



\$~35

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

+ W.P.(C) 8620/2025&CM APPL. 37126/2025

MAA SHARDA DEVI MAHAVIDYALAYAPetitioner

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

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND
ANRRespondents

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

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

ORDER
30.06.2025

%

1. present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, by the petitioner institution, seeking to set aside the decision taken in 441st Meeting of Northern Regional Committee held on 21st – 22nd May, 2025, by Respondent No. 2, whereby the petitioner's recognition was withdrawn.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that, petitioner did not received any show cause notice. Despite that the respondent no.2 without verifying the facts, passed the impugned decision stating that no reply was submitted within stipulated time.



3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the impugned decision is amenable to challenge by way of statutory appeal under Section 18 of the National Council for the Teacher Education Act, 1993 (hereinafter referred to as “The Act”). The said provision outlines the appellate remedy available to a party aggrieved by orders passed under Sections 14, 15, or 17 of the Act and mandates that the appeal be filed in the prescribed manner and within the prescribed period. The provision is set out below:

“18. Appeals.—(1) Any person aggrieved by an order made under section 14 or section 15 or section 17 of the Act may prefer an appeal to the Council within such period as may be prescribed.

(2) No appeal shall be admitted if it is preferred after the expiry of the period prescribed therefore: Provided that an appeal may be admitted after the expiry of the period prescribed therefore, if the appellant satisfies the Council that he had sufficient cause for not preferring the appeal within the prescribed period.

(3) Every appeal made under this section shall be made in such form and shall be accompanied by a copy of the order appealed against and by such fees as may be prescribed.

(4) The procedure for disposing of an appeal shall be such as may be prescribed: Provided that before disallowing an appeal, the appellant shall be given a reasonable opportunity to represent its case.

(5) The Council may confirm or reverse the order appealed against.”

4. Learned Counsel for the respondents relying upon the order passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras in W.P.(C) No. 21575/2025, on 18.06.2026 titled ***Ezhil Teacher Training Institution***



vs. NCTE & Ors., submits that relief should be granted to the petitioner subject to filing an appeal before the Appellate Court before the NCTE.

5. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that similarly placed institutions have already approached this Court and an interim order staying the withdrawal order is already in operation.

6. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner placed reliance on the order dated 22.05.2025 passed in W.P.(C) 7008/2025 titled as ***“Ram Krishna College v. National Council for Teacher Education & Anr.”***, wherein this Court was pleased to grant interim protection to the petitioner therein despite the pendency of an appeal.

7. During the course of the arguments, the petitioner has also placed reliance on the orders dated 18.06.2025 and 23.06.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 8459/2025 titled ***“Doctor Jai Mangal Singh Prathmik Prashikshan Sansthan v. National Council for Teacher Education and Anr.”*** dated 18.06.2025 and in W.P.(C) 8513/2025 titled ***“Vinayak College of Education v. National Council for Teacher Education and Anr.”*** respectively.

8. Taking into consideration the parity of circumstances and the interim relief granted in the above-mentioned matters, so as to keep consistency in the orders passed by this Court, the present petition is required to be listed before the concerned Roster Bench on 20.08.2025, where similar matters are listed for further consideration.

9. In the meanwhile, the Impugned decision withdrawing the recognition of the petitioner is stayed till the date of next hearing and petitioner is permitted to participate in counselling and admit students



for academic session 2025-2026.

RENU BHATNAGAR, J
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 30, 2025

Pr/my

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)