

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10271 of 2024

K.S. College of Professional Education Plot No. 821, 830, 831, Street/Road Neora, Vill/P.O. Neora, Tehsil/Taluka - Bihata, town/City - Danapur, District - Patna, Bihar - 801113 through the Director Nitish Madan Murari Singh (Male), aged about 46 son of Dr. Madan Murari, resident of 34, Kasturba Path, North Sri Krishnapuri, Police Station Sri Krishnapuri, Patna, District-Patna at present residing at Oasis Plaza Plot No - 224 Bazar Road Besides Rajaram Libarary Gokulpeth Shankar Nagar S.O. Shankar Nagar Nagpur, Maharashtra - 440010.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Patliputra University Mahatma Gandhi Nagar, Chitragupta Nagar, Patna - 800020, through the Registrar.
2. The Vice Chancellor, Patliputra University, Mahatma Gandhi Nagar, Chitragupta Nagar, Patna - 800020.
3. The Registrar, Patliputra University, Mahatma Gandhi Nagar, Chitragupta Nagar, Patna - 800020.
4. The Examination Controller, Patliputra University, Mahatma Gandhi Nagar, Chitragupta Nagar, Patna 800020.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Niranjan Kumar
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Rana Vikram Singh
		Ms. Rasika

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 9 19-06-2025 1. Heard learned Counsel for the parties cornered.
2. The petitioner-institution, namely, K.S. College of Professional Education, a teacher training college recognized by the Eastern Regional Committee of the National Council for Teacher Education and affiliated to Patliputra University, has filed the present writ petition for a direction to the respondent-university to accept the online registration fee and examination forms of 16 B.Ed.



students admitted in the academic sessions 2023–25, and to permit them to appear in the B.Ed. Examination.

3. I. A. No. 01 of 2025 has also been filed by the petitioner praying for interim relief to direct the Examination Authority to allow provisional registration and permit the 16 students to appear in the B.Ed. 1st Year Examinations subject to the outcome of the present writ application.
4. The brief facts of the case is that the institution, in question, was initially granted recognition by the National Council for Teacher Education for one-year B.Ed. course, which was subsequently extended to two-year programme under the 2014 Regulations of the National Council for Teacher Education. Fresh recognition for an annual intake of 100 students was granted on 23.05.2015.
5. Admissions in the B.Ed. College in the State of Bihar are, now, conducted through a Common Entrance Test by a designated State Nodal University. For the academic sessions 2023–25, Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Darbhanga, was declared as Nodal Authority for the CET-B.Ed. 2023.
6. The State Nodal Officer on 29.03.2023 published examination schedule for CET-B.ED 2023 for the



academic sessions 2023-25. Spot admissions were scheduled from 14.06.2023 to 26.06.2023.

7. The petitioner-institution admitted CET-B.Ed. 2023 qualified candidates in the 1st Round, 2nd Round, and Spot admission against the approved/sanctioned intake for the 2023–25 academic sessions. Thereafter, Patliputra University issued instructions vide notice, dated 18.01.2024, for online registration of B.Ed. students between 19.01.2024 to 25.01.2024 for the academic sessions 2023–25. In compliance, the petitioner's Institution submitted registration fees for all admitted students.
8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that registration of only 82 candidates were done, but for the remaining 16 candidates, portal was not being opened. All 16 candidates were duly qualified through CET-B.Ed. 2023 and were admitted during the Spot Counseling process. They are all eligible for pursuing B.Ed. course. Non-acceptance/refusal of their registration by the University is arbitrary, discriminatory and against the principle of natural justice. It has further been argued that no deficiency or illegality has been pointed out either in



the admission process or eligibility of the 16 candidates.

9. Learned counsel for the University argued that the Combined Entrance Test for admission into the B.Ed. course was conducted by the Nodal University. Following the entrance test, a list of successful candidates was published. Thereafter, counselling was conducted for the qualified candidates, pursuant to which admissions were granted in various recognized B.Ed. colleges, including the petitioner-institution. A list of such admitted students for B.Ed. course was to be sent to the University for validation.
10. The petitioner Institution, vide its letter no. 442, dated 29.09.2023, forwarded a list of 82 admitted students only for the sessions 2023–25. These students were duly validated, registered and permitted to fill up their examination forms. Admit cards were also issued to them and they were allowed to appear in the B.Ed. 1st Year Examination held on 10.07.2024 and concluded on 19.07.2024.
11. The 16 students did not take the B.Ed. 1st Year Examination which concluded on 19.07.2024. The names of the 16 students, in question, were not included in the



list submitted by the petitioner-institution, nor were their details forwarded for validation or registration.

12.In reply, learned counsel for the petitioner argued that a list of 98 students for the academic sessions 2023-25 was actually submitted by the petitioner-institution in accordance with the direction from the respondent no. 4, vide letter no. 442, dated 29.09.2023. Despite repeated request, the remaining 16 students were not registered, compelling the petitioner to file the present writ application.

13.I have heard learned counsel for the parties concerned and have gone through the materials available on record, including the list of candidates sent by the petitioner-institution to the University for registration.

14.From perusal of the letter no. 442, dated 29.09.2023 (Annexure-R1 to 4/A to the counter affidavit), it appears that the petitioner-institution submitted a list of 82 candidates admitted in the Institution for their validation and subsequent registration. The letter, dated 29.09.2023, was duly acknowledged by the University, which would appear on the face of the letter itself.

15. The petitioner has, now, claiming that in fact the



petitioner-institution had given a list of 98 candidates to the Controller of Examination, vide letter, dated 29.09.2023, but arbitrarily, the University has validated only 82 candidates.

16.If both the lists of candidates, dated 29.09.2023, submitted by the petitioner-institution are compared, it appears that the list submitted by the petitioner, which has been brought on record by way of counter affidavit of the University bears receiving/acknowledgment of the University officials; whereas, the list of 98 candidates brought on records by the petitioner by way of rejoinder affidavit does not bear any receiving or acknowledgment. The signature of the Chief Administrative Officer appearing in the two lists brought on record by the petitioner-institution and the University, though of the same person, but are apparently different.

17. The list, now, claimed to be submitted containing 98 candidates (Annexure-P/24), was neither received by the University nor acknowledged or verified in any form. It appears that the list of 98 students brought on record by the petitioner-institution in the rejoinder has been prepared subsequently i.e. after submission of list of 82



candidates by the petitioner-institution for registration and validation. The admission of extra students, which may be 16 in numbers, after submission of the final list of 82 admitted candidates by the petitioner-institution cannot be validated by the University.

18. Considering the aforesaid discussion, this Court finds that non-registration/non-validation of the 16 students was consequence of the petitioner’s failure to include their names in the original submitted list of admitted candidates, declaring 82 candidates only and they were allowed to appear in the B.Ed. 1st Year Examination. Admittedly, 16 students were not allowed to appear in the B.Ed. 1st Year Examination.
19. Accordingly, this writ application, being devoid of any merit, is dismissed.

Prabhakar Anand/-

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

U	✓		
---	---	--	--

