



\$~12

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5765/2025 & CM APPL. 26338/2025**

M K COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & ANR.Petitioners

Through: **Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari and Mr. Mrinal Kishor, Advs.**

versus

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER
EDUCATION & ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: **Mr. Akhilesh K. Srivastava, Standing Counsel with Ms. Archana Joshi and Mr. Raja Ram Tripathi, Advs.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

16.05.2025

1. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioners seeking following reliefs:-

“(i) issue a writ of mandamus or any other suitable writ, order or direction directing the Respondents to issue revised recognition order for 100 Seats of B.Ed. Course to the Petitioner institution under NCTE Regulations, 2014; and/or;”

(ii) issue direction/order holding that the recognition granted to the petitioner for B.Ed. course continues to be in operation under the NCTE Act and the petitioner be treated as a recognized institution for all purposes and the respondents be directed to take all consequential steps including correcting the status of petitioner institution as a recognized institution on their website



and to inform the affiliating body and the Department of Higher Education, Government of Gujarat enabling the petitioner to conduct the B.Ed. Course as well as participate in counselling & admit students.”

2. The case of the petitioners is that petitioner institution was recognized on 31.03.2008 for running a B.Ed. course with an intake of 100 students. The NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 was notified on 01.12.2014 in order to implement the new NCTE Regulations, 2014 vis-à-vis existing recognized institutions.
3. Mr. Amitesh Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners states that petitioner institution submitted an affidavit dated 04.02.2015 in the prescribed format for the purpose of issuance of revised recognition order for B.Ed. course. He submits that despite lapse of time, the revised recognition order has not been issued.
4. He submits that the recognition of petitioner institution continues but the affiliating university is not permitting admissions. He clarifies that the recognition given to petitioner institution for 100 seats continues to be in operation under the NCTE Act and petitioner institution may be treated as a recognized institution for all purpose till any contrary orders are passed by respondents as per law.
5. He further submits that the respondents may be directed to take all consequential steps forthwith including correcting the status of the petitioner institution on the website, informing the Department of Higher Education, State of Gujarat and affiliating University/ concerned authority.
6. Mr. Akhilesh K. Srivastava, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondents states that the affidavit submitted by petitioner



institution has not been received.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are directed to submit fresh affidavit for acceptance and compliance of NCTE Regulation, 2014.

8. In the meantime, let respondents decide the request of petitioner institution for issuance of revised recognition order of petitioner institution for 100 seats expeditiously, preferably within six weeks from today.

9. In view of the above, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, the pending application also stands disposed of.

MAY 16, 2025

aj

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J