



\$~94

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6293/2026**

HARNAM DASS LEKHRAJ INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amol Sinha, Mr. Nishant
Bhishnoi, Ms. Srishti Prabhakar,
Advs.

versus

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (NCTE) &
ANR.**

.....Respondent

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

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH**

ORDER
08.05.2026

%

CM APPL. 30916/2026

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 6293/2026

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 appropriate writ, order or direction quashing the order dated 06.04.2026 passed by the NCTE Appellate Authority in Appeal No. APPLWRC202515439, whereby the Appellate Authority has upheld the aforesaid withdrawal order.



- b) Issue a writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction quashing the Revised Withdrawal Order dated 04.11.2025 passed by the Western Regional Committee, NCTE, whereby the recognition granted to the Petitioner institution for conducting the B.Ed. programme has been withdrawn.*
- c) Issue a writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to restore the Petitioner's recognition for the B.Ed. programme forthwith and permit the Petitioner to continue the course without interruption.*
- d) Issue a writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to consider the Petitioner's compliance documents afresh, in accordance with law, after granting a fair and meaningful opportunity of hearing..."*
2. For the reasons stated in the petition, issue notice.
 3. Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
 4. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner Institute was granted recognition by the respondent No. 1 *vide* order dated 26.08.2008, for running B.Ed. programme of one year duration with annual intake of 100 students. Pursuant to this recognition, the petitioner Institute has been conducting B.Ed. course since the year 2008. The recognition was subsequently revised in 2015 for a 2 year B.Ed. programme with an annual intake of 100 students.
 5. In 2024-25, the respondent No. 2 initiated proceedings against the petitioner on a complaint received, by issuance of a show cause notice



and seeking documents relating to land, building, safety certificates, salary disbursement, etc.

6. The petitioner duly replied to the show cause notice and submitted all the relevant documents.
7. Thereafter, a reminder show cause notice was issued, to which the petitioner replied stating that a reply is already submitted on 15.05.2025 in pursuance of the first show cause notice.
8. Pursuant to the said proceedings, the respondent No. 2, passed a revised withdrawal order dated 04.11.2025, which the petitioner challenged before the appellate authority by availing the statutory remedy.
9. The appellate authority passed the impugned order dated 06.04.2026, affirming the position of respondent No. 2. Hence, the present petition has been filed.
10. Mr. Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that the representative of the petitioner duly appeared before the appellate authority on the scheduled date through video conferencing mode but the impugned order incorrectly recorded that no one appeared on behalf of the petitioner institute.
11. He also states that the impugned order suffers from procedural irregularities and in effect of the said irregularities, the petitioner has been unable to effectively pursue its case before the appellate authority.
12. Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel for the respondents, opposes the present petition.
13. I am of the view that the limited relief acceptable to the learned



counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner may be given another fresh and meaningful opportunity of hearing by the appellate authority and may be permitted to effectively represent its case.

14. Without going into the effective merits of the petition and the issue raised therein or the question whether the petitioner was unable to pursue its case or not, the interest of justice, to my mind, would be met if the petitioner is given another opportunity to present its case in detail before the appellate authority, and the issue whether they were unable to effectively pursue its case or not.
15. For the said reasons, the appellate authority shall give an opportunity of personal hearing to the representative of the petitioner institute as per the applicable rules within 4 weeks from today and after hearing the petitioner, shall pass an order in accordance with law.
16. Consequently, the impugned order of the appellate authority dated 06.04.2026 is set aside, with the above directions.
17. With these directions, the petition is disposed of.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MAY 8, 2026/sp