



2026:DHC:8548-DB



* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Judgment Reserved on: 17.09.2026

%

Judgment Delivered on: 30.09.2026

CNR No. DLHC010434952026

+ LPA 718/2026 & CM APPLs. 62322-27/2026

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.**

.....Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh
Nanda, Mr. Puneet Kumar and Mr.
Asra H. Rashid, Advocates.

versus

**SHRI TAIJAL B.A. B.ED. INTEGRATED
COLLEGE**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Akhilesh Kumar
Srivastav, Advocate.

CNR No. DLHC010435082026

+ LPA 722/2026 & CM APPLs. 62352-57/2026

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.**

.....Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh
Nanda, Mr. Puneet Kumar and Mr.
Asra H. Rashid, Advocates.

versus

**BRIGHT INDIA MAHILA TEACHER TRAINING
COLLEGE**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti
Kumari and Ms. Vipasha Jain,
Advocates.

Signature Not Verified

Signed By: NEEILAM
SHARMA
Signing Date: 01.10.2026
14:48:12

LPA 718/2026 with connected matters

Page 1 of 17



CNR No. DLHC010435122026
+ **LPA 724/2026 & CM APPLs. 62366-70/2026**
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Adv. with Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Mr. Puneet Kumar and Mr. Asra H. Rashid, Advocates.

versus

SK GREENWOOD SHIKSHAN PRASHIKSHAN
MAHAVIDYALAYA THROUGH SK GREENWOOD
SHIKSHAN SANSTHAN SAMITI THROUGH ITS
SECRETERYRespondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior Advocate with Mr. Gaurav Arora, Advocate.

CNR No. DLHC010435172026
+ **LPA 726/2026 & CM APPLs. 62385-89/2026**
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Mr. Puneet Kumar and Mr. Asra H. Rashid, Advocates.

versus

PRAKASH SHIKSHAK PRASHIKSHAN MAHAVIDYALAYA
& ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari and Ms. Vipasha Jain, Advocates.

CNR No. DLHC010435222026
+ **LPA 728/2026 & CM APPLs. 62399-404/2026**
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Mr. Puneet Kumar and Mr. Asra H. Rashid, Advocates.



2026:DHC:8548-DB



versus

SHYAM ADARSH SHIKSHA MAHAVIDYALAYA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shubhanshu Mishra, Advocate.

CNR No. DLHC010435312026

+ **LPA 731/2026 & CM APPLs. 62427-31/2026**

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.**

.....Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Mr. Puneet Kumar and Mr. Asra H. Rashid, Advocates.

versus

BHARTIYA TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior Advocate with Mr. Gaurav Arora, Advocate.

CNR No. DLHC010435342026

+ **LPA 732/2026 & CM APPLs. 62440-44/2026**

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.**

.....Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Mr. Puneet Kumar and Mr. Asra H. Rashid, Advocates.

versus

**RANA PRATAP MAHILA TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE
& ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Ms. Priti Kumari and Ms. Vipasha Jain, Advocates.



CNR No. DLHC010435442026
+ **LPA 735/2026 & CM APPLs. 62461-65/2026**
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh
Nanda, Mr. Puneet Kumar and Mr.
Asra H. Rashid, Advocates.

versus

PANDIT JP UPADHYAY TT COLLEGE THROUGH SAINT
SOLDIER SHIKSHA SAMITI THROUGH ITS
SECRETRYRespondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Gaurav Arora,
Advocate.

CNR No. DLHC010435522026
+ **LPA 736/2026 & CM APPLs. 62476-81/2026**
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
& ANR.Appellants

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh
Nanda, Mr. Puneet Kumar and Mr.
Asra H. Rashid, Advocates.

versus

PALI ACADEMY INSTITUTIONRespondent
Through: Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Mayank Manish,
Mr. Ravi Kant and Mr. Vineet
Upadhyay, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA



JUDGMENT

TEJAS KARIA, J

INTRODUCTION

1. This batch of *intra court* Appeals assail the orders dated 03.07.2026, 24.06.2026, 17.06.2026, 17.06.2026, 02.07.2026, 17.06.2026, 17.06.2026, 17.06.2026, and 03.07.2026 (“**Impugned Orders**”) passed in writ petitions bearing Nos. 8629/2026, 8340/2026, 8193/2026, 8197/2026, 8563/2026, 8204/2026, 8228/2026, 8219/2026, and 8632/2026 (“**Writ Petitions**”), filed by the respective Respondent-Institutions. Since these Appeals raise common issues, they are heard and decided by way of this Common Judgment.

FACTUAL MATRIX

2. The Respondents-Institutions are institutions formally recognised by the Western Regional Committee (“**WRC**”) of the National Council for Teacher Education (“**NCTE**”) for conducting four-year integrated B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. teacher education programme.

3. In 2020, the Government of India introduced the National Education Policy, 2020 (NEP-2020), which, *inter alia*, recommended that all teacher education programmes be conducted within composite multidisciplinary institutions, requiring standalone teacher education institutions (“**TEIs**”) to transition into multidisciplinary higher education institutions (“**HEIs**”) by 2030.

4. Pursuant thereto, the NCTE initiated the process for transition of existing recognised four-year integrated B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. institutions into the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (“**ITEP**”). In furtherance



thereof, the NCTE issued successive Public Notices dated 05.02.2024, 06.05.2025, 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 (“**Public Notices**”), prescribing the eligibility conditions, regulatory framework and timelines governing such transition.

5. Following the issuance of the Public Notices, the Respondent-Institutions submitted online applications seeking transition of their existing four-year integrated B.A. B.Ed. / B.Sc. B.Ed. programmes into ITEP for the Academic Session 2026-27 (“**Transition Applications**”). The Transition Applications were thereafter scrutinized by the WRC in accordance with the provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 (“**NCTE Act**”), the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 (“**NCTE Regulations**”), as amended, and the applicable Standard Operating Procedure (“**SOP**”), and other guidelines governing transition into ITEP.

6. Upon such scrutiny under Regulation 7 of the NCTE Regulations and the applicable SOP, the WRC noticed several deficiencies and non-compliances and issued preliminary Show Cause Notices to the Respondent-Institutions, calling upon the Respondent-Institutions to remove the said deficiencies and furnish the requisite statutory documents and compliances within 21 days.

7. The Respondent-Institutions thereafter submitted their replies to the Show Cause Notices. The WRC subsequently issued Final Show Cause Notices after preliminary scrutiny, calling upon the Respondent-Institutions to remove the listed deficiencies and furnish requisite statutory compliances and documents on the portal. Upon examination of the online replies,



representations, and uploaded documents submitted by the Respondent-Institutions, the WRC concluded that the Respondent-Institutions had failed to satisfy multiple threshold statutory and regulatory prerequisites.

8. Consequent to the decision of the WRC, Refusal Orders dated 12.05.2026, 15.04.2026, 24.04.2026, 10.04.2026, 30.04.2026 (“**Refusal Orders**”) were issued to the respective Respondent-Institutions under the NCTE Act, rejecting their respective Transition Applications.

9. Aggrieved by the Refusal Orders, the Respondent-Institutions instituted Writ Petitions challenging the Refusal Orders and seeking, *inter alia*, directions to the NCTE to conduct an inspection of the Respondent-Institutions.

10. *Vide* the Impugned Orders, the Writ Petitions were allowed, and the Refusal Orders were set aside, with a direction to the NCTE to conduct an inspection of the Respondent-Institutions and thereafter complete the show cause and adjudication process within the prescribed timeframe.

11. Aggrieved by the Impugned Orders, the Appellants have preferred the present Appeals.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS

12. The following submissions were made on behalf of the Appellants:

12.1. The Impugned Order dated 03.07.2026, while relying upon ***Vision College of Teachers Training v. NCTE***, Neutral Citation: 2026:DHC:5050, proceeds on an erroneous interpretation of the framework governing the processing of applications under the NCTE Regulations, inasmuch as it assumes that a refusal order could not have been passed without first conducting an



inspection of the Respondent-Institution. The direction requiring the NCTE to conduct an inspection within a prescribed timeframe is contrary to the scheme of the NCTE Regulations.

- 12.2. Even assuming that certain grounds set out in the Show Cause Notices and the Refusal Orders could not have been sustained in the absence of an inspection, the Refusal Orders ought not to have been set aside in their entirety, as they were founded upon other grounds on which they could validly have been sustained. The learned Single Judge did not examine the correctness of those grounds or determine whether the Refusal Orders could independently be sustained thereon.
- 12.3. The deficiencies and grounds set out in the Show Cause Notices issued to the Respondent-Institutions comprised both preliminary threshold grounds under Regulation 7(1) of the NCTE Regulations and grounds that would arise only after inspection. Even if interference with the Refusal Orders were warranted, the Transition Applications could not have been directed to proceed forthwith to the stage of inspection under Regulation 7(7) of the NCTE Regulations as amended *vide* Notification dated 04.05.2022 (“**Regulation 7(7)**”). Since certain grounds were capable of determination based on documentary scrutiny, the Transition Applications were required first to be considered at the stage contemplated under Regulation 7(1) of the NCTE Regulations.



- 12.4. Regulation 7(7) of the NCTE Regulations vests the concerned Regional Committee with the authority to determine whether an institution requires inspection and contemplates consideration of the application by that Committee before any such inspection is directed.
- 12.5. In the event that the Refusal Orders were set aside, the appropriate consequential direction would have been to require the concerned Regional Committees to scrutinise the Transition Applications from the stage at which they stood when the Refusal Orders were issued, namely, the stage contemplated under Regulation 7(1) of the NCTE Regulations. The direction to conduct inspections, together with the consequential directions issued in that regard, therefore ought to be set aside.
- 12.6. The documents mandatorily required for recognition of the ITEP course were specified on the application portal itself, thereby demonstrating that each application was required to undergo scrutiny at the stage contemplated under Regulation 7(1) of the NCTE Regulations.
- 12.7. The requirement that an institution be multidisciplinary (“**MDI**”) constitutes a mandatory preliminary condition. Regulation 8.1 of the NCTE Regulations categorically stipulates that institutions shall offer ITEPs in a multidisciplinary environment. The Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 expressly referred to the MDI requirement and clarified that non-compliance therewith would entail summary rejection.



- 12.8. The application form for transition likewise contained a separate tab requiring the upload of documents evidencing MDI status. The initial summary rejection of applications for non-fulfilment of the MDI requirement, without affording the institutions concerned an opportunity of being heard, was challenged in ***Tak Shiksha Niketan T. T. College v. NCTE***, W.P. (C) No. 18213/2025, wherein this Court, *vide* order dated 01.12.2025, directed that no rejection or refusal could be made without affording the institutions a reasonable opportunity. It was in this context that the Show Cause Notices in the present matters included grounds relating both to the MDI requirement and to the other requirements prescribed for offering the ITEP course.
- 12.9. Any reconsideration of the applications from the stage of Regulation 7(1) of the NCTE Regulations would have to adhere to the time-bound framework prescribed by the Supreme Court in ***Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya v. State of U.P.***, (2013) 2 SCC 617. If this Court directs reconsideration of the Transition Applications from the stage of Regulation 7(1) of the NCTE Regulations, the timeline stipulated in ***Maa Vaishno Devi*** (*supra*), along with the proposal made by the Appellants, may be retained, subject to suitable modification depending upon the date of pronouncement of judgment.
- 12.10. Considering that there are more than 150 matters in which orders similar to that in ***Vision College*** (*supra*) have been passed, the decision in the present set of LPAs may be directed to govern all



such similar matters. A similar direction was passed by this Court in LPA No. 719/2026.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS

13. The following submissions were made on behalf of the Respondent-Institutions:

- 13.1. The Refusal Orders are unsustainable, as they proceeded on grounds extending beyond the deficiencies communicated in the Show Cause Notices. Although the Respondent-Institutions had furnished the documents and particulars prescribed on the application portal for transition to ITEP, the Refusal Orders were founded, *inter alia*, upon the alleged non-fulfilment of the requirement of being an MDI.
- 13.2. By introducing additional deficiencies in the Refusal Orders that had not been communicated in the Show Cause Notices, the Appellants deprived the Respondent-Institutions of a meaningful opportunity to address the grounds upon which their Transition Applications were ultimately rejected. The decision-making process was thereby vitiated for breach of the principles of natural justice.
- 13.3. The Respondent-Institutions satisfy the requirements prescribed by the NCTE, the State Government and the affiliating university for conducting the ITEP programme and have continuously conducted the existing four-year integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. course. Their infrastructure and instructional facilities had previously been examined and found sufficient for the grant of



recognition, and the Respondent-Institutions have continued to maintain and augment the infrastructure requisite for their educational programmes.

- 13.4. The deficiencies relied upon by the WRC, particularly those pertaining to physical infrastructure, could not have been regarded as conclusively established in the absence of an inspection of the Respondent-Institutions. Whether the Respondent-Institutions satisfy the prescribed physical requirements necessarily calls for verification. The Respondent-Institutions were, therefore, entitled to have their Transition Applications processed following such inspection, rather than rejected at the threshold without verification.
- 13.5. The Appellants failed to conclude the process relating to the Transition Applications within the time-bound framework prescribed by the Supreme Court in *Maa Vaishno Devi (supra)*. Although the Transition Applications had been submitted sufficiently in advance, the process was not completed within the prescribed timeframe, nor were the Respondent-Institutions taken to the stage of inspection. Such delay in the regulatory process, particularly in a matter concerning the Academic Session 2026-27, could not be permitted to operate to the prejudice of the Respondent-Institutions.
- 13.6. The Respondent-Institutions had sought transition of their existing four-year integrated B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. courses to ITEP for the Academic Session 2026-27. The process was



inherently time-sensitive, having regard to the commencement of the admission and counselling process. A direction for inspection and expeditious consideration of the Transition Applications was, therefore, necessary to ensure that the Respondent-Institutions were not deprived of the academic session on account of the manner in which their applications had been processed.

- 13.7. Recommencement of the process under Regulation 7 would entail considerable time and further delay the consideration of the Transition Applications. Having regard to the time-bound nature of the process, appropriate timelines may, therefore, be prescribed for the completion of each stage.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

14. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

15. The issue that arises for consideration in the present Appeals concerns the scope of scrutiny permissible under Regulation 7(1) before an application proceeds to the stage of inspection contemplated under Regulation 7(7).

16. Regulation 7(1) provides that where an application is incomplete or is not accompanied by the requisite documents, it shall be treated as incomplete and rejected. Regulation 7(7), by contrast, contemplates an inspection through virtual mode by a team of experts for the purpose of assessing the institution's preparedness to commence the course. The two provisions, therefore, operate at distinct stages of the process.



17. Regulation 7(1) cannot be construed to mean that every application, irrespective of whether it is complete and accompanied by the requisite documents, must necessarily proceed to an inspection. Such an interpretation would render the scrutiny contemplated under Regulation 7(1) otiose. Accordingly, where a document required to accompany an application has not been furnished, or where the application is otherwise incomplete, the concerned Regional Committee is required to deal with the application in accordance with Regulation 7(1).

18. Insofar as deficiencies relating to the physical infrastructure or other aspects of an institution's preparedness are concerned, and where such deficiencies, by their nature, require verification, Regulation 7(7) expressly contemplates an inspection "*with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course*".

19. In the present case, the Show Cause Notices and the Refusal Orders identify deficiencies of varying nature, including deficiencies relating to the documents necessary to establish the eligibility of the Respondent-Institutions, as well as deficiencies concerning infrastructure and preparedness, which would ordinarily fall to be verified at the stage of inspection.

20. In ***Vision College*** (*supra*), the learned Single Judge proceeded on the basis that the deficiencies referred to in the show cause notices therein, including those relating to teaching staff and physical infrastructure, could be determined only upon inspection and, consequently, directed that the institutions be inspected. However, that direction does not dispense with the independent scrutiny required under Regulation 7(1). We note that in ***Vision College*** (*supra*), Regulation 7(1) was constructed as permitting rejection



where an application was incomplete or was not accompanied by the requisite documents.

21. Accordingly, the setting aside of Refusal Orders on the ground that they included deficiencies capable of determination only upon inspection would not result in the Transition Applications proceeding directly to inspection, bypassing Regulation 7(1). We are of the considered view that the Transition Applications must first be considered at the stage contemplated under Regulation 7(1). Where a Transition Application is complete and accompanied by the requisite documents, the further process under Regulation 7 shall thereafter follow in accordance with law.

22. During the hearing, the parties placed on record their respective proposed timelines for processing the Transition Applications. Having regard to the time already elapsed and the timelines so proposed, we direct the WRC to scrutinise the Transition Applications under Regulation 7(1) within a period of two weeks from the date of this Judgment. In the event that any Transition Application is found to be incomplete or deficient in respect of a document required to accompany it, the WRC shall communicate the specific deficiency to the concerned Respondent-Institution and afford a reasonable opportunity to rectify the same.

23. Where the WRC finds a Transition Application to be complete and accompanied by the requisite documents, it shall thereafter process the application in accordance with the NCTE Regulations, including Regulation 7(7), wherever applicable. If the WRC proposes to take an adverse decision on a ground not previously communicated to the concerned Respondent-Institution, it shall afford that institution a reasonable opportunity to respond.



24. It is directed that the Respondent-Institutions shall not be required to deposit any fresh application fee for the consideration of the Transition Applications pursuant to the directions issued in this Judgment.

25. In view of the foregoing, the Impugned Orders directing the inspection of the Respondent-Institutions are hereby modified and it is directed that Transition Applications shall be processed by the WRC within the timelines as per the following schedule, formulated based on the proposals submitted by the parties, which shall be strictly adhered to:

S. No.	Stage	Timeline	To be completed by
1	Examination of the Transition Applications under Regulation 7(1), including communication of deficiencies, if any, in respect of the requisite documents	2 weeks	14.10.2026
2	Opportunity to the concerned Respondent-Institution to rectify the deficiencies so communicated	1 week	21.10.2026
3	Consideration of the reply and decision whether the Transition Application is to proceed to inspection and, where so decided, completion of inspection; otherwise, passing of an appropriate order	3 weeks	11.11.2026
4	Post inspection, communication of deficiencies, if any, <i>via</i> a show cause notice	1 week	18.11.2026
5	Opportunity to the concerned Respondent-Institution to rectify the deficiencies communicated after inspection	2 weeks	02.12.2026
6	Further decision after consideration of the reply to the post-inspection show cause notice and to decide if Letter of Intent (“LOI”) is to be issued	1 week	09.12.2026
7	If LOI issued then opportunity provided to the concerned Respondent-Institution to meet with conditions in terms of Regulations 7(13) to 7(16)	6 weeks	20.01.2027



2026:DHC:8548-DB



8	Consideration of compliance with Regulations 7(13) to 7(16), including communication of any deficiency and opportunity to respond	2 weeks	03.02.2027
9	Final decision regarding grant or refusal of recognition	1 week	10.02.2027

26. The timelines indicated above shall operate as outer limits. If any stage is completed before the timeline stipulated above, the WRC shall proceed to the next applicable stage without awaiting the expiry of the stipulated timeline.

27. Accordingly, the present Appeals stand disposed of in the aforesaid terms. Pending Applications, if any, also stand disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

TEJAS KARIA, J

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

SEPTEMBER 30, 2026

HK