



\$~6

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 3315/2026 & CM APPL. 16024/2026

SMT RUKMA DEVI MAHILA SHIKSHAK PRASHIKSHAN
MAHAVIDYALAYA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti
Kumari, Mr. Pankaj Kumar Ray,
Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondents

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

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

20.03.2026

%

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

“a) issue a writ of certiorari or any other suitable writ or order quashing & setting aside the impugned withdrawal order dated 10.07.2025 of western regional committee (WRC); and/or

b) issue a writ of certiorari or any other suitable writ or order quashing & setting aside the impugned order dated



*23.01.2026 passed by Appellate Authority of NCTE; and/or
c) issue a writ of mandamus or any other suitable writ,
order or direction to respondents to issue order of
restoration of recognition of B.Ed course with intake of 100
seats (two basic units) and to include the name of petitioner
institution in the list/category of recognised institutions for
conducting B.Ed. course on their website and to inform the
Affiliating University and the Department of Higher
Education, Government of Rajasthan regarding recognized
status of petitioner institution enabling inclusion and
participation in the counselling & admission process for
B.Ed. course; and/or...”*

2. By virtue of the petition, the petitioners challenge the withdrawal order 10.07.2025 and the order dated 23.01.2026 passed by the appellate authority of NCTE.
3. It is the case of the petitioner that the order of the appellate authority committee has been passed without hearing the petitioners and the same is violative of principles of natural justice and Rule No. 11 of NCTE Rules, 1997.
4. Mr. Kapoor, learned standing counsel for the respondents, states that in the present case, though the second notice was issued on 16.12.2025 for hearing on 17.12.2025, he concedes that the 24 hours notice, is too short a notice.
5. I am of the view that a 24 hours notice is insufficient for the petitioners to prepare for arguments before the appellate authority and for a proper hearing. A reasonable time is required to prepare for such



a hearing and such reasonable time forms an integral part of principles of natural justice. Consequently, the order dated 23.01.2026 is set aside for the aforesaid reasons.

6. The appellate authority shall give at least 7 days notice to the petitioners, grant a personal hearing and thereafter shall pass a reasoned order dealing with each and every contention of the petitioners.
7. In the meantime, the stay order dated 11.08.2025 passed in W.P. (C) 11998/2025 shall continue till the final decision of the appellate authority is passed and for a period of one week thereafter.
8. No opinion has been expressed on the merits/ demerits of the case.
9. The petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MARCH 20, 2026/sp