

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

2026:PHHC:070752-DB



(273)

CWP-34521-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.05.2026

Haryana Self Finance Private Colleges Association --Petitioner

Versus

Indira Gandhi University (IGU) Meerpur & Ors. --Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA.
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR.

Present:- Mr. Arjun Pratap Atma Ram, Advocate and
 Ms. Shefali Bahia, Advocate for the petitioner.

 Mr. Amit Rao, Advocate for respondent no.1.

 Mr. Nitin Kaushal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

 Mr. Karan S. Gill, Advocate and
 Mr. Aarav S. Gill, Advocate for respondent-NCTE.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA.J (Oral)

1. An affidavit has been filed by the respondent-NCTE on 27.03.2026, wherein it is stated that the inspection proforma annexed as Annexure P-15 with this writ petition, is not an officially approved proforma, relied upon by the NCTE. Since the State was relying upon inspection proforma contained in Annexure P-14, therefore, we called upon the NCTE to clarify the status of inspection proforma contained in Annexure P-14. The following order was passed on 08.04.2026:

“Though an affidavit has been filed in compliance of the earlier order passed by this Court, but after hearing learned counsel for the parties at some length, we deem it appropriate to call upon the respondent-NCTE to file an additional affidavit clearly specifying as to whether the inspection format,

contained in Annexure P-14, has approval of the NCTE or not.

List this case again on 06.05.2026.”

2. Today, learned counsel representing the NCTE on the basis of instructions obtained from the responsible authorities, stated that the assertion made in para 3 of the affidavit dated 27.03.2026 referring to inspection proforma annexed as Annexure P-15, contains an inadvertent error and that it actually refers to Annexure P-14. Categorical stand has been taken that Annexure P-14, relied upon by the State as being the inspection proforma, is not an approved inspection proforma relied upon by the NCTE. Once that be so, we find substance in the grievance raised by the petitioner-Association that the inspection proforma (Annexure P-14) dated 26.07.2024 issued by the Director General, Higher Education, Haryana cannot form the basis of inspection of educational institutions, imparting different educational courses regulated by the NCTE. Learned counsel for the NCTE further states that the inspection format approved by NCTE, is an online system in which various information is to be furnished. Based upon the information furnished in the online format, the inspection is then carried out by the NCTE team. Learned counsel clarifies that infact there are two parallel teams which carry out the inspection, one of which sits at the head office while the other inspection team visits the college and digitally transmits the observations made by it to the head office.

3. Though, learned counsel for the petitioner has also assailed instructions dated 02.07.2020 contained in Annexure P-10 and 08.08.2020 contained in Annexure P-12. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he has no serious difficulty with regard to these instructions and therefore, the prayer made to quash these instructions, is not pressed.

4. So far as the challenge made to the minutes of the university dated 30.03.2022 (Annexure P-18) and the decision dated 25.03.2022 (Annexure P-19), is concerned, learned counsel comes up with a prayer to withdraw such prayers from the present writ petition with liberty to institute separate independent proceedings for challenging it on various grounds.

5. In that view of the matter, the present petition stands disposed of.

6. All the pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

06.05.2026
lucky

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No