



\$~30, 32 & 33

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

+ W.P.(C) 15781/2025 & CM APPL. 64658/2025

DR. RAM MANOHAR LOHIYA MAHAVIDYALAYA.....Petitioner

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

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra and Ms. Tripta Sharma, Advocates for NCTE.

32

+ W.P.(C) 18353/2025 & CM APPL. 76934/2025

JAMUNA PRASAD MEMORIAL COLLEGEPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior Advocate with Mr. Abhishek Singh, Mr. Karan Chaudhary and Mr. Ayush Anand, Advocates.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra and Ms. Tripta Sharma, Advocates for NCTE.

33

+ W.P.(C) 18679/2025 & CM APPL. 77616/2025

JAMUNA PRASAD MEMORIAL COLLEGEPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior Advocate with Mr. Abhishek Singh, Mr. Karan Chaudhary and Mr. Ayush Anand, Advocates.



versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra and Ms. Tripta Sharma, Advocates for NCTE.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER
24.12.2025

%

W.P.(C) 15781/2025

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 withdrawal order dated 10.09.2025 issued by the Respondent No.2, withdrawing recognition of the B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. courses of petitioner institution, in an arbitrary and illegal manner; and

(b) direction to respondent no.2 to issue order of restoration, thereby restoring recognition of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. courses of the petitioner institution with all the benefits of being a recognised institute; and

(c) consequent direction to respondent no.2 to update its website by displaying the recognised status of petitioner institution in respect of its B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. courses and communicate the same to its affiliating body and the state department of higher education; enabling the petitioner to participate in ongoing counselling and admission process.”

2. Petitioner's case, as set out in the petition is that vide order dated 01.02.2016, Northern Regional Committee ('NRC') granted recognition to the Petitioner institute for running B.Ed. course with an annual intake of 50 seats (1 unit) for academic session 2016-17. By order dated 03.03.2016, recognition was granted for running D.El.Ed. course with an annual intake of 50 seats (1 unit) for the same academic year. NRC issued Corrigendum dated 10.02.2017 stating therein that approved annual intake mentioned in



recognition order dated 03.03.2016 in respect of the Petitioner institution be read as 100 seats (2 units) in place of 50 seats (1 unit).

3. It is stated in the writ petition that before Petitioner could obtain affiliation from affiliating authority for additional intake, Additional Chief Secretary, Government of UP issued a letter dated 24.08.2018 conveying that D.El.Ed. institution were no more required in the State for the next 5 years and hence, Petitioner admitted students in B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. courses in accordance with the intake capacity originally sanctioned and no student was admitted in D.El.Ed. against additional intake pursuant to Corrigendum dated 10.02.2017. At the end of 5 years' restriction, Petitioner sought affiliation for additional intake and vide OM dated 08.01.2025, the concerned affiliating body, granted affiliation for 100 seats (2 units) of D.El.Ed. course from academic session 2024-25 onwards in light of the Corrigendum and Petitioner admitted 100 students of D.El.Ed. course for the said session.

4. It is averred that NRC in its 439th meeting held on 05th and 06th May, 2025 decided to issue show cause notice to the Petitioner under Section 17 of NCTE Act, 1993 and notice was issued on 02.06.2025 alleging that Corrigendum uploaded on the portal of NRC was fake and uploaded with *mala fide* intent. Petitioner submitted its response vide letter dated 25.06.2025 and denied the allegations. In 443rd meeting of NRC, it considered the response of the Petitioner and decided that recognition granted to the institution for B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. courses be withdrawn under Section 17(1) of NCTE Act with effect from the end of academic session next following the date of communication of withdrawal order and that the institution shall not admit students from academic session 2025-26 onwards.



Basis this decision, impugned withdrawal order was issued on 10.09.2025, withdrawing recognition of both the courses.

W.P.(C) 18353/2025

5. By this writ petition, Petitioner seeks the following reliefs:-

“a) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari, quashing and setting aside the decision of the Northern Regional Committee (NRC), NCTE, recorded in its 444th Meeting held on 24th–25th July 2025, along with the consequential withdrawal order dated 10.09.2025, in so far as it withdraws the recognition of the Petitioner’s B.El.Ed. programme granted vide recognition order dated 02.05.2016;

b) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari, quashing the Appellate Order dated 27.11.2025 passed by the Appeal Committee of Respondent No. 1 in Appeal ID APPLNRC202515375,

whereby the Petitioner’s statutory appeal concerning the B.El.Ed. programme has been rejected;

c) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus, directing Respondent No. 2 to restore the Petitioner’s recognition for the B.El.Ed. programme as originally granted on 02.05.2016 and to give effect to such restoration forthwith;

d) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus, directing Respondent No. 2 to issue necessary communication confirming the restoration of the Petitioner’s B.El.Ed. recognition to all concerned authorities, including the affiliating University—Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Rohilkhand University, Bareilly—and the State Government, so that the status of the Petitioner’s B.El.Ed. programme for the current academic session is duly reflected in official records and counselling processes;”

6. Case of the Petitioner is that on consideration of Petitioner’s application dated 28.05.2015, recognition was granted by NRC for B.El.Ed. course with annual intake of 100 seats vide order dated 02.05.2016 for academic session 2016-17. Petitioner conducted the course continuously thereafter, without any break or complaint. In March, 2025, Petitioner received communication dated 03.03.2020, purportedly granting recognition for B.Ed. course under file no. UP-3432 and the envelope containing the



communication was dispatched from Dwarka office of NCTE. The content of the communication was found to be uploaded on the official website of NCTE under 'Recognised Institutions'. Petitioner had no role in either issuing or uploading of this communication and it never admitted any student in the B.Ed. course. Show cause notice was issued by NRC on 02.06.2025, alleging that B.Ed. recognition order was fake and calling upon the Petitioner to explain why recognition for B.El.Ed. (100 seats) and other courses be not withdrawn. In its 444th meeting NRC resolved to withdraw the recognition for B.El.Ed. course without any adverse material against the Petitioner regarding this programme. Petitioner submitted a detailed reply on 28.08.2025 enclosing all documents including postal envelope, website screenshots, etc., and undertook not to proceed with any B.Ed. admission. However, withdrawal order was issued on 10.09.2025 withdrawing recognition of the institution for D.El.Ed., D.El.Ed. additional intake and B.El.Ed. courses. Statutory appeal was filed by the Petitioner on 30.08.2025 under Section 18 of NCTE Act, 1993 against the decision of withdrawal. Appeal Committee sought a comprehensive affidavit from the Petitioner with narrative of facts and supporting material, which the Petitioner gave on 19.11.2025. Final order was passed in the appeal on 27.11.2025, whereby the appeal relating to B.El.Ed. course was rejected without identifying any statutory contravention by the Petitioner and/or without any cogent material establishing that the alleged communication dated 03.03.2020 was fake or that Petitioner had any role in issuing/uploading the same.

W.P.(C) 18679/2025

7. This writ petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner seeking the following reliefs:-



“a) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, quashing and setting aside the decision of the Northern Regional Committee (NRC), NCTE, recorded in its 444th Meeting held on 24th–25th July 2025, along with the consequential withdrawal order dated 10.09.2025, insofar as it withdraws the recognition of the Petitioner’s D.El.Ed. programme granted vide recognition order dated 31.08.2012 and Recognition for Additional intake to D.El.Ed. granted on 02.05.2016;

b) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, quashing the Appellate Committee Order dated 27.11.2025 passed by the Appeal Committee of Respondent No. 1 in Appeal ID APPLNRC202515374, whereby the Petitioner’s statutory appeal against the withdrawal of recognition for D.El.Ed. course and D.El.Ed. (Additional intake) has been rejected;

c) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, directing Respondent No. 2 to restore the Petitioner’s recognition for the D.El.Ed. course granted vide Recognition Order dated 31.08.2012, and further to restore the recognition for the D.El.Ed. (Additional Intake) granted vide Order dated 02.05.2016. and

d) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, directing that the Petitioner–Institution be permitted to participate in the counselling process and admit students to the D.El.Ed. course [for the recognized intake] for the academic year 2025–2026 and/or all subsequent academic years.

e) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, directing Respondent No. 2 to issue the requisite communication regarding the restoration of the Petitioner’s recognition for the D.El.Ed. course and the D.El.Ed. (Additional Intake) to the concerned State authorities and the affiliating University, in accordance with the NCTE Act, 1993 and the NCTE Regulations, 2014.”

8. Petitioner avers that on 31.08.2012, NRC granted recognition to the Petitioner institute for D.El.Ed. (50 seats) programme effective from academic session 2012-13 and the course was conducted without any complaint. On 02.05.2016, NRC granted additional intake of 50 seats for D.El.Ed. course for academic session 2016-17. In its 444th meeting, NRC resolved to withdraw recognition for D.El.Ed. course for 50 seats granted initially as also for additional intake for the same course, owing to an



allegation that the B.Ed. recognition order dated 03.03.2020 was fake. Statutory appeal under Section 18 of NCTE Act was rejected against withdrawal order dated 10.09.2025, withdrawing recognition for D.El.Ed., D.El.Ed. additional intake and B.El.Ed. courses.

9. Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioners submits that recognitions granted to the Petitioners have been illegally and arbitrarily withdrawn merely on the basis of allegations that the recognition orders in respect of D.El.Ed. course (additional intake of 50 seats) in W.P.(C) 15781/2025 and in respect of B.Ed. course in W.P.(C) Nos. 18353/2025 and 18679/2025 were fake, whereas the documents are found uploaded on the official website of NCTE even today. No inquiry has been conducted by NCTE till date to find out the genuineness of the documents and/or who issued/uploaded the allegedly fake documents. Therefore, the allegation that the documents are fake/forged is only a speculation and on mere presumptions and speculations, recognition of institutions cannot be withdrawn and that too for courses in respect of which there are no allegations and recognitions were validly granted. It is further urged that a Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Maa Sharda Vidyapeeth v. National Council for Teacher Education and Another, 2025 SCC OnLine Del 5683***, while examining an identical issue and holding that the withdrawal of recognition was in excess of the allegations in the show cause notice also delved into what consequential relief could be granted to the Petitioner therein and directed that recognition granted for the course in respect to which there was no dispute/allegation will be restored and Petitioner will be permitted to participate in the ongoing counselling for academic session 2025-26 and similar relief be granted to the Petitioners herein on parity.



10. Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, learned counsel for the Respondents does not dispute that till date, no inquiry/investigation has been initiated to ascertain the genuineness of the certificates of recognition, alleged to be fake/forged or to establish that Petitioners had any role in issuing/uploading the documents. He also does not dispute that in identical circumstances in ***Maa Sharda Vidyapeeth (supra)***, Court has directed the Respondents to restore the recognition of the Petitioner therein in respect of the course for which there was no dispute/allegation.

11. I have learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioners and counsel for the Respondents. Owing to similitude in the issues involved in the three writ petitions, they were taken up for hearing together and are being disposed of by this common order, with the consent of the parties.

12. Indisputably, in W.P.(C) 15781/2025, Petitioner was granted recognition for running B.Ed. course with annual intake of 50 seats as also for D.El.Ed. course with an annual intake of 50 seats for the same academic year. The dispute is in relation to additional intake of 50 seats for D.El.Ed. course in light of Corrigendum dated 10.02.2017, which is alleged to be fake. Insofar as W.P.(C) 18353/2025 is concerned, Petitioner was granted recognition for B.El.Ed. course with annual intake of 100 seats vide order dated 02.05.2016 and the dispute/allegation is with regard to B.Ed. course inasmuch as the recognition order dated 03.03.2020 is stated to be fake by the Respondents. Same position obtains in W.P.(C) 18679/2025 with respect to B.Ed. course, while there is no allegation of forgery with regard to recognition for D.El.Ed. course for 100 seats. It is equally undisputed that till date Respondents have taken no initiative to inquire/investigate into the genuineness of documents of recognition which are purportedly fake/forged



and therefore, the allegations have remained allegations only and significantly, role of the Petitioners in issuing the said documents or uploading them on NCTE's portal is far from established till date. In these circumstances, Respondents cannot be permitted to withdraw recognitions validly granted in respect of courses *qua* which there are no allegations, on mere speculations. In fact, it is intriguing as to why no investigation has been conducted by Respondents till date if they were serious in alleging that some of the recognition orders were not genuine, as rightly flagged by Mr. Sharawat.

13. Learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioners is also right in his submission that cases of the Petitioners are covered on all four corners by the judgment of this Court in ***Maa Sharda Vidyapeeth (supra)***. Reading of the judgment shows that NRC withdrew the recognition granted to the Petitioner basis an allegation that a fake Corrigendum order was uploaded reflecting an increase in the intake capacity from 50 to 100 students for the B.Ed. course. No enquiry was conducted to establish and prove that the document was fake/forged and the allegations of forgery did not form part of the show cause notice issued to the Petitioner. *Albeit* the impugned order withdrawing the recognition was quashed on the ground that the decision taken therein was in excess of the allegations in the show cause notice, the Court also examined whether recognition could be withdrawn for the course in respect of which there was no allegation and answered the question by agreeing with the Petitioner that since there was no dispute with regard to recognition granted for 1 unit of 50 seats, the recognition should be restored to that extent and Petitioner be permitted to participate in the ongoing counselling. On a parity of reasoning, I see no reason to accord a different



treatment to the Petitioners herein, who are similarly placed to this extent. It bears repetition to state that in W.P.(C) 15781/2025, there is no dispute with regard to B.Ed. course with annual intake of 50 seats and D.El.Ed. course with annual intake of 50 seats. Likewise, in W.P.(C) 18353/2025 there is no dispute with respect to B.El.Ed. course with annual intake of 100 seats and in W.P.(C) 18679/2025 for D.El.Ed. course with 100 seats. Petitioners have already undertaken before the NRC and the Appellate Committees that they shall not admit students for courses in respect of which the recognition orders are alleged to be fake though even today it is the categorical stand of the Petitioners that these documents were neither prepared nor uploaded by them on the official website of NCTE. It cannot be overlooked that till date it is questionable whether these documents are fake/forged.

14. Accordingly, these writ petitions are allowed to the extent of quashing the withdrawal orders dated 10.09.2025 in all the three writ petitions. Respondents are directed to pass consequential orders for restoration of recognition of the Petitioners' institutes for courses aforementioned, in respect of which there are no allegations. Further direction is issued to the Respondents to include the Petitioners in the ongoing counselling for academic session 2025-26 for the undisputed courses for which NCTE shall issue necessary Public Notice and update the status of the Petitioners on its official website intimating all concerned including State authority, affiliating body and counselling authorities that Petitioners have been permitted to participate in counselling and admit students for academic session 2025-26. The needful shall be done within three days from today.

15. It is, however, made clear that this order will not preclude the concerned authorities to initiate investigation/inquiry and/or any other legal



action in respect of the documents purportedly fake or forged, in accordance with law.

16. Writ petitions stand disposed of along with pending applications.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 24, 2025/AK/YA