



\$~73

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 2038/2026&CM APPL. 9981/2026**
SSM COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONPetitioner
Through: Mr Abhishek Singh, Mrs. Priyanka
Madavaram

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandesh
Nanda, Mr. Shivom Sethi, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

13.02.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:

“a). Quashing of the Minutes of the 453rd Meeting (Volume- III) held by Respondent No. 2 on 11th and 12th December, 2025, whereby the decision has been taken to withdraw the recognition granted to the Petitioner Institution for running the Four-Year B.A. B.Ed. course vide recognition order dated 16.11.2021, on grounds that the said decision is arbitrary, illegal and contemptuous; and

b). A consequential direction to restore the recognition of the Petitioner Institution for the aforesaid Four-Year B.A. B.Ed. course; and/or...”

2. The brief facts of the case are that National Council for Teacher Education (**“NCTE”**) issued public notices inviting applications for recognition of various teacher training courses. Pursuant thereof, the



petitioner submitted its application to the Northern Regional Committee (**“NRC”**) on 19.03.2015 seeking grant of recognition for running B.A. B.Ed./ B.Sc. B.Ed. course.

3. The State Government of Haryana informed NCTE not to entertain the applications seeking recognition for 4 year course B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed and opening of New B.Ed. colleges in the state henceforth and during the years 2016-17 and 2017-18.
4. Being aggrieved by the said decision, the petitioner filed W.P. (C) No. 12753/2018 and vide order dated 18.10.2019 this Court directed respondents to decide petitioner’s application within 12 weeks.
5. However, the officials of respondents did not comply with the same, and the petitioner filed a Contempt Petition (C) No. 269/2021.
6. Pursuant thereof, the respondents’ officials initiated processing petitioner’s application and NRC issued Letter of Intent dated 15.07.2021.
7. This Court taking note of the fact that the respondents issued Letter of Intent to the petitioner, disposed of the contempt petition *vide* Order dated 17.11.2021.
8. Thereafter, NRC in its 351st Meeting held on 28.10.2021 granted recognition to petitioner institute for running 4-year integrated B.A. B.Ed course from academic session 2022-23. A recognition Order dated 16.11.2011 was issued in favour of the petitioner.
9. Thereafter, NRC in its 389th Meeting held on 27.12.2022 took up the matter pertaining to the said course of petitioner institute and initiated proceeding under Section 17 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and issued Show Cause Notice proposing withdrawal of the recognition and observing



that “the recognition was given to these institutions due to compliance of contempt case in the Hon’ble Court”.

10. Being aggrieved by aforesaid show cause notice, the petitioner again filed W.P.(C) 1493/2023 and vide order dated 06.02.2023, the Court stayed the show cause notice.
11. Subsequently, the petitioner submitted its application for transition of B.A. B.Ed 4-year integrated course to Integrated Teacher Education Programme (**“ITEP”**) course.
12. This Court vide order dated 29.11.2024 disposed of the W.P. (C) 1493/2023.
13. NRC after scrutinizing petitioner’s application for transition refused the said application on ground of deficiencies recorded *vide* order dated 17.04.2025.
14. As per NRC Minutes of 453rd Meeting held on 11th – 12th December, 2025, NRC took the impugned decision of withdrawal of recognition of B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed.4 year integrated course under Section 17(1) of NCTE Act, 1993.
15. Hence, the present petition.
16. In the 389th meeting, the respondent observed “the recognition was given to these institutions due to compliance of the contempt case in the High Court.” This is the fountainhead based on which the show cause notice was issued.
17. The recognition was given due to compliance of contempt case. However, Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel for the respondents, states that the respondents have decided not to continue with this course and that is also one of the grounds to withdraw recognition.



18. Additionally, the date of grant of recognition was post the date of the decision of the respondents to scrap the B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed course.
19. However, the same is disputed by Mr. Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners, who states that the course is continuing due to subsequent notifications, including notification dated 06.05.2025.
20. It is also stated by Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel for the respondents, that the petitioner had an equally efficacious remedy under Section 18 of the NCTE Act.
21. However, in similar matters, this court has granted relief to similarly situated petitioners. Hence, I am inclined to allow the petition.
22. I am of the view that the very foundational assumption of the respondents that recognition was given to the institutions due to compliance of contempt case and to subsequently withdraw the recognition to the petitioner institutes is incorrect reasoning.
23. It is assumed that even when a contempt is pending, the respondent(s) would have given recognition after due application of mind and in accordance with applicable procedures and due compliances. It cannot be withdrawn on the ground that recognition was given because “contempt was pending”.
24. Hence, the present petition is allowed and the decision taken by NRC in its 453rd meeting held on 11th and 12th December, 2025 is hereby set aside.
25. The present petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms, along with pending applications, if any.

JASMEET SINGH, J

FEBRUARY 13, 2026/sp