



\$~98

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 780/2026 & CM APPL. 3883/2026**
SONIA MAHILA MAHAVIDYALAYA (D.EL.ED)

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Brijendra Singh Advocate

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

% **29.01.2026**

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 respondentNo.2, withdrawing recognition of the 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 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 and communicate the same to its affiliating body



and the state department of higher education; enabling the petitioner to participate in ongoing counseling and admission process.”

2. This order is being passed in view of a similar order dated 24.12.2025 passed in W.P.(C) 15781/2025, covering the present issue. Based upon the said order and using the same reasons and expressions, this order is being passed.
3. The facts of the present case are that *vide* order dated 26.10.2016, Northern Regional Committee (“**NRC**”) granted recognition to the petitioner institute for running D.El.Ed. course with an annual intake of 50 seats (1 unit) for academic session 2017-18. NRC issued Corrigendum dated 05.12.2016 stating therein that approved annual intake mentioned in recognition order dated 26.10.2016 in respect of the petitioner institution be read as 100 seats (2 units) in place of 50 seats (1 unit).
4. Before the 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. institutions were no more required in the State for the next 5 years and hence, the petitioner admitted students in 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 05.12.2016. At the end of 5 years’ restriction, the petitioner sought affiliation for additional intake and *vide* office memo 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 the petitioner admitted 100 students of D.El.Ed. course for the said session.

5. The 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. The 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 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 the course.
6. Mr. Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that recognitions granted to the petitioner 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) 780/2026 and was 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 the petitioner will be permitted to participate in the ongoing counselling for academic session 2025-26 and similar relief be granted to the petitioner herein on parity.

7. Mr. Rupal, learned counsel for the respondents, 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.
8. Indisputably, in the present case, the petitioner was granted recognition for running D.El.Ed. course with annual intake of 50 seats for academic year 2017-18. 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. It is equally undisputed that till date the 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 petitioner in issuing the said documents or uploading them on NCTE's portal is far from established till date. In these circumstances, the 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. Singh, learned counsel.

9. Reliance on ***Maa Sharda Vidyapeeth (supra)*** is well placed. 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 D.El.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 petitioner herein, who



is similarly placed to this extent. It bears repetition to state that in W.P.(C) 780/2026, there is no dispute with regard to D.El.Ed. course with annual intake of 50 seats. The petitioner has 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 petitioner 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.

10. Accordingly, this writ petition is 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 petitioner institute for courses aforementioned, in respect of which there are no allegations. Further direction is issued to the respondents to include the petitioner 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 petitioner on its official website intimating all concerned including State authority, affiliating body and counselling authorities that petitioner 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.
11. 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.

12. The petition is disposed of along with pending applications, if any.

JANUARY 29, 2026 / (MS)

JASMEET SINGH, J