



\$~128, 129, 131, 133, 140, 141, 146 and 149

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

+ W.P.(C) 13864/2025 and CM APPL. 56841/2025

GRANODAYA MAHAVIDHYALAYA & ANR.....Petitioners
versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Respondents

129

+ W.P.(C) 13866/2025 and CM APPL. Nos. 56844/2025 and
56845/2025

OM VIDHYAVASINI PTC COLLEGEPetitioner
versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Respondents

131

+ W.P.(C) 13872/2025 and CM APPL. Nos. 56852/2025 and
56853/2025

CHAUDHARI MAHILA ADHYAPAN COLLEGE.....Petitioner
versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Respondents

133

+ W.P.(C) 13887/2025 and CM APPL. Nos. 56882/2025 and
56883/2025

SHREE SAHAJANAND PRIMARY TEACHER TRAINING
COLLEGEPetitioner

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Respondents

140

+ W.P.(C) 13921/2025 and CM APPL. 56989/2025 and 56990/2025

SHREE DHARMJIVANDASJI PTC COLLEGEPetitioner
versus



141 NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Respondents
+ W.P.(C) 13923/2025 and CM APPL. Nos. 56993/2025 and
56994/2025

SHREE YOGANAND SWAMI SEVA SAMAJ TRUST PTC
COLLEGEPetitioner
versus

146 NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Respondents
+ W.P.(C) 13947/2025 and CM APPL. 57099/2025

LATE RAMSWAROOP YADAV
MAHAVIDYALAYAPetitioner
versus

149 NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Respondents
+ W.P.(C) 13955/2025 and CM APPL. Nos. 57114/2025 and
57178/2025

RAGHU RAM MAHAVIDYALAYAPetitioner
versus
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Respondents

Appearance:

Counsels on behalf of petitioners

Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari and Mr. Pankaj Kumar Ray,
Advocates for petitioner in item no. 128.

Mr. Abhishek Singh, Ms. Priyanka Madhavaram and Mr. Karan Chaudhary,
Advocates for petitioner in item no. 146

Mr. Rishabh Kumar and Mr. Keshav Sharma, Advocates for petitioner in
item no. 149.



Mr. Gaurav Arora, Advocate for petitioners in item nos. 129, 131, 133, 140 and 141.

Counsels on behalf of respondents

Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik Rupal, Mr. Vibhu Sharma and Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra, Advocates for NCTE in item no. 128.

Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Shivom Sethi and Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Advocates item nos. 128, 129, 131, 133, 140, 141, 149 and 146.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

10.09.2025

1. In the present batch of matters the challenge is to the withdrawal of recognition of the petitioner institutions by the respective regional committees of the NCTE.
2. The recognition has been withdrawn in these cases, *inter alia*, on the ground that there was no submission of PAR for the academic sessions 2021-22 and 2022-23 in terms of the public notice issued by the NCTE, and in some cases the withdrawal of recognition is premised on the ground that there was no reply given to the show cause notice.
3. The learned counsels for the petitioners submit that the premise on which recognition has been withdrawn by the respective regional counsel is not tenable. Elaborating on this, it is submitted that in some of the cases the PAR was submitted and there was an acknowledgment with regard to the submission of such PAR, but notwithstanding such submissions, the impugned order of withdrawal came to be passed.
4. In cases where recognition has been withdrawn on the ground of non-filing of reply to the show cause notice, the submission is that the reply to



the show cause notice was given either through mail or sent through speed post, however, the same was not considered.

5. It is submitted that in similar matters including, ***W.P.(C) 8133/2025*** titled as ***Mahavir Teacher Training School vs. National Council for Teacher Education and Anr.***, notice has been issued by this Court and the impugned order has been stayed till the next date of hearing with further direction to permit the petitioner(s) therein to participate in counselling and admit students for the academic session 2025-26.

6. The attention of the Court is invited to the decision ***NCTE and Anr. vs. Vaishnav Institute of Technology and Management, (2012) 5 SCC 139***, particularly to para 28 thereof which reads as under:

“28. Derecognition or withdrawal of recognition of a recognised institution is a drastic measure. It results in dislocating the students, teachers and the staff. That is why, the Council has been empowered under Section 13 to have a constant vigil on the functioning of a recognised institution. On the recommendation of the Council after inspection, if a recognised institution does not rectify the deficiencies and continues to function in contravention of the provisions of the 1993 Act or the Rules or the Regulations, the Regional Committee under Section 17 has full power to proceed for withdrawal of recognition in accordance with the procedure prescribed therein.”

(emphasis supplied)

7. It is further submitted that as per SOP, two show cause notices are required to be issued, but in all these cases only one show cause notice was issued.

8. In view of the above, issue notice. Mr. Anuj Kapoor, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent accepts notice. He submits that the present petition ought not to be entertained for the reason that there is a



statutory remedy available in terms of Section 18 of the NCTE Act, against the order of withdrawal of recognition.

9. He further submits that in some cases, the submission of PAR was defective, therefore recognition was withdrawn, whereas in some cases, replies to the show-cause notices were filed after passing of withdrawal order, therefore, the same were not considered.

10. However, on being queried by the Court, Mr. Kapoor fairly states that in similar matters notice has been issued and interim relief has also been granted.

11. Let counter affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed within a period of two weeks thereafter.

12. Re-notify on 22.09.2025 alongwith W.P.(C) 8133/2025.

13. In the meanwhile, having regard to the submissions noted hereinabove, which *prima facie* appears to have substance, and further regard being had to the fact that in similar matters stay has been granted while issuing notice, the operation of the impugned withdrawal orders/decisions is stayed till the next date of hearing and the petitioners are permitted to participate in the counselling and admit students in the academic session 2025-26.

14. It is further directed that respondent/NCTE will issue a necessary public notice and upload the list of institutes on its website thereby intimating all concerned, including State authority, affiliating authorities and counselling authorities that operation of the impugned withdrawal order/decisions in respect of such listed institutes have been stayed by this Court and they have been permitted to participate in the counselling and admit the students for the academic session 2025-2026, which shall be



complied with. This may be done by the NCTE latest by 17.09.2025.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025/jg