

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE No. W.P.No.5890 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	03.03.2026	<p data-bbox="507 568 603 604"><u>VN, J</u></p> <p data-bbox="507 663 1206 1025">This Writ Petition is filed questioning the action of the Respondent-University in insisting the Petitioner-Society to pay “University Common Services Fee (UCS)” as a condition precedent and in rejecting the Petitioner’s application for issuing ‘No Objection Certificate (NOC)’, as illegal and arbitrary.</p> <p data-bbox="507 1066 1206 1478">2. The Petitioner herein is an Educational Society under which Educational Institutions are being operated. The Petitioner submitted an application dated 23.01.2026 seeking NOC. As a pre-condition for issuance of NOC, the Respondents insisted for payment of UCS Fee payment. Hence, the present Writ Petition is filed.</p> <p data-bbox="507 1518 1206 1930">3. The learned counsel for the Petitioner Sri Karumanchi Indraneel Babu would submit that as per the Andhra Pradesh Higher Education Regulatory and Monitoring Commission Act, 2019, “fee” is defined as all charges, including tuition fees and development charges and the “University Common Services Fee” is not being contemplated under the said Rules.</p>	

	<p>4. The learned counsel for the Petitioner would further submit that similar fee was collected vide G.O.Ms.No.41 Higher Education (R.M) Department dated 06.08.2023, which was questioned before this Court in W.P.No.32909 of 2022 and batch and this Court after examining the Rules, disposed of the said Writ Petitions on 05.12.2023 in favour of Petitioners therein with certain directions and the Writ Appeals filed thereon i.e. W.A.Nos.182 of 2024 and batch were disposed of on 09.07.2025 confirming the Common Order dated 05.12.2023 passed in W.P.Nos.32909 of 2022 and batch.</p> <p>5. The learned counsel for the Petitioner further submits that though the issue in the present Writ Petition was adjudicated in the previous Writ Petitions, the Respondent-University is again insisting the Petitioner-Society to pay UCS Fee, which cannot be sustained.</p> <p>6. Sri D. Krishna, learned Standing Counsel for Respondent-University seeks time for filing Counter- Affidavit.</p> <p>7. Heard the respective counsels.</p> <p>8. The Division Bench of this Court while disposing of the W.A.Nos.182 of 2024 and batch on 09.07.2025 held at Paragraph No.36 of the Order as under;</p> <p><i>“36. In our opinion, the fee structure has to be regulated and determined strictly in accordance with the rules and in particular Rule 8(4) of the Rules. We</i></p>	
--	--	--

		<p>are also of the opinion that the interim directions issued by the learned single Judge on 12.10.2022, preventing the Commission from seeking information with regard to the various heads led to an incorrect assessment of the fee structure of the institutions. Since we have already held that the information which was sought for by the Commission in terms of Schedules 1 to 31 were all relevant and were required for a proper determination of the fee structure, the present set of cases are disposed of with the following directions:</p> <p>While directions 23(a) and 23(b) of the impugned judgment and order are upheld, direction 23(c) is set aside. In regard to direction 23(d), it is ordered that the Commission shall determine the fee structure strictly in terms of the Rules and, in particular, Rule 8(4) of the Rules. Direction 23(d) shall, accordingly, stand modified to that extent.</p> <p>The writ petitioners shall, within two weeks from today, furnish all the material data as is otherwise envisaged to be provided in terms of the notification, dated 30.06.2022, in schedules 1 to 31. The Commission, after considering the data, shall tentatively determine the fee. The worksheets or copies thereof be furnished to the institutions, who may then be given an opportunity to make a representation in terms of Rule 8(3) of the Rules read with Regulation 5.5 of the Regulations and if any fee which is claimed under a particular head is disallowed, the Commission should record reasons for such a disallowance and communicate the same to the respective institutions.</p> <p>The fees fixed by the Government vide G.O.Ms.No.17, dated 07.07.2024, shall be</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><i>considered to be tentative and shall be subject to a fee structure which is duly assessed, recommended and accepted by the Government.</i></p> <p><i>Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. No costs.”</i></p> <p>9. In the light of the above directions, no further decision was taken by the Fee Monitoring Commission and in the absence of any decision by the Commission, the very insistence by the Respondent-University for payment of UCS Fee, <i>prima facie</i>, appears to be unsustainable.</p> <p>10. Therefore, there shall be an interim direction as under;</p> <p>(i) The Respondent-University shall not insist for payment of UCS Fee pending further orders.</p> <p>Post on 31.03.2026.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">_____ VN,J</p> <p>KLP</p>	
--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--