's recognition might have been justified as the premises themselves were allegedly deficient. This in fact appears to have been the confusion which has resulted in the passing of the impugned order dated 13 October 2020 by the Appellate Committee.

40. The petitioner had not, however, in fact shifted to the new premises and was still continuing to operate from the old premises.

41. This Court, *vide* order dated 18 April 2023, specifically observed that the respondent could consider conducting inspection of the petitioner. Obviously, this was intended to apply to the new premises to which the petitioner desired to shift its activities. No such inspection has been conducted till now.

42. That said, though the petitioner is entitled, as a result of the above discussion, to setting aside of the order withdrawing recognition

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 17 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44



2024 : DHC : 3370



dated 8 August 2019 and the impugned Appellate Order dated 13 October 2020, the petitioner can nonetheless not be permitted to continue to permanently run its activities from the premises presently in its occupation, as they are hired premises, and the 2017 Regulations specifically require TEIs to be located in self-owned premises.

43. In view of the aforesaid, this writ petition is disposed of in the following terms:

(i) The impugned order of withdrawal dated 8 August 2019 and Appellate Order dated 13 October 2020 are quashed and set aside.

(ii) The respondent WRC/NCTE is directed to conduct the inspection of the new premises to which the petitioner desires to shift within a period of four weeks from today. If any fees are required to be paid by the petitioner in that regard, the petitioner would be duly intimated and the fees would be paid by the petitioner within 48 hours of being intimated.

(iii) In case the premises are found to be deficient in any regard, the WRC would proceed in the matter in accordance with law, which would require a proper show cause notice to be issued to the petitioner and the matter to be dealt with in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the NCTE Act and the applicable Regulations, and the principles of natural justice



2024 : DHC : 3370



and fair play.

(iv) Till culmination of the decision on the petitioner's application for shifting, the petitioner would be entitled to continue to operate from the premises presently in its occupation.

44. This writ petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms, with no orders as to costs.

45. This judgment shall also be communicated by WRC / NCTE to the Affiliating Institution/Body for appropriate/necessary action.

C.HARI SHANKAR, J

APRIL 25, 2024/yg

Click here to check corrigendum, if any

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AWP(C) 11210/2021
KUMAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:51:59

Page 19 of 19

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: CHANDRASHEKHARAN
HARI SHANKAR
Signing Date: 29.04.2024
18:50:44