IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No. 5084 of 2026

Decided on: 27.04.2026

M/s A-One Educational Society **…..Petitioner**

Versus

National Council for Teacher Education **.....Respondent**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioner: Mr. Janak Raj and Mr. Abhinav Mehta, Advocates.

For the Respondent: Mr. B. Nandan Vashist, Advocate.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. B. Nandan Vashist, learned Counsel appears and waives service of notice on behalf of respondent.

Considering the grievance of the petitioner and the order being passed hereinafter, there is no necessity to call for reply of the respondent. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, matter has been heard at this stage.

2. The case of the petitioner is that it had applied on 26.06.2008 for running D.Ed/J.B.T course in their institute

[1]Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.

as per applicable rules and regulations to respondent. Keeping in view respondent's reply dated 18.07.2008, the petitioner statedly complied the codal formalities and sent its communication to respondent on 26.08.2008. The petitioner also submitted the approved building plan to respondent on 03.02.2009. Some of the requisite documents were reportedly supplied by the petitioner to respondent on 30.04.2009. The respondent thereafter is stated to have issued inspection order. The Inspection Team raised certain objections. According to the petitioner, the petitioner had furnished demand draft of ₹40,000/- and applied for re-inspection on 18.11.2009 (Annexure P-6). It is the case of the petitioner that it had thereafter repeatedly sent reminders as enclosed alongwith the writ petition (Annexure P-7; colly), however, there has been no response from the respondent. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner would be satisfied in case the respondent is directed to take a call on the above communications of the petitioner. This is not objected to by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent.

3. Having regard to above submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of with direction to the respondent to

consider and pass appropriate order on Annexure P-6 and Annexure P-7; colly in accordance with law within a period of six weeks. The decision so arrived at shall also be communicated to the petitioner.

The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

April 27, 2026
yogesh