



\$~83

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9962/2025 & CM APPL. 41429/2025**

**MEHMUDA SHIKSHAN AND MAHILA GRAMIN VIKAS
BAHUDDDESHIYA SANSTHAS CENTRAL INDIA WOMENS
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & ANR.Petitioners**

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

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: **Ms. Renu Gupta, Standing Counsel
for NCTE.
Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Shivom Sethi
and Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Advs.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

17.07.2025

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking direction to respondent no.2/Western Regional Committee to issue order of restoration of recognition of B.Ed. course for 100 seats (Two Basic Units).
2. Mr. Amitesh Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioners submits that recognition of the petitioner's B.Ed course was withdrawn by the respondent no.2 vide its order dated 17.12.2024, however, on appeal being preferred by the petitioner under Section 17 of the NCTE Act, Appellate Authority vide its order dated 12.03.2025 set aside the impugned order dated 17.12.2024 and remanded the case back to the



Western Regional Committee (WRC) for revisiting the matter.

3. Mr. Kumar submits that though the impugned order was set aside and the matter was remanded, however, consequential direction was not given by the Appellate Authority to restore the recognition of B.Ed. course and to update the website of NCTE reflecting the petitioners' institute as a recognized institution.

4. He invites attention of the Court to order of coordinate bench dated 30.07.2021 passed in W.P.(C) 7260/2021 titled as **Arihant College & Anr. vs. NCTE & Anr.** to contend that under similar circumstances this Court had given the consequential directions as prayed hereinabove. The attention of the Court is drawn to para 6 and 7 of the said order which reads thus:

“6. The petition is, therefore, allowed and the NCTE is directed to issue an order of restoration of recognition. The petitioner will be permitted to participate in counselling and admit students for the year 2021-22 and also for subsequent years, until and unless a fresh withdrawal order is passed against it. The status of the petitioner as a recognised institution will also be reflected on the respondent-NCTE's website, and will be communicated by the NCTE to the petitioner's affiliating university as well as to the concerned departments of the State Government. The respondents are directed to comply with these directions within one week.

7. As several petitions for substantially similar relief are being filed in this Court, it is further directed that, whenever a withdrawal order is challenged by an institution (either by way of appeal or by way of writ proceedings) and the matter is remanded to the concerned regional committee, the regional committee will issue an order of restoration of recognition in favour of the institution, pending reconsideration of the withdrawal order. Although the Appellate Committee of the NCTE would be well advised to expressly quash the original order of the concerned



regional committee while remanding the matter, the position in law is that the order automatically stands quashed. The institution is, therefore, entitled to the benefits of recognition until a fresh withdrawal order is passed. The order of restoration of recognition should be issued within two weeks of the order of remand being communicated to the regional committee, or upon request of the concerned institution. This streamlined procedure would obviate the multiplicity of litigation which is being witnessed at present. Neither the concerned institutions nor the NCTE should be put to the burden of filing or defending proceedings before the Court for this purpose.”

5. He submits that similar directions were again reiterated by this Court in order dated 17.08.2022 passed in W.P.(C) 11923/2022 titled **Sundarban Minority B.ED College & Anr. vs. National Council for Teacher Education & Anr.** He submits that paras 6 and 7 of the said order are relevant, which reads thus:

“6. It pains the Court to note that despite directions and procedure laid down by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, lapses continue.

7. The present petition is allowed. Respondents are directed to issue a restoration order in terms of the directions of the Appellate Authority in the remand order within a period of two weeks from today. Respondents are also directed to display the name of Petitioner-college in the list/ category of recognised institutions along with the restoration order for conducting B.Ed. course on their website. The same shall also be communicated to the affiliating university as well as the Department of Higher Education, Government of West Bengal to enable the Petitioner-college to participate in the counselling and admission process for the academic year 2022-23 and for subsequent years, unless a withdrawal order is passed.”



6. In view of the above, issue notice. Ms. Renu Gupta, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.1/NCTE accepts notice.
7. On being queried by the Court, Ms. Gupta does not dispute the similar directions having been given by this Court. She, however, contends that after remand, the decision has already been taken by the respondent no.2/WRC, however, approval of the minutes is still awaited.
8. In view of the position obtaining as on date, the present petition alongwith pending application is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.2/WRC to issue order of restoration of recognition of B.Ed. course for 100 seats (Two Basic Units) of the petitioner's institute.
9. Further direction is given to the WRC/NCTE to update the status of the petitioners' institute as a recognized institution on its website and necessary communication be also sent to the affiliating university as well as concerned department of the State Government. These directions be complied with within a period of 10 days from today.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

JULY 17, 2025

N.S. ASWAL