



\$~95

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 1059/2026 & CM APPL. 5110/2026

SKS COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Manish Adv., Mr. Ravi
Kant Adv Mr. Vineet Upadhyay, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Shivom Sethi,
Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

%

27.01.2026

1. This writ petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:

*“a) quash the Refusal Order dated 22.08.2025 issued by the Respondent No.2, whereby it has refused the Application of the Petitioner Institution submitted for recognition of Integrated Teacher Education Programme, for Academic Session 2026-27; without following the mandatory procedure; and
(b) direct the Respondent No.2 to restore, reconsider & decide the application of the petitioner institution, submitted for recognition of Integrated Teacher Education Programme, for the academic session 2026-27; within the reasonable time and also in accordance with the provisions made therefor; ...”*

2. In the present case, the petitioner lays a challenge to refusal order dated 22.08.2025 issued by respondent No. 2, whereby application of the petitioner for recognition of ITEP course has been refused.



3. Issue notice.
4. Mr. Anuj Kapoor, learned counsel for the Respondents accepts notice.
5. This order is being passed in view of a similar order dated 01.12.2025 passed in W.P.(C) 18213/2025, covering the present issue. Based upon the said order and using the same reasons and expressions, this order is being passed.
6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned order has been passed without following the procedure laid down in Proviso to sub-Section (3)(b) of Section 14 of The National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 ('NCTE Act'), which provides that before passing any order under sub-Clause (b), the Regional Committee shall provide a reasonable opportunity to the concerned institution for making a written representation. It is urged that at this stage, the Petitioner will be satisfied if a direction is issued to the Respondents to issue a show cause notice and give an opportunity to the Petitioner to make a representation.
7. Learned counsel for the Respondents, on instructions, submits that the impugned order does not reflect that opportunity was afforded to the Petitioner to represent before the impugned order was passed, which is a mandate of Section 14(3)(b).
8. There is no gainsaying that any order that visits a person or an entity with civil consequences must pass muster of compliance with principles of natural justice. Petitioner applied on 31.05.2025 for recognition of its four years Integrated Teacher Education Programme, pursuant to NCTE Public Notice dated 06.05.2025. The application was considered by the Regional Committee in its 444th Meeting held on 25.07.2025, wherein a decision was taken to reject the application. Perusal of the refusal order dated 22.08.2025



does not indicate compliance of Proviso to sub-Section (3)(b) of Section 14 of NCTE Act. Clearly, the impugned order is in violation of the mandatory statutory provision and cannot be sustained on this short ground.

9. Accordingly, without going into the merits of the case, this writ petition is allowed to a limited extent of setting aside impugned order dated 22.08.2025 on the ground that it was passed without affording reasonable opportunity to the Petitioner to make a written representation. It will be open to the Respondents to issue a show cause notice to the Petitioner pointing out the deficiencies/objections, if any and calling upon the Petitioner to respond to the same. Petitioner shall submit a written representation/reply to the show cause notice within two weeks from the date of receipt and after considering the representation/reply, Respondents shall pass a fresh order, in accordance with law, within a period of two weeks thereafter. In case the Petitioner is aggrieved by the decision, it will be at liberty to take recourse to legal remedies.

10. Writ petition stands disposed of making it clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

JASMEET SINGH, J

JANUARY 27, 2026/AS