



\$~49

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **LPA 71/2026, CM Nos.10413/2026 & 10415/2026**
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER
EDUCATION AND ANR.Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Ms. Shivom Sethi,
Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Mr. Puneet
Kumar & Mr. Adhish Saxena,
Advocates.

Versus

BANSUR MAHAVIDHYALAYA & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Trideep Pais, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Sahil Ghai, Mr. Anuj Kishore
Saxena, Mr. Aekansh Agarwal, Ms.
Saloni Ambastha & Ms. Sakshi Jain,
Advocates for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **16.02.2026**

CM Nos.10414/2026 & 10416/2026 (both for exemption)

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The Applications stand disposed of.

LPA 71/2026

3. Heard the learned Counsel for the Parties.
4. The Appellants have filed the present Appeal to assail the order dated 12.01.2026 ("**Impugned Order**") passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C) No.19683/2025 ("**Writ Petition**") filed by the Respondent No.1- Institution whereby the Writ Petition has been allowed and a direction has been issued to the Appellants that the application dated 05.03.2024 submitted by the Respondent No.1- Institution be decided expeditiously and in any case

LPA 71/2026

Page 1 of 5



before 31.03.2026. The learned Single Judge has further directed that the said application shall be decided on merits and after hearing the Respondent No.1-Institution.

5. The prayer made in the Writ Petition was that a direction be issued to the Appellants to open its online web portal, allow submission of online application and to accept such application submitted by the Respondent No.1-Institution for transition from 4 year Integrated BA/B.Sc.-B.Ed. to 4 year Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) under National Education Policy, 2020 and in the alternate, to accept such application in physical form.

6. For appreciating the prayer made in the Writ Petition, we need to take note of the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 issued by the Appellants for operating of its portal for providing final opportunity to the existing Institutions offering 4-year integrated B.Sc., B.Ed./B.A. B.Ed. courses to apply afresh for transition into 4-year ITEP course. The said Public Notice also mentions a provision inserted in Appendix-15 of National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations 2014 which provides for a provision for transition to ITEP. Prior to the said Public Notice dated 12.09.2025, Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 providing for transition to ITEP was issued. Whereafter on certain representations, a decision was taken by the Appellants to accord final opportunity to the Institutions seeking transition by giving an opportunity to apply afresh online on the portal of the Appellants. It was further provided that those institutions which have earlier submitted application seeking transition in response to Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 may be exempted from making payment of processing fee subject to specifying / mentioning the registration number of the earlier application submitted.



7. The Respondent No.1- Institution had made application on 05.03.2024 pursuant to the earlier Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 and thus according to the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025, it was not exempted from applying afresh; the only exemption available to the Respondent No.1- Institution was that it would be exempted from making payment of processing fee. The last date of submission of the application pursuant to the latter Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 was 05.10.2025.

8. The Respondent No.1- Institution has not challenged the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 requiring all Institutions seeking transition to apply afresh. Admittedly, the Respondent No.1- Institution did not submit its application pursuant to the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 prior to the last date i.e. prior to 05.10.2025.

9. With the assertions that certain technical glitches were noticed by the Respondent No.1- Institution while submitting their application pursuant to the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025, the Writ Petition was filed as the Respondent No.1- Institution sought liberty to make its application after closure of the portal on the last date of submission of the application, i.e., after 05.10.2025. The prayer in the Writ Petition, as already noticed, was confined only to allow the Respondent No.1- Institution to submit an online application or to accept such application physically, after 05.10.2025 which was the last date in terms of the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025.

10. However, what we notice from the order impugned in this Appeal is that the learned Single Judge, without considering the prayer and the context in which the prayer was made in the Writ Petition, has allowed the Writ Petition and has gone into the extent of directing the Appellants to consider the application made by the Respondent No.1- Institution not pursuant to the



Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 but pursuant to the earlier Public Notice dated 05.02.2024. We may note that the need for issuing subsequent Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 had arisen after the process pursuant to earlier Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 was completed for the reason that several representations were received from the institutions seeking their transition to ITEP. We have already noticed that Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 did not exempt any institution from applying afresh. The only exemption provided therein is that those Institutions which had applied pursuant to the Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 would be exempted from depositing the processing fees. In the aforesaid view of the matter, we are of the opinion that the prayer granted in the Writ Petition by the learned Single Judge exceeds the scope of Writ Petition itself.

11. At this juncture, the learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent No.1- Institution has attempted to impress upon this Court that pursuant to the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025, the Respondent No.1 Institution could not make its application for the reason that while attempting to make the application, the Respondent Institution faced certain technical glitches. The said fact has been denied by the Appellants. Be that as it may, there is no adjudication on the said issue, as raised by the learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent No.1- Institution in the order passed by learned Single Judge which is under challenge herein.

12. In view of the aforesaid, we allow the present Appeal and set aside the Impugned Order dated 12.01.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C) No.19683/2025. The Writ Petition is restored to its original number, which shall be decided expeditiously in accordance with law. We also direct completion of pleadings by the Parties within six weeks.



13. Needless to say, all rights and contentions of the Parties are kept open to be pleaded before the learned Single Judge.

14. The Appeal as well as the pending applications stand disposed of. No order as to costs.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

FEBRUARY 16, 2026
'gsr'