



\$~84

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 6107/2026 & CM APPL. 30011/2026**
R.S. MEMORIAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi Kant,
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
05.05.2026

%

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

“a) quash the Refusal Order dated 25.11.2025 issued by the Respondent No.2 (through email dated 25.11.2025), whereby, the Respondent No.2 has Refused the application of the Petitioner Institution submitted for transition of its B.A. B.Ed./ B.Sc. B.Ed. course to I.T.E.P., for the academic session 2026-27; without following the mandatory procedure; and

(b) direct the Respondent No.2 to restore, reconsider & decide the aforesaid application of Petitioner Institution,



submitted for transition of its B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. course to I.T.E.P., for the session 2026-27; within a reasonable time & in accordance with the provisions made therefor; ...”

2. Mr. Sharawat, learned senior counsel for the petitioner, states that a refusal order dated 25.11.2025 issued by the respondent No. 2, whereby application of the petitioner for transition of its B.A. B.ED./B.SC. B.ED. course to ITEP has been rejected. He further states 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.
3. For the said reasons, issue notice.
4. Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and draws my attention to the fact that the present dispute is covered by the Order dated 19.01.2026 passed by this Court in a similar matter titled as ***“Dpm College & Anr. v. National Council For Teacher Education & Anr., W.P.(C) 722/2026”***.
5. Mr. Kapoor on instructions, states 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).



6. The detailed Orders have already been passed in similar matters covering this dispute. However, in order to ensure complete clarity, they are reiterated hereinbelow.
7. It is well settled that any administrative decision entailing civil consequences must conform to the principles of natural justice. The petitioner applied on 04.10.2025 for transition of its four years B.A. B.ED./B.SC. B.ED. course to Integrated Teacher Education Programme, pursuant to NCTE Public Notice dated 12.09.2025. The application was considered by the Regional Committee, wherein a decision was taken to reject the application. Perusal of the refusal order dated 25.11.2025 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.
8. In view of the above, without examining the merits of the deficiencies noted in the impugned order, the writ petition is allowed to the limited extent of setting aside the order dated 25.11.2025 on the ground of violation of principles of natural justice.
9. My attention has been drawn to the refusal order dated 25.11.2025, wherein the deficiency has been noted as under:-

“The institution has neither submitted any evidence to prove that it is a multidisciplinary institution in relevant subjects as per sub-regulation 2(ca) of NCTE Regulations, 2014 as amended vide Gazette Notification dated 26.10.2021 nor it has applied under the category of Merger/ Collaboration as per the Guidelines issued by NCTE for



Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand- Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions.”

10. Since the timelines have been mandated by the Hon’ble Supreme Court and there is shortage of time, for the time being, it is directed that the said deficiency shall be treated as a show cause notice and the petitioner shall file its response within 10 days.
11. In case there is any other deficiency, the same shall be communicated to the petitioner within 5 days from today.
12. Thereafter, the respondents shall pass a reasoned order in accordance with law within two weeks and communicate the same to the petitioner. It is clarified that the petitioner shall remain at liberty to avail appropriate legal remedies, if aggrieved by the decision so rendered.
13. This Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.
14. The present writ petition is disposed of along with pending applications, if any.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MAY 5, 2026/sp