



\$~110

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

+ **W.P.(C) 18707/2025**

MALVIYA SMRITI ACADEMY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Akhilesh K. Srivastava, Mr. Rishabh Kumar, Ms. Rajnandini Chaturvedi and Ms. Ritu Kumari, 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 Respondents.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

% **09.12.2025**

CM APPL. 77804/2025 (Exemption)

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

W.P.(C) 18707/2025 & CM APPL. 77803/2025

3. This writ petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India laying a challenge to withdrawal order dated 26.03.2025 issued by the Respondents, whereby recognition of the Petitioner for D.El.Ed Course with annual intake of 50 students has been withdrawn.
4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the impugned order is erroneous and arbitrary on the face of it inasmuch as it is predicated on an



assumption that Petitioner did not submit its reply to the final show cause notice dated 09.05.2024, whereas Petitioner had responded to the show cause notice vide reply dated 22.05.2024, copy of which is appended to the writ petition along with a document indicating receipt of the reply in the office of NCTE on 22.05.2024.

5. Issue notice.

6. Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondents.

7. After hearing counsel for the Petitioner and on perusal of page 32 of the writ petition, which reflects that the reply filed by the Petitioner to final show cause notice dated 09.05.2024 was received in the office of NCTE, Dwarka, I am of the view that the finding in the impugned withdrawal order that the institution did not submit its reply to the show cause notice is factually incorrect. It goes without saying that the impugned order has been passed without taking into consideration the response of the Petitioner and deserves to be set aside on this short ground, being violative of principles of natural justice.

8. Accordingly, this writ petition is allowed to the extent of quashing the withdrawal order dated 26.03.2025 on the limited ground that it was passed without taking into consideration the reply of the Petitioner. This will not preclude the Respondents from taking a fresh decision after considering the reply and if necessary, calling upon the Petitioner for a hearing. If a fresh decision is taken, a reasoned and speaking order shall be passed and will be communicated to the Petitioner within one week from the date of the decision and Petitioner will be at liberty to take recourse to appropriate remedies, if aggrieved.



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

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 9, 2025

S.Sharma