



\$~43

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

+ W.P.(C) 14579/2025 and CM APPL. 59829/2025

AL-MEEZAN EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS B.ED.
COLLEGE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi
Kant, Mr. Vineet Upadhyay, Mr. Jayant Dubey
and Mr. Ayush Aanand, Advocates.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Hardik Rupal and Ms. Aishwarya
Malhotra, Advocates for NCTE.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER
23.12.2025

%

1. This writ petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226
of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

*“(a) quashing of the impugned Withdrawal Order dated 30.12.2021 issued
by Respondent No.2 withdrawing recognition of Petitioner Institution’s
B.Ed. Course; on the wrong observations; and*

*(b) quashing of Appeal Order dated 20.08.2025 issued by Respondent
No.1 thereby rejecting the petitioner’s Statutory Appeal and confirming
the aforesaid Withdrawal Order dated 30.12.2021; without considering
the same on merits; and*

*(c) direction to Respondent No.2 to issue the Restoration Order thereby
restoring recognition of the Petitioner’s B.Ed. Course so as to enable the
Petitioner to enjoy status of being a recognized institution with all
consequent benefits; and*

*(d) direction to Respondent No.2 to communicate the recognized status of
Petitioner Institution to the State Department of Higher Education and the*



concerned Affiliating Body of Petitioner Institution for Affiliation & Counseling purpose w.r.t. present Academic Session.”

2. Petitioner institute was granted recognition by Southern Regional Committee ('SRC') vide order dated 21.12.2005 for running B.Ed course with annual intake of 100 seats. Pursuant to NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 duration of B.Ed course was increased to two years and accordingly, revised recognition order was issued by SRC on 16.05.2015 for conducting the course for academic session 2015-16 and since then Petitioner has been functioning successfully. Without any basis, SRC issued final show cause notice dated 20.09.2020, in response to which Petitioner submitted its compliance vide letter dated 02.11.2020 and thereafter, nothing was heard from SRC and institute continued to run uninterruptedly till academic session 2024-25. It was only when the staff of institution visited the affiliating university i.e., Karnataka University on 16.04.2025 for some administrative work, they were informed orally that the recognition was withdrawn and hence, this writ petition was filed.

3. Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner submits that impugned withdrawal order dated 30.12.2021 was never communicated to the Petitioner or to the affiliating university and cannot be enforced against the Petitioner. He further submits that owing to the non-communication, Petitioner has been admitting students in the last 4 years and at this stage, if the withdrawal order is given effect to, it will have an adverse effect on the careers of the students undergoing the course. It is also urged that there are serious discrepancies in the deficiencies/shortcomings mentioned by SRC in the first show cause notice, final show cause notice, withdrawal order and the appellate order and it is settled law that withdrawal



order cannot be passed on grounds extraneous to show cause notice and similarly, appellate order cannot point out deficiencies not mentioned in the withdrawal order/show cause notice. On these grounds, it is submitted that impugned orders dated 30.12.2021 and 20.08.2025 deserve to be quashed. Without prejudice, Mr. Sharawat submits that in order to put a quietus to the issues raised by the Respondents, Petitioner will submit approved list of the faculty as also BCC within three weeks from today and after setting aside the impugned orders, Court may issue directions to the Respondents to take a fresh decision in the matter.

4. Mr. Rupal, learned counsel appearing for the Respondents denies that there are discrepancies or variations in the show cause notices and the impugned orders. He submits that the recognition was rightly withdrawn and even till date Petitioner has not submitted approved list of faculty as also BCC and in the absence of these documents, recognition cannot be restored.

5. Having heard learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner and counsel for the Respondents and looking to the fact that as of today the deficiencies that remain to be cured, even according to the Respondents are: (a) approved list of faculty; and (b) BCC. Petitioner is willing to furnish the documents within three weeks from today and on furnishing the documents, Respondents have no objection in reconsidering the withdrawal order. Petitioner is right in submitting that the withdrawal order was not communicated by the Respondents and despite best efforts, Mr. Rupal is unable to establish that communication was sent. It is trite that no order can be enforced until it is communicated to the effected party. This Court also finds merit in the contention of the Petitioner that there are serious discrepancies in the deficiencies/shortcomings pointed out in the show cause



notices and the withdrawal/appellate orders and thus, the withdrawal order and consequently the appellate order are unsustainable in law.

6. Accordingly, this writ petition is allowed to the extent of quashing the withdrawal order dated 30.12.2021 as also appellate order dated 20.08.2025. As undertaken, Petitioner will furnish the approved list of the faculty as also the BCC within three weeks from today. On receipt of the documents, Respondents shall take a fresh decision on withdrawal of recognition within two weeks from the date of receipt of the documents and communicate the same to the Petitioner, who is at liberty to take recourse to legal proceedings in case of any surviving grievance.

7. Writ petition is disposed of along with the pending application.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 23, 2025/YA