



\$~63

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

+ **W.P.(C) 18032/2025**

**LIMBDI AYURVED MEDICAL COLLEGE AND RESEARCH
CENTER AND ANOTHER**Petitioners

Through: Mr. A. Mariarputham, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Anurag Dayal Mathur, Mr.
Avneesh Arputham and Mr. Ankit Sharma,
Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Balendu Shekhar, CGSC with
Mr. Krishna Chaitanya, Mr. Rajkumar Maurya and
Mr. Divyanshu Singh Dev, Advocates for R1.
Mr. Kumar Prashant, Advocate for R2 and R3.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH**

ORDER
28.11.2025

%

CM APPL. 74588/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 18032/2025 & CM APPL. 74587/2025

3. This writ petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioners under Article 226 of the Constitution of India laying a challenge to impugned orders dated 07.11.2025 and 21.11.2025. By order dated 07.11.2025, Respondent No.3 has withdrawn the permission granted to the Petitioner No.1/College to admit students for 100 seats in BAMS Course for academic session 2025-26.



By impugned order dated 21.11.2025, Respondent No.2 has dismissed the First Appeal filed by the Petitioners challenging order dated 07.11.2025.

4. To the extent necessary, the facts set out in the writ petition are that an inspection was carried out in the Petitioner No.1's premises on 08.09.2025 and on 09.09.2025 and College was found compliant with all requirements under the NCIMS Act, 2020 and Regulations framed thereunder and Letter of Intent was issued on 12.09.2025. Second inspection was carried out on 25.09.2025 and 26.09.2025 and again College was found compliant and hence, Letter of Permission ('LoP') was issued on 08.10.2025 for admitting 100 students in UG BAMS Course.

5. It is stated that pursuant to an alleged complaint received against the Petitioners, an inspection was carried out on 30.10.2025 *albeit* complaint was never shared with the Petitioners and on 07.11.2025, impugned order was passed by Respondent No. 3 withdrawing the LoP, against which Petitioners filed First Appeal before Respondent No. 2. Appeal was dismissed on 21.11.2025 without looking into the representation of the Petitioners submitted on 14.11.2025, seeking hearing.

6. Mr. A. Mariarputham, learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioners submits that perusal of impugned order dated 07.11.2025, withdrawing the LoP, shows that the order is based on some complaint received against the Petitioners, however, copy of the complaint was never shared with the Petitioners and therefore, the allegations levelled therein are unknown. As a result, Petitioners were unable to refute the allegations and this has resulted in grave prejudice, since the trigger point for withdrawing the LoP was this complaint. It is also submitted that despite two earlier inspections finding the Petitioners compliant with all statutory and other requirements, an



inspection was carried out on 30.10.2025, however, neither the Petitioners were informed of the deficiencies, if any, nor copy of the inspection report was furnished. To compound the illegalities committed, impugned order withdrawing LoP was passed without hearing the Petitioners, which is in the teeth of Regulations 63(7) of National Commission for Indian System of Medicine (Minimum essential standards, assessment and rating for undergraduate Ayurveda colleges and attached teaching hospitals) Regulations, 2024 ('2024 Regulations'), mandating that opportunity of being heard is to be given to an institution before withdrawal of permission. In support of this plea, reliance is placed on an interim order passed by this Court on 18.10.2025 in *W.P.(C) 16223/2025* in case titled *Mangalayatan Ayurveda Medical College and Research Center & Anr. v. National Commission for Indian System of Medicine & Anr.*, where the withdrawal order was stayed on the ground that no show cause notice was given before withdrawing the permission and the order was upheld by the Division Bench on 07.11.2025 in LPA No. 673/2025.

7. Learned counsel for Respondents No. 2 and 3 submits that hearing was not given to the Petitioners owing to the urgency of the situation where on one hand, a complaint was received against the Petitioners and on the other, counselling was ongoing.

8. Having heard learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioners and learned counsels for the Respondents, this Court finds merit in the contentions raised on behalf of the Petitioners. Perusal of order dated 07.11.2025 shows that the genesis of the order was a complaint received against the Petitioners. Strangely, the complaint was not shared with the Petitioners and therefore, Petitioners are in dark with respect to the allegations levelled and were



naturally unable to refute the same. Regulation 63(6) of 2024 Regulations provides the eventualities under which permission granted to the college can be withdrawn and Regulation 63(7) provides that an opportunity of hearing shall be given to the institution before withdrawal of permission. Regulation 63(7) therefore embodies an important principle of natural justice i.e., *audi alteram partem*, which means that no one should be condemned unheard. This is clearly a case where LoP was withdrawn basis a complaint leading to an inspection report and neither of the two documents were provided to the Petitioners coupled with the fact that Petitioners were not heard before withdrawing the permission. Regulation 63(6) and (7) is extracted hereunder for the ease of reference:-

“(6) In case of fraudulent activities carried out by the institutions like fraudulent admissions, on paper teachers, financial frauds, fraudulent appointment of hospital staff, the permission of the college shall be withdrawn.

(7) An opportunity of being heard shall be given to the institution before withdrawal of the permission.”

9. Petitioners filed an Appeal before the First Appellate Committee aggrieved by order dated 07.11.2025, but even the Appellate Committee did not look into the violation of principles of natural justice as also the Regulations. In my view, impugned order dated 07.11.2025 is untenable in law, having been passed without providing an opportunity of hearing to the Petitioners as also relevant documents, such as the complaint and the inspection report of the inspection conducted on 30.10.2025, which formed the bedrock of the decision. Appellate Order dated 21.11.2025 upholding order dated 07.11.2025 also deserves to be quashed for the same reason.



10. Accordingly, impugned orders dated 07.11.2025 and 21.11.2025 are hereby quashed and set aside. It is left open to Respondents No. 2 and 3 to issue a show cause notice to the College, in case it intends to take any action on the basis of the complaint and/or inspection report. If the show cause notice is issued, Respondents No. 2 and 3 will ensure that all relevant documents on which reliance is placed, including the complaint referred to in order dated 07.11.2025 as also the inspection report aforementioned, shall be furnished to the Petitioners along with the show cause notice. Upon receipt of the show cause notice, College shall reply within two weeks from the date of receipt, whereafter it will be open to Respondents No. 2 and 3 to take a decision after considering the reply and calling upon the Petitioners for hearing, for which time, place and venue will be intimated in advance. The decision taken by Respondents No. 2 and 3 will be communicated to the Petitioners within one week from the date of the decision and needless to state that if the Petitioners are aggrieved, they may take recourse to appropriate legal proceedings.

11. Writ petition is allowed and disposed of along with the pending application, making it clear that Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and all rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

JYOTI SINGH, J

NOVEMBER 28, 2025/YA