

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD**

**MAIN CASE: W.P.No.18787 of 2026**

**PROCEEDING SHEET**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER</b>	<b>OFFICE NOTE</b>
01.	18.06.2026	<p><b><u>JS, J</u></b></p> <p><b><u>I.A.Nos.1 &amp; 2 of 2026</u></b></p> <p>Heard Sri S.Niranjan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri Tarun G. Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri Vivek Reddy, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri M. Mahaboob Ali, learned Standing Counsel for All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) representing respondent No.1, Sri M.Vamshi Kiran Yadav, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Higher Education representing respondent Nos.2, 4 and 6, Sri Malipeddi Srinivasa Reddy, learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.3 and Sri A.P.Suresh Ram, learned Standing Counsel for Telangana Council of Higher Education (TCHE) representing respondent No.4.</p> <p>Learned Senior Counsel representing Petitioners submitted that the Petitioners-Institutions have been in existence since the year 1980 and have been imparting technical education continuously for more than four decades. It is contended that for the Academic Year 2026–27, the</p>	

	<p>Petitioners-Institutions submitted an application to Respondent No.1–AICTE seeking Extension of Approval (EoA), pursuant to which an Expert Visit Committee inspection was conducted and the application was approved.</p> <p>It is further submitted that the online dashboard of the Petitioners-Institutions on the AICTE portal reflects the status "EoA Issued" and further shows that there are no deficiencies against the Institution. It is contended that the name of the Petitioners-Institutions also finds place in the list of institutions approved by AICTE for the Academic Year 2026–27. Notwithstanding the same, Respondent No.1 has failed to enable the requisite link permitting the Petitioners to download the EoA, thereby effectively preventing the Institution from availing the benefit of the approval already granted.</p> <p>It is further submitted that representations dated 20.05.2026 and 08.06.2026 were submitted to Respondent No.1 requesting that access be provided for downloading the EoA. However, despite receipt of the said representations, Respondent No.1 has neither acted upon the same nor communicated any reasons for withholding access to the approval granted in favour of the Institution.</p> <p>It is contended that the action of Respondent No.1 is <i>ex-facie</i> arbitrary, irrational and self-</p>	
--	--	--

contradictory. Having processed the application, conducted inspection, recorded no deficiencies, approved the Institution and reflected the status of the Institution as "EoA Issued" on its official portal, Respondent No.1 cannot subsequently deny the Petitioners-Institutions access to the very approval granted in their favour.

It is further submitted that identical issues had arisen in earlier years and this Court, by orders dated 01.05.2025 passed in W.A. No.1281 of 2024 and batch, had specifically stayed the "No Admission" and "Withdrawal of Approval" status imposed upon the Petitioners-Institutions and clarified that previous rejection by AICTE would not come in the way of future admissions pending disposal of the appeals.

It is further submitted that another institution sponsored by the very same Society, namely Amjad Ali Khan College of Business Administration (M.B.A.), which is also covered by the connected proceedings arising out of the common judgment under challenge, has been granted EoA for the Academic Year 2026–27 and has been permitted to download the same. The differential treatment meted out to the Petitioners-Institutions is therefore arbitrary and discriminatory.

It is also further submitted that Osmania

University has informed the Petitioners that inclusion of the Institution in the counselling process for the Academic Year 2026–27 would be considered only upon production of the EoA issued by AICTE. In the absence of access to the EoA, the Petitioners-Institutions would be deprived of participation in the counselling and admission process despite having secured approval from AICTE.

It is accordingly prayed that pending disposal of the writ petition, Respondent No.1 be directed to forthwith enable access to and permit downloading of the Extension of Approval for the Academic Year 2026–27 and that consequential directions be issued to permit inclusion of the Petitioners-Institutions in the TGEAPCET counselling process and admissions for the Academic Year 2026-27.

*Per contra*, the learned Senior Counsel representing learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No.1–AICTE opposed the grant of any interim relief and submitted that the Petitioners-Institutions are not entitled to the reliefs sought in the present writ petition.

It is further submitted that the petitioners have failed to file the requisite documents as mandated under the Approval Process Handbook for the academic years 2024–27. It is also submitted that the petitioners knowingly filed a false affidavit dated

30.12.2025, containing incorrect statements, with a view to obtaining approval for the academic year 2026–27. The said issue is directly connected with the writ appeal presently pending before the Hon'ble Division Bench in W.A. No. 1281 of 2024.

It is further submitted that mere reflection of the status "EoA Issued" on the online portal does not confer any indefeasible right upon the Petitioners-Institutions to claim issuance or downloading of the Extension of Approval. It is contended that the approval process is subject to verification of all applicable requirements and compliance with orders passed by the competent authorities, and no vested right accrues merely on the basis of an entry reflected on the portal.

On the aforesaid grounds, opposed the interim applications and prayed to dismiss the same.

Having considered the submissions of the learned counsel appearing for the respective parties and upon perusal of the material placed on record, *prima facie*, the institution is running from 1980, it will hamper the interest of various students as well who can get admission in these institutions. Further, Respondent No.1 has processed the application submitted by the Petitioners, conducted the requisite inspection, recorded no deficiencies and reflected the status of the Institution as "EoA Issued",

withholding access to the Extension of Approval without communicating any reasons therefore would require consideration.

It is an admitted fact that the Extension of Approval (EoA) for the academic year 2026–27 was issued in March, 2026. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the representations dated 20.05.2026 and 08.06.2026 submitted by the petitioners seeking access to and download of the said EoA, the respondents have failed to enable such download. The said representations have remained unattended and no decision thereon has been communicated to the petitioners, thereby causing serious prejudice to their rights and interests.

This Court also takes note of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in W.A. No.1281 of 2024 and batch, whereby interim protection was granted to the Petitioners-Institutions and it was clarified that the previous rejection by AICTE would not come in the way of further admissions, subject to the result of the writ appeals.

This Court is also conscious of the fact that the counselling process for admissions for the Academic Year 2026-27 is scheduled to commence from 19.06.2026. If the petitioner No.2-institution is excluded from the counselling process at this stage,

the same would result in serious and irreversible consequences not only to the institution but also to aspiring students who may seek admission into the courses offered by the institution. The loss of an academic year and the denial of participation in the counselling process cannot be adequately compensated at a later stage in the event the writ petition succeeds.

This Court finds that the online dashboard of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Petitioner-Institution on the AICTE portal reflects the status as "EoA Issued" for the Academic Year 2026–27 and further records that no deficiencies have been noted against the Institution. It is also not in dispute that the name of the Petitioners-Institutions figures in the list of institutions approved by AICTE for the Academic Year 2026–27.

In view of the above observations;

(i) There shall be interim direction to Respondent No.1–AICTE and other concerned authorities to forthwith enable access to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Petitioner-Institution for downloading the Extension of Approval (EoA) for the Academic Year 2026–27 from the petitioner No.2-institution's online dashboard on the AICTE web portal.

(ii) There shall be interim direction to the respondents and all other concerned authorities to

forthwith include the name of the petitioner No.2-institution in the TGEAPCET counselling process for the Academic Year 2026-27 in respect of all the courses offered by the petitioner No.2-institution, which is scheduled to commence from 19.06.2026.

(iii) It is, however, made clear that the grant of Extension of Approval, inclusion of the petitioner No.2-institution in the counselling process and all admissions made pursuant to this interim order shall be subject to the final outcome of the writ petition. The petitioners as well as respondents including concerned authorities are hereby directed to make mention of this interim order in their respective web portals as a communication to all the concerned including students.

**W.P.No.18787 of 2026**

Post on 30.07.2026 for filing counter-affidavit by the respondents.

JS,J

**Note:**  
Issue CC Today.  
B/o. KRL