



\$~57, 58 and 59

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010664032025
+ **W.P.(C) 13859/2025 & CM APPL. 56833/2025**
T.D. EDUCATION COLLEGEPetitioner
Through: Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi Kant,
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay, Advs.
versus
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR
.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Mohinder JS Rupal, Mr. Hardik
Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Ms.
Tripta Sharma, Advs.

58
CNR No. DLHC010665032025
+ **W.P.(C) 13948/2025 & CM APPL. 57100/2025**
T.D. EDUCATION COLLEGEPetitioner
Through: Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi Kant,
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay, Advs.
versus
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR
.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Mohinder JS Rupal, Mr. Hardik
Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Ms.
Tripta Sharma, Advs.

59
CNR No. DLHC010665042025
+ **W.P.(C) 13953/2025 & CM APPL. 57107/2025**
T.D. EDUCATION COLLEGEPetitioner
Through: Mr. Mayank Manish, Mr. Ravi Kant,
Mr. Vineet Upadhyay, Advs.
versus
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND ANR
.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Mohinder JS Rupal, Mr. Hardik
Rupal, Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Ms.
Tripta Sharma, Advs.



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
31.08.2026

%

1. These connected writ petitions are taken up for hearing as the issue involved therein are similar, as by the same impugned minutes of 425th meeting held by respondent No.2 - Western Regional Committee Western Regional Committee ("**WRC**") on 29th-30th May 2025, all the courses i.e. B.Ed., D.Ed. [D.El.Ed.] and M.Ed., of the Petitioner, are withdrawn.
2. By the impugned decision held on 29th-30th May 2025, it appears that the respondent had placed the file of Indira Nagar, of its 3 courses concerning the petitioner Institution i.e. B.Ed. / D.Ed. [D.El.Ed.] / M.Ed. courses, and finally taken decision of withdrawal of each courses under Section 17 of the NCTE Act, 1993 ("**1993 Act**"), at Chakghat, which were not even part of the Agenda of the said impugned meeting.
3. Further, the aforesaid minutes of meeting seems to suggest that the aforesaid courses of petitioner Institutions, were neither before the WRC nor were their files before the WRC. Hence, the action pertaining to withdrawal of recognition by the respondents, seems to be incorrect and unjustifiable.
4. Further, by perusal of the impugned minutes of meeting, it appears that the inspection of institution conducted under Section 17 of 1993 Act, between 15.04.2009 to 20.04.2009, was made basis of



withdrawal after lapse of such a long time, which is not justifiable, with regard to the petitioner Institution, which is a running institution since 2005 and was also continuing as a running institution, even after the inspection which was conducted in the year 2009.

5. For the said reasons, issue notice.
6. Mr. Rupal, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. He opposes and submits that the petitioner-College has shifted its premises from rental to its own premises without the permission of respondent No. 2, which is in violation of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, and therefore, respondent No. 2 was justified in withdrawing recognition of the Petitioner-College.
7. In view of the aforesaid, the impugned minutes of 425th meeting of held on 29th-30th May 2025 by the respondent No.2, *qua* the petitioner, is set aside, and respondent No.2 is directed to restore the recognition of the petitioner Institution for B.Ed. / D.Ed. [D.El.Ed.] /M.Ed. courses, with all consequential benefits.
8. It is further directed that respondent No.2 shall communicate the recognised status of the petitioner Institution for aforesaid courses, to the concerned affiliating body, as well as the Department of Higher Education, within one week, from today.
9. With these directions, the petitions are disposed of.

JASMEET SINGH, J

AUGUST 31, 2026/sp