



\$~33

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 9169/2024, C.M. APPL. 37507/2024**
MAA BANDHUI DEVRAJ 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. Tamim Qadri, Mr. Saahil Gupta,
Mr. Diwas Kumar, Advs.
Mr. Mohinder JS Rupal, Mr. Hardik
Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Ms.
Tripta Sharma, 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 withdrawal order dated 07.10.2023 issued by NRC withdrawing recognition of B.Ed. course of Petitioner Institution and also order dated 12.04.2024 passed by Appellate Authority of NCTE; and/or
b) issue direction/order of a writ of mandamus or any other suitable writ or order directing the respondents to issue the restoration order in respect of B.Ed. course (2 Basic Units)*



of the Petitioner Institution with consequential direction to issue the Revised Recognition Order and correct the status of Petitioner Institution as a recognized Institution for 2 basic units (100 seats) on their website and to inform the Affiliating University & the Department of Higher Education, Government of U.P. enabling the petitioner to conduct the B.Ed. course with 2 basic units (100 seats); and/or...”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioners are old institutions duly recognized by the Northern Regional Committee (“**NRC**”) from 2011. After the coming up of NCTE (Recognition Norms & Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (“**NCTE Regulations, 2014**”) the norms of B.Ed. Courses changed and consequently, the respondent vide letter dated 24.12.2014 issued guidelines for the existing institutions. The petitioners were required to give an affidavit confirming its acceptance to the adherence NCTE Regulations, 2014 and to give an undertaking to fulfil the revised norms.
3. The petitioners submitted two affidavits in this regard. However, only one affidavit was received by respondent No. 2. Despite receiving the affidavit, the impugned orders dated 07.10.2023 by the respondent No. 2 and the appellate authority’s order dated 12.04.2024, confirming the order dated 07.10.2023, were passed.
4. Mr. Amitesh Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners, states that the petitioners will submit a fresh affidavit.
5. Mr. Rupal, learned counsel for the respondents, states that respondent No. 2 will give a fresh hearing to the petitioners in this regard.



6. In this regard, Paragraph No. 7 the order dated 30.07.2021, passed in W.P.(C) 7260/2021 holds relevance and reads as under:

“7. As several petitions for substantially similar relief are being filed in this Court, it is further directed that, whenever a withdrawal order is challenged by an institution (either by way of appeal or by way of writ proceedings) and the matter is remanded to the concerned regional committee, the regional committee will issue an order of restoration of recognition in favour of the institution, pending reconsideration of the withdrawal order. Although the Appellate Committee of the NCTE would be well advised to expressly quash the original order of the concerned regional committee while remanding the matter, the position in law is that the order automatically stands quashed. The institution is, therefore, entitled to the benefits of recognition until a fresh withdrawal order is passed. The order of restoration of recognition should be issued within two weeks of the order of remand being communicated to the regional committee, or upon request of the concerned institution. This streamlined procedure would obviate the multiplicity of litigation which is being witnessed at present. Neither the concerned institutions nor the NCTE should be put to the burden of filing or defending proceedings before the Court for this purpose.”

7. In the view of the above, since the matter is being remanded to the NRC, the NRC shall issue an order of restoration of recognition in



favour of the petitioners, pending reconsideration of the withdrawal order.

8. With these directions, the petition is disposed of.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MARCH 20, 2026/sp