



WEB COPY



W.P.No.67 of 2009

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY**

W.P.No.67 of 2009

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT,
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.B.INDUSEKAR,
AG, ANANDRAJ VILLA,
7 SECOND CANAL CROSS ROAD,
GANDHI NAGAR, ADYAR, CHENNAI - 20.

... Petitioner

Vs

1. ALL INDIA COUNCIL OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION (AICTE),
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR, 7TH FLOOR,
CHANDER LOK BUILDING,
JANPATH, NEW DELHI.
2. DISTANCE EDUCATION COUNCIL
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR,
MAIDAN GARHI, NEW DELHI.
3. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU
REP. BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI 9.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for the issuance of Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records of the first respondent culminating in its impugned proceedings bearing F.No.37-3/Legal/AICTE/2008 dated 26.9.2008, quash the same.

For Petitioner : No representation

For R2 : Mr.S.Thiruveugadam



W.P.No.67 of 2009

ORDER

WEB COPY

When the matter was listed for hearing, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner institution. *Mr.S.Thiruveugadam*, the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent.

2. On a perusal of the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, it can be seen that the grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner is conducting courses through correspondence mode for certain candidates belonging to banking and other institutions. It is in the nature of a training programme and does not even require any approval or accreditation. However, since the respondents started interfering with the affairs of the petitioner, seeking recognition and stating that the petitioner has to get prior approval from AICTE or recognition from the Distance Education Council, an application was made, which ultimately culminated in the impugned proceedings. Challenging the same, the writ petition is filed.

3. When the matter was taken up for hearing, it was not represented on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is still conducting the courses or that the cause of action subsists even after 16 years. Secondly, even if the



W.P.No.67 of 2009

petitioner is conducting the courses and the cause of action subsists, the entire legal framework for applying for recognition of the Course has changed and nothing can be pursued with reference to the earlier application or its rejection in the year 2008. A fresh application has to be made if the petitioner still wants recognition or approval as per the present regime.

4. Accordingly, finding that the prayer in the writ petition has become infructuous in any event, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

02.12.2025

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
nsl

2/2

To

1. THE DIRECTOR,
ALL INDIA COUNCIL OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION (AICTE),
7TH FLOOR, CHANDER LOK BUILDING, JANPATH, NEW DELHI.
2. THE DIRECTOR, THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COUNCIL
MAIDAN GARHI, NEW DELHI.
3. THE CHIEF SECRETARY, THE STATE OF TAMILNADU
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI – 600 009.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.67 of 2009

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

ns1

W.P.No. 67 of 2009

02.12.2025
2/2