



\$~71,28-30,32,33,50,57,59,64,65,68,70-73,75,85-87,89-96,
106,108,110,124,125

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of decision: 29.05.2026

+ W.P.(C) 4860/2026& CM APPL. 23901/2026, CM APPL.23902/2026
VISION COLLEGE OF TEACHERS TRAININGPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv Mr.
Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayish Aanand Adv
Mr. Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR

.....Respondents

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

28

+ W.P.(C) 7747/2026
GYAYAK T.T. COLLEGEPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

29

+ W.P.(C) 7767/2026
HUKUM CHAND NOBLE INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND
TECHNOLOGYPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.



Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

30

+

W.P.(C) 7771/2026

RAJASTHAN T.T. COLLEGE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR

.....Respondent

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

32

+

W.P.(C) 7791/2026

GANPATI MAHILA MAHAVIDHYALAYA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

33

+

W.P.(C) 7799/2026

RAMSWAROOP AGRAWAL TEACHERS TRAINING COLLEGE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv



versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR
.....Respondent

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

50

+ W.P.(C) 7818/2026

MJRP COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR
.....Respondent

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

57

+ W.P.(C) 7855/2026

NIRMAL TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE & ANR. ...Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.
.....Respondent

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

59

+ W.P.(C) 7878/2026

BHARTI MAHILA MAHAVIDYALAYAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand



- Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
versus
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.
.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Shivom Sethi,
Mr. Nandeesh Nanda Adv.
- 64
+ W.P.(C) 7911/2026
MAHATMA GANDHI INTERNATIONAL GIRLS COLLEGE
.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
versus
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.
.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Shivom Sethi,
Mr. Nandeesh Nanda Adv.
- 65
+ W.P.(C) 7926/2026
ADITYA COLLEGE
.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
versus
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.
.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Shivom Sethi,
Mr. Nandeesh Nanda Adv.
- 68
+ W.P.(C) 6445/2026
KULDEEPAK COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & ANR.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv



Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

70

+

W.P.(C) 6483/2026

MAA SHARDA MAHAVIDHYALAYA & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

72

+

W.P.(C) 6409/2026

B T INSTITUTE OF EXCELLENCE & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

73

+

W.P.(C) 6511/2026

VIJYASHREE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE & ANR. ...Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv



Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

75

+

W.P.(C) 7512/2026

ADARSH SHIKSHA MAHAVIDHYALAYA & ANR. ...Petitioner

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

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

85

+

W.P.(C) 7599/2026

VARDMAN TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE & ANR.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

86

+

W.P.(C) 7607/2026

SORABH COLLEGE OF TEACHER TRAINING & ANR.

.....Petitioner



Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

87

+ W.P.(C) 7617/2026

SORABH COLLEGE OF TEACHER TRAINING & ANR.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

89

+ W.P.(C) 7627/2026

ORIENTAL B ED COLLEGE & ANR.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent



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

90

+ W.P.(C) 7631/2026
CHOUDHARY A R COLLEGE & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

....Respondent

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

91

+ W.P.(C) 7661/2026
BHASKAR KANAYA P G MAHAVIDALAYA & ANR.

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari & Mr.
Pankaj Kumar Ray, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

....Respondent

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

92

+ W.P.(C) 7701/2026
B D MEMORIAL KALYAN SANSTHANPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv



versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR

.....Respondent

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

93

+

W.P.(C) 7704/2026

SHRI ONKAR SINGH MEMORIAL WOMENS TEACHERS
TRAINING COLLEGE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR

.....Respondent

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

94

+

W.P.(C) 7706/2026

SAMBAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR

.....Respondent

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

95

+

W.P.(C) 7719/2026

AKASHDEEP PG GIRLS COLLEGE & ANR.

.....Petitioner

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

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION..Respondent



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

96

+

W.P.(C) 7938/2026

SHRI G.D. KISSAN B.ED. COLLEGE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

106

+

W.P.(C) 7964/2026

SHRI KRISHNA TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGEPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

108

+

W.P.(C) 7968/2026

SARASWATI GIRLS COLLEGE, MANOHARPURPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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



110

+

W.P.(C) 7971/2026

MANAV P.G. MAHAVIDYALAYA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

124

+

W.P.(C) 7737/2026

MAHARAJA AGRASEN TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR

.....Respondent

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

125

+

W.P.(C) 7739/2026

SHRI KANIRAM COLLEGE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat Sr. Adv with
Mr. Mayank Manish Adv Mr. Ravi Kant Adv
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay Adv Mr. Ayush Aanand
Adv Jayant Dubey Adv

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR

.....Respondent

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



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

JASMEET SINGH, J. (ORAL)

W.P.(C) 4860/2026

1. The facts of this writ petition are being treated as the lead petition.
2. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:-

“(a) quash the Refusal Order dated 11.03.2026 issued by the Respondent No.2, whereby it has refused the application submitted by Petitioner Institution for transition of its B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. course to Integrated Teacher Education Programme, for the Academic Session 2026-27; in an arbitrary and illegal manner; and

(b) direct the Respondent no.2 to restore, reconsider and decide the aforesaid application of the Petitioner Institution, submitted for transition of its B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. course to Integrated Teacher Education Programme, for ensuing academic session; in accordance with provisions made therefor, as also, in a reasonable time...”

3. In the present matter, the notice was issued vide order dated 13.04.2026 and yet, no reply has been filed on behalf of respondents.
4. However, since there is urgency in the matter, the petition is taken up for hearing.
5. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner is a running institution and is seeking transition to the 4-year ITEP course. After the first



round of litigation, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the petitioner on 19.12.2025 pointing out 5 deficiencies. Subsequently, the petitioner responded to the said Show Cause Notice within stipulated time and thereafter, another Show Cause Notice was issued on 03.02.2026 pointing out additional 27 deficiencies. The same was also responded to on 10.02.2026. Thereafter, the impugned refusal order was passed on 11.03.2026 refusing transition.

6. Hence, the present petition.
7. Mr. Sharawat, learned senior counsel for the petitioner, states that in the present case, the petitioner has deposited application fee and is only seeking inspection of the petitioner institute. The deficiencies as pointed out in the 2 Show Cause Notices as well as in the impugned refusal orders have been passed without inspecting the petitioner institution, which is contrary to the National Council For Teacher Education (“**NCTE**”) Regulations.
8. Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel for respondents, states that in the present case, the petitioner has an equally efficacious remedy of approaching the appellate forum. He further places reliance upon the Scheme of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 as well as the Standard Operating Procedure (“**SOP**”) governing processing of applications. The regulatory framework itself contemplates issuance of two separate Show Cause Notices at distinct stages of scrutiny and therefore the argument that both Show Cause Notices must be identical or cannot contain different grounds is wholly misconceived. He states that the first Show Cause Notice is issued at the stage of preliminary scrutiny and maintainability,



particularly to determine whether the applicant institution satisfies the threshold eligibility requirements, including compliance with the requirement of being a Multidisciplinary Institution (“MDI”). Thereafter, upon consideration of documents and materials placed on record, a second Show Cause Notice may be issued containing further deficiencies or grounds arising during substantive scrutiny of the application. In this regard, the SOP of the NCTE was specifically relied upon to demonstrate that the Council possesses the power and authority to undertake preliminary scrutiny and form a *prima facie* satisfaction regarding eligibility before directing inspection. It was argued that inspection is not an automatic or mechanical exercise and can be undertaken only where the Council is *prima facie* satisfied that the institution fulfills the threshold requirements under the Regulations. Reliance was also placed upon Regulation No. 7(7) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, which provides that the Regional Committee may decide the matter either on the recommendations of the State Government or “on its own merits.” It was submitted that the expression “on its own merits” necessarily implies that the NCTE is empowered to independently scrutinize the application and assess whether the institution satisfies the essential eligibility conditions before proceeding further, including before ordering inspection. It was further argued that the SOP and Regulations operate harmoniously and specifically contemplate a two-stage scrutiny mechanism involving separate Show Cause Notices. Accordingly, the mere fact that the second Show Cause Notice contains additional or more detailed grounds cannot by itself



invalidate the proceedings. Further submissions were advanced that the petitioners have an efficacious statutory remedy by way of appeal under Section 18 of the NCTE Act and that the Hon'ble Court, in exercise of writ jurisdiction, ought not to undertake factual examination regarding veracity of documents or grant transitional relief bypassing the statutory appellate mechanism. It was also submitted on behalf of the NCTE that the validity of the refusal order must be independently assessed and that any alleged infirmity in the Show Cause Notices does not ipso facto render the refusal order invalid, particularly where the grounds forming the basis of refusal are otherwise sustainable on merits.

9. I have heard learned counsels for the parties.
10. As regards the question of equally efficacious remedy is concerned, there is merit in the submission that the Show Cause Notices itself are contrary to the NCTE Regulations.
11. Regulation No. 7 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 reads as under:-



7. Processing of applications.--

(1) In case an application is not complete, or requisite documents are not attached with the application, the application shall be treated: incomplete and rejected, and application fees paid shall be forfeited.

(2) The application shall be summarily rejected under one or more of the following circumstance--

(a) failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the National Council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 on or before the date of submission of online application;

(b) failure to submit print out of the applications made online alongwith the land documents as required under sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 within fifteen days of the submission of the online application.

(3) Furnishing any false information or concealment of facts in the application, which may have bearing on the decision making process or the decision pertaining to grant of recognition, shall result in refusal of recognition of the institution besides other legal action against its management. The order of refusal of recognition shall be passed after giving reasonable opportunity through a show cause notice to the institution.

(4) A written communication alongwith a copy of the application form submitted by the institution shall be sent by the office of Regional Committee to the State Government or the Union territory administration and the affiliating body concerned within thirty days from the receipt of application, in chronological order of the receipt of the original application in the Regional Committee.

(5) On receipt of the communication, the State Government or the Union territory administration concerned shall furnish its recommendations or comments to the Regional Committee concerned within forty five days from the date of issue of the letter to the State Government or Union territory, as the case may be. In case, the State Government or Union Territory Administration is not in favour of recognition, it shall provide detailed reasons or grounds thereof with necessary statistics, which shall be taken into consideration by the Regional Committee concerned while disposing of the application.

(6) If the recommendation of the State Government is not received within the aforesaid



period, the Regional Committee concerned shall send a reminder to the State Government providing further time of another thirty days to furnish their comments on the proposal. In case no reply is received, a second reminder shall be given for furnishing recommendation within fifteen days from the issue of such second reminder. In case no reply is received from the State Government within aforesaid period the Regional Committee shall process and decide the case on merits and placing the application before the Regional Committee shall not be deferred on account of non-receipt of comments or recommendation of the State Government.

(7) After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decide that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course. In case of open and distance learning programmes, sampled study centres shall be inspected. Inspection shall not be subject to the consent of the institution, rather the decision of the Regional Committee to cause the inspection shall be communicated to the institution with the direction that the inspection shall be caused on any day after ten days from the date of communication by the Regional Office. The Regional Committee shall ensure that inspection is conducted ordinarily within thirty days from the date of its communication to the institution. The institution shall be required to provide details about the infrastructure and other preparedness on the specified proforma available on the website of the Council to the visiting team at the time of inspection along with building completion certificate issued by the competent civil authority, if not submitted earlier:

Provided that the Regional Committee shall organise such inspections strictly in chronological order of the receipt of application for the cases to be approved by it:

Provided further that the members of the visiting team for inspection shall be decided by the Regional Committee out of the panel of experts approved by the Council and in accordance with the visiting team policy of the Council.

(8) At the time of the visit of the team of experts to an institution, the institution concerned shall arrange for the inspection to be videographed in a manner that all important infrastructural and instructional facilities are videographed along with interaction with the management and the faculty, if available at the time of such visit. The visiting teams, as far as possible, shall finalise and courier their reports alongwith the video recordings on the same day:

Provided that the videography should clearly establish the outer view of the building, its surroundings, access road and important infrastructure including classrooms, labs, resource rooms, multipurpose hall, library and others. The visiting team shall ensure that the videography is done in a continuous manner, the final unedited copy of the videography is handed over to them immediately after its recording and its conversion to a CD should be done in the presence of visiting team members:

Provided further that at the time of inspection for new courses or enhancement of intake of the existing course, the visiting team shall verify the facilities for existing recognized teacher education courses and ascertain the fulfillment and maintenance of regulations and norms and standards for the existing courses as well.



(9) The application and the report alongwith the video recordings or CDs of the visiting team shall be placed before the Regional Committee concerned for consideration and appropriate decision.

(10) The Regional Committee shall decide grant of recognition or permission to an institution only after satisfying itself that the institution fulfills all the conditions prescribed by the National Council under the Act, rules or regulations, including, the norms and standards laid down for the relevant teacher education programmes.

(11) In the matter of grant of recognition, the Regional Committees shall strictly act within the ambit of the Act, the regulations made thereunder including the norms and standards for various teacher education programmes, and shall not make any relaxation thereto.

(12) The Regional Director, who is the convener of the Regional Committee, while putting up the proposals to the Regional Committee, shall ensure that the correct provisions in the Act, rules or regulations including norms and standards for various teacher education programmes are brought to the notice of the Regional Committee so as to enable the Committee to take appropriate decisions.

(13) The institution concerned shall be informed, through a letter of intent, regarding the decision for grant of recognition or permission subject to appointment of qualified faculty members before the commencement of the academic session. The letter of intent issued under this clause shall not be notified in the Gazette but would be sent to the institution and the affiliating body with the request that the process of appointment of qualified staff as per policy of State Government or University Grants Commission or University may be initiated and the institution be provided all assistance to ensure that the staff or faculty is appointed as per the norms of the Council within two months. The institution shall submit the list of the faculty, as approved by the affiliating body, to the Regional Committee.

(14) (i) All the applicant institutions shall launch their own website with hyperlink to the Council and corresponding Regional Office websites soon after the receipt of the letter of intent from the Regional Committee, covering, inter alia, the details of the institution, its location, name of the programme applied for with intake; availability of physical infrastructure, such as land, building, office, classrooms, and other facilities or amenities; instructional facilities, such as laboratory and library and the particulars of their proposed teaching faculty and non-teaching staff with photographs, for information of all concerned. The information with regard to the following shall also be made available on the website, namely:-

(a) sanctioned programmes along with annual intake in the institution;

(b) name of faculty and staff in full as mentioned in school certificate along with their qualifications, scale of pay and photograph;

(c) name of faculty members who left or joined during the last quarter;

(d) names of students admitted during the current session along with qualification, percentage of marks in the qualifying examination and in the entrance test, if any, date of admission and such other information;

(e) fee charged from students;

(f) available infrastructural facilities;



- (g) facilities added during the last quarter;
- (h) number of books in the library, refereed journals subscribed to, and additions, if any, in the last quarter.
- (ii) The institution shall be free to post additional relevant information, if it so desires.
- (iii) Any false or incomplete information on its website shall render the institution liable for withdrawal of recognition.
- (15) The institution concerned, after appointing the requisite faculty or staff as per the provisions of norms and standards of respective programmes, and after fulfilling the conditions under regulation 8, shall formally inform about such appointments to the Regional Committee concerned.
- (16) The letter granting approval for the selection or appointment of faculty shall also be provided by the institution to the Regional Committee with the document establishing that the Fixed Deposit Receipts of Endowment Fund and Reserve Fund have been converted into a joint account and after receipt of the said details, the Regional Committee concerned shall issue a formal order of recognition which shall be notified as provided under the Act.
- (17) In cases, where the Regional Committee, after consideration of the report of the visiting team and other facts on record, is of the opinion that the institution does not fulfill the requirements for starting or conducting the course or for enhancement of intake, after giving an opportunity of being heard to the institution pass an order refusing to allow any further opportunity for removal of deficiencies or inspection for reasons to be recorded in writing: provided that against the order passed by the Regional Committee, an appeal to the Council may be preferred as provided under section 18 of the Act.
- (18) The reports of inspection of the institutions along with the names of the visiting team experts shall be made available on the official website of the Regional Committee concerned after the same have been considered by the Regional Committee.
- (19) The Regional Committee shall process the application for closure in the manner prescribed for the processing of applications for new programmes or additional programmes or additional intake.



12. Regulation No. 7(1) of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, reproduced above, shows that an application made by the institute can be rejected only (a) if it is not complete and/or (b) requisite documents are not attached to the application. In the present case, the same is not the situation. The Show Cause Notices show various non-compliances by the petitioner institution, which according to my mind can only be done after inspection. Before inspection and issuance of Letter of Intent (“**LOI**”), the respondents cannot be in a position to require the petitioner to show cause against deficiencies such as shortage of teaching staff, lack of physical infrastructure etc. While the respondents are right in contending that two show cause notices can be issued, but the show cause notices are in violation of Regulation No. 7 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014, as explained.
13. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in the judgment of **Rikhab Chand Jain v. Union of India, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2510**, has reiterated the settled position of law concerning the exercise of writ jurisdiction vested with the Courts, despite the availability of an alternative statutory remedy. The existence of an alternative remedy is termed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the said judgment as a self-imposed restriction and the same cannot be treated as an absolute bar. The relevant paragraph of the judgment reads as under:-

“7. Decisions of this court are legion from which guidance can aptly be drawn as to when a writ petition ought to be entertained despite the party approaching the High Court not exhausting the alternative statutory remedy available to



him/her/it. Insistence by the courts—both this court and the High Courts—of exhaustion of a statutory remedy provided by an enactment before invoking the writ jurisdiction of a High Court under article 226 of the Constitution can be traced to one of several self-imposed restrictions, laid down by judicial precedents of this court. Unless, of course, any of the exceptions (challenge to an act/order grounded on (i) breach of a fundamental right; (ii) violation of natural justice principles; (iii) lack of jurisdiction; and (iv) unconstitutionality of a statute) is satisfied, that a writ court may refuse to entertain a writ petition does not admit of anydoubt. This court relying on a host of decisions including *State of U.P. v. Mohammad Nooh* [1957 SCC OnLine SC 21; AIR 1958 SC 86.] and *Titaghur Paper Mills Co. Ltd. v. State of Orissa* [(1983) 53 STC 315 (SC); (1983) 142 ITR 663 (SC); (1983) 2 SCC 433; 1983 SCC (Tax) 131; 1983 SCC OnLine SC 102.] has, in *Godrej Sara Lee Ltd. v. Excise and Taxation Officer-cum-Assessing Authority* [(2023) 109 GSTR 402 (SC); 2023 SCC OnLine SC 95.] , reiterated that availability of an alternative statutory remedy does not oust the jurisdiction of a writ court. It was also explained how “entertainability of a writ petition” is a concept distinct from the concept of “maintainability of a writ petition”.

(Emphasis added)

14. From a conspectus of the aforesaid judgment, I am of the view that even though the Section 18 of the NCTE Act provides an appellate



statutory remedy but in the present case, the availability of such statutory remedy, does not stand in way of this Court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, as the show cause notice which forms the basis of the impugned order is itself vitiated by law for the reason of being violative of principles of natural justice and violative of Regulation No. 7 of the NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014.

15. These are important institutions which are required to function within strict and time bound parameters. The timelines governing such matter have been authoritatively prescribed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court itself in its judgment titled ***Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya v. State of U.P., (2013) 2 SCC 617***, which are to be scrupulously followed by all the concerned parties. The necessity to ensure compliance with these timelines is also one of the grounds which persuades me to entertain the present petition.
16. For the said reasons, the present petition is allowed and the impugned Refusal Order dated 11.03.2026 is set aside. Accordingly, the respondents shall conduct inspection of the petitioner College within 3 weeks from today and shall thereafter take all appropriate necessary steps to ensure that the guidelines of the Hon'ble Supreme Court are scrupulously complied with. The entire exercise including the issuance of show cause notice pointing out the deficiencies, furnishing of their replies, and the adjudication of those show cause notices, shall be completed on or before 30.06.2026, for the academic session 2026-2027. Let a copy of the inspection report also be supplied to the petitioner.



17. This order is being passed in peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, where the institute in question seeking transition, is already an institute operating a 4-year integrated B.A.B.Ed./ B.Sc. B.Ed. course and the infrastructural requirements are not substantially different.
18. With these directions, the present petition is disposed of, along with pending applications, if any.

W.P.(C) 7747/2026, W.P.(C) 7767/2026, W.P.(C) 7771/2026, W.P.(C) 7791/2026, W.P.(C) 7799/2026, W.P.(C) 7818/2026, W.P.(C) 7855/2026, W.P.(C) 7878/2026, W.P.(C) 7911/2026, W.P.(C) 7926/2026, W.P.(C) 7512/2026, W.P.(C) 7599/2026, W.P.(C) 7607/2026, W.P.(C) 7617/2026, W.P.(C) 7627/2026, W.P.(C) 7631/2026, W.P.(C) 7661/2026, W.P.(C) 7701/2026, W.P.(C) 7704/2026, W.P.(C) 7706/2026, W.P.(C) 7719/2026, W.P.(C) 7938/2026, W.P.(C) 7964/2026, W.P.(C) 7968/2026, W.P.(C) 7971/2026, W.P.(C) 7737/2026, W.P.(C) 7739/2026

19. These are writ petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking similar prayers as in W.P.(C) 4860/2026.
20. For the reasons stated in the petitions, issue notice.
21. Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
22. These petitions are covered by the order/judgment passed above in W.P.(C) 4860/2026 and the order/judgment passed above in W.P.(C) 4860/2026 shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to all these cases as well. Consequently, the impugned refusal order(s) are set aside. The respondents are bound by the directions contained in paragraph No. 16, herein above, and shall act accordingly.
23. At the oral request of the learned counsel for the petitioners, the name of the petitioner in W.P.(C) 7599/2026 and W.P. (C) 7661/2026 is



corrected and shall read as “VARDHMAN TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE & ANR.” and “BHASKAR KANYA P G MAHAVIDALAYA & ANR”, respectively.

24. With these directions, the present petitions are disposed of, along with pending applications, if any.

W.P.(C) 6445/2026, W.P.(C) 6483/2026, W.P.(C) 6409/2026, W.P.(C) 6511/2026

25. These are writ petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking similar prayers as in W.P.(C) 4860/2026.
26. These petitions are covered by the order/judgment passed above in W.P.(C) 4860/2026 and the order/judgment passed above in W.P.(C) 4860/2026 shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to all these cases as well. Consequently, the impugned refusal order(s) are set aside. The respondents are bound by the directions contained in paragraph No. 16, herein above, and shall act accordingly.
27. With these directions, the present petitions are disposed of, along with pending applications, if any.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MAY 29, 2026 / (MS)

(corrected and released on 02.06.2026)