



\$~3 (Appellate Side)

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

+ W.P.(C) 10295/2025

JANATA SHIKSHAN PRASARAK MANDALS WOMENS B ED
COLLEGE & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti
Kumari and Mr. Pankaj Kumar Ray,
Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.
.....Respondents
Through: Mr. Hardik Rupal, Adv. for NCTE.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

% **ORDER**
10.04.2026

**CM APPL. 21898/2026 (under Section 151 CPC for
correction/modification of final judgment dated 16.09.2025)**

1. The present application has been filed seeking correction/modification of final judgment dated 16.09.2025 passed in W.P.(C) 10295/2025.
2. Mr. Amitesh Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that in the operative directions in para 16 of the judgment, the Court had directed restoration of recognition of petitioner institute for B.Ed. course only in the event no deficiencies are pointed out by the NCTE.
3. He submits that once the impugned withdrawal order, as well as, impugned order of Appellate Committee were set aside, the recognition of



petitioners ought to have been restored without making it contingent upon no deficiencies having been pointed out by the NCTE during subsequent inspection.

4. To substantiate his contention Mr. Amitesh Kumar has invited attention of the Court to the decision of a coordinate bench of this Court passed under somewhat similar circumstances in **Arihant College & Ors. vs. NCTE & Anr.** [W.P.(C) 7260/2021; date of decision 30.07.2021].

5. In view of the above, issue notice. Mr. Hardik Rupal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/NCTE accepts notice.

6. He submits that he has no objection in case the present application is allowed.

7. In view of the above, para 16 of the judgment dated 16.09.2025 is modified/corrected to read as under:

“16. Consequently, the petition is allowed. The impugned withdrawal order dated 14.11.2022, as well as, the impugned order dated 13.10.2024 of the appellate committee, are set aside, and the following directions are passed:

- i. The matter is remanded to the respondent no.2-WRC;*
- ii. The WRC will restore the recognition of petitioner institution for B.Ed. course (two basic units-100 seats) and consequently, the NCTE/WRC shall communicate about the restoration order to the affiliating university of the petitioner institution, as well as, to the State Government. Further, NCTE/WRC will also do the needful with regard to updation of the status of petitioner institution on its website.*
- iii. The NCTE is directed to carry out fresh inspection under Section 13 of NCTE Act and inform the petitioner institution about recommendations, if any, on the basis of such inspection;*
- iv. In the event any deficiencies are pointed out in the recommendations, NCTE will grant reasonable time to the*



petitioner institution to rectify the same; and

- v. *If no deficiencies are recommended, or in case deficiencies recommended by NCTE are rectified by petitioner institution during the time period granted to it, the restoration order will continue and in case deficiencies are not rectified, it will be open to WRC to initiate action under Section 17 of the Act in accordance with law.”*

8. The application stands disposed of in the above terms.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 10, 2026

N.S. ASWAL