

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COMMITTEE  
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION  
BANGALORE

Minutes of the 355<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SRC held at the Conference Hall of  
NCTE, Bangalore on 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2018.

The following persons attended the Meeting:-

- |                          |   |          |
|--------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Sri. S. Sathyam       | - | Chairman |
| 2. Dr. M.P. Vijaya Kumar | - | Member   |
| 3. Dr. J. Prasad         | - | Member   |
| 4. Shri.Rangadhamappa    | - | Member   |
| 5. Mr. Ravindra Singh    | - | Convenor |

The following members did not attend the Meeting:

- Prof. K. Dorasami, Prof. Sandeep Ponnala and the Representatives of the Govts. of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu-Pondicherry, A& N.
- Prof. M.S. Lalithamma had taken leave of absence on personal grounds. In fact, she had taken (long) leave of absence in September 17 itself because of having to go to Australia to attend to unavoidable personal commitments.

**Consideration of LOI reply & Non submission of reply : (Volume-1)**

1.	SRCAPP2016 30064 B.Sc.B.Ed 1Unit Azim Premji University, PES Campus, Bangalore, Karnataka	<p><b>AzimPremji University, PES Campus, Pixel Park, B Block, Electronic City, Hosur Road, (Behind Nice Road), Bangalore (U)-560010, Karnataka.</b></p> <p>AzimPremji Foundation for Development, PES Campus, Pixel Park B Block, Electric City, Hosur Road (Behind Nice Road), Anekal, Bangalore, Karnataka has submitted an online application for offering M.Ed and B.A.B.Ed / B.Sc.B.Ed course in the name of AzimPremji University, PES Campus, Pixel Park, B Block, Electronic City, Hosur Road, ( Behind Nice Road), Bangalore (U)-560010, Karnataka on 30.05.2016 and hard copy of the application was received on 07.06.2016.</p> <p>Letter was addressed to the Secretary to Government, Education Department, Government of Karnataka seeking recommendation /comments in respect of the application received by the SRC-NCTE for recognition of the proposed B.P.Ed course, on 22.06.2016. Reminder –I was issued on 01.10.2016. Reminder-II was sent to the Government on 02.11.2016.</p> <p>Recommendation of the State Government was received by this office after the completion of 90 days from the date of issue of the letters to the State Government vide Govt. Order No:ED 281 URC 2016, Bangalore, dated 15.12.2016 for B.A., B.Ed / B.Sc.B.Ed and vide order no. ED 282 URC 2016, Bangalore, dated 14.12.2016 for M.Ed course.</p> <p>The online application was scrutinized along with hard copy of the application.</p> <p>The SRC in its 324<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 07<sup>th</sup> – 08<sup>th</sup> December, 2016, considered the scrutiny of the application and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <i>“Four entities are involved- AzimPremji Trust; AzimPremji Foundation for Development; Peoples Education Society; and AzimPremji University.</i></li><li>2. <i>The promoter society is the Foundation, They have no title to the lands.</i></li><li>3. <i>The University is the institution concerned. They have only ‘lease hold title’acquired from a private party. This is not admissible under the 2014 Regulations.</i></li><li>4. <i>AzimPremji Trust and Peoples Education Society are not legally relevant to this case.</i></li><li>5. <i>EC is not given.</i></li><li>6. <i>LUC is not given.</i></li><li>7. <i>BP is not given.</i></li><li>8. <i>BCC is not given. Building is reported to be still under construction.</i></li><li>9. <i>For M.Ed –NAAC certificate is not given.</i></li><li>10. <i>Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.”</i></li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on</p>
----	---	--

08.12.2016. The institution has submitted reply through online on 29.12.2016 and hard copy on 30.12.2016.

The SRC in its 327<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 19<sup>th</sup>& 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2017 considered the notice reply and decided as under:-

1. "The SRC did not mean to question the academic standing of the AzimPremji University.
2. The SRC has to function strictly under the NCTE Regulations. It has no power or discretion to relax the Regulations. Only the Council has that power.
3. The AzimPremji University may approach the NCTE (HQ) fir obtaining the relaxation required by them. Thereafter, they can approach the SRC for appropriate further attention/action."

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 25.01.2017.

But till date the institution has not submitted any reply for further action.

The SRC in its 335<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 11<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 considered the matter of non submission of reply of the institution and decided as under:-

1. "There are too many deficiencies in this case.
2. They have not cared to address any one of them substantively.
3. Reject the application.
4. Return FDRs, if any.
5. Close the file. "

The SRC in its 336<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 reconsidered the matter and decided as under:-

1. "The communication of the NCTE (HQ) about the proposed amendment to the Regulations is seen. Circulate copies to all the Members. We can discuss in the next meeting.
2. SRO has brought up the case of AzimPremji University for consideration towards possible review w.r.t. the proposed amendment.
3. We find it difficult to accept this agenda item for consideration. There is no error apparent on the face of the record to warrant review. There is no other justification to reopen a decision taken by us on 11.4.2017. That the SRO has not yet issued the order is not relevant for our consideration."

As per the decision of SRC a rejection order was issued to the institution vide order No: F.No./NCTE/SRC/SRCAPP201630034/M.Ed/B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed/KA/2017-18/92951,

dated 24.04.2017.

Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC, the institution filed an appeal before the appellate authority, NCTE Hqrs.

The appellate authority vide order F.No. 89/221/2017Appeal/7<sup>th</sup> Meeting-2017 dated 01.05.2017 has remand back the case of AzimPremji University, Anekal, Karnataka.

The SRC in its 338<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 1<sup>st</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-

“1. As described our SCN on 08.12.2016, there are four main entities in this case:

AzimPremji University; Premji Foundation for Development; AzimPremji Trust; and peoples Education Society.

2. documents given show that all land dealings ( sale or lease) are between P.E.S. and A.P. Trust.

3.1 The A.P. Foundation is the promoter Society. They have no title ( freehold or lease).

3.2 The A.P. University is the institution concerned. They have no title ( freehold or leasehold)

4.1 NCTE ( Council) has amended the Regulation to relax the norms relating to landarea requirement in hill-areas and urban areas; even ‘lease ’ has been allowed.

4.2 That being so, the earlier considerations relating to land-holding need not anymore be a hurdle to further processing this case.

4.3 Availability of 1000 sq.mts of land for supporting a super-structure of built-up area is the minimum requirement indicated.

5.1 We can now get the VT inspection done.

5.2 Cause composite inspection for M.Ed( 1 unit) and B.A.B.Ed / B.Sc.B.Ed ( 2 units).

5.3 Ask the V.T. to collect all relevant documents. Title-deeds ( if any); LUC & EC for the Sy. Nos. involved; and B.P.and BCC;”

VT members names were generated through online VT module for inspection during the period 14.05.2017 to 03.06.2017. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 30.05.2017 and 31.05.2017 and the VT report along with documents received on 02.06.2017.

The SRC in its 342<sup>nd</sup> meeting held during 05<sup>th</sup> – 06<sup>th</sup> July, 2017 considered the VT report and decided as under:-

1. “The Composite VT Inspection report is exhaustive and gives many details.

2. The ( recently) amended Regulations have raised many new conditions.

- 3. SRO should list the various issues/ conditions in a tabular format and give against each the correct factual position relating to the AzimPremji University.”**

Further, an e-mail received by this office from the Under Secretary ( Regulations), NCTE, Hqrs on 08.09.2017 stated as under:-

“I am directed to refer to your email letter dated 09.08.2017 on the subject noted above and to say that through the NCTE Notification dated 28.04.2017. It is hereby clarified that an exemption has been carved out to the main existing provision 8(4) in Regulation. Thus the provisios mentioned below 8 (4) pertain to different situations where either a teacher education institution is running or proposed to be run on land which is not owned by it or even where the land area is less than required as per the main provision. Thus each provision indicates different situations for which specific prescriptions have been given for relaxing the land area requirement or even the land ownership norms. The amended part of sub regulation (4) is stated below:

“No institution shall be granted recognition under these regulations unless the institution or society sponsoring the institution is in possession of required land free from all encumbrances on the date of application and the said land shall be either on ownership basis or on lease from the Government or Government institutions for a period of not less than thirty years subject to the relevant laws of the concerned State or Union Territory.

Provided that in cases of Central or State Government Institutions or Universities, recognition may be accorded for a period of five years on land or premises, which is leased to them.

Provided further that such institution shall be required to shift to premises with own land and building thereon, in conformity with the specification in these regulations within a period of five years from the date of recognition.

Provided also that in case of Central or State Government Institutions or Universities, recognition may be accorded on land or premises, which is leased to them for a period of thirty year or more.

Provided also that in cases of Cities notified as Category X and Y by the Government of India for the purposes of house rent allowance, any University or College which has been in existence

for the last ten academic years on the date of application and not in possession of land as per National Council for Teacher Education norms, be allowed to apply for new Teacher Education Programmes or additional Intake exclusively on the basis of the availability of built up area as per National Council for

		<p>Teacher Education Norms, if the institution has at least one thousand sq.meter of land area on which the required infrastructure is built up.”</p> <p>2. The case under reference pertain to the first provisio and the requirement here would be that it shall be a State Central Govt. institution or a University which is proposing to run a teacher education programme from land/premises which are leased to it. The approval by RC is to be given for five years and within five years the said institution is expected to move to its own premises. The proviso is specific and is on standalone basis for facilitating a TEI which propose to be run from premises which are not owned by it.</p> <p>3. Needless to say, all other norms pertaining to building size, teaching faculty etc. will be required as per the existing regulations in this regard. Therefore Regional Director is advised to keep the above discussion in mind while processing the case under consideration.”</p> <p>The SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 21<sup>st</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2017 considered the decision of 342<sup>nd</sup> meeting and Reply from the Hqrs. and decided to issue Show Cause Notice for the following deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>“1. The NCTE (HQ) has sent a clarification regarding the recently amended regulation.The effective position is that govt institutions/Univs can be given recognition for 5 years even on leased land or premises.</li><li>2. The V.T.I report is examined.</li><li>3.1 AzimpremjiUniv is not a govt institution. Therefore, the recent amendment is not relevant to them.</li><li>3.2 Also, the lease period is only 3 years whereas the amendment talks of an interim recognition for 5 years within which time the applicant is expected to develops own facilities and shift into them.</li><li>4 In the result, and for the reasons given above, the AzimPremjiUniv does not qualify for consideration at all.</li><li>5 Issue SCN accordingly.”</li></ul> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 27.09.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail received from Mr. R.C.Chopra, Section Officer on 27.09.2017 requesting to send the original records with brief of the institution. Hence, the original file with brief of the institution is forwarded herewith.</p> <p>A reply of the NCTE, Hqrs dated 03.10.2017 is received by this office on 06.10.2017 is as under:-</p> <p>“I am directed to refer to the representation dated 28.09.2017 of AzimPremji University with reference to the show cause notice decided by the Southern Regional Committee</p>
--	--	--

in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21-22 September 2017 and to say that legal opinion on the following issues have been obtained from the NCTE panelled legal Counsel of Hon'ble Supreme Court which are stated below:-

- i) *Representation dated 28.09.2017 received from AzimPremji University.*
- ii) *NCTE clarification vide letter no. NCTE Reg. 1/6/2017 –US (Reg)-HQ dated 07.09.2017.*
  
- iii) *SCN by the SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting dated 21 and 22 Sept. 2017.*
- iv) *Letter No. PRS/PS/60/2016 date 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 received from Mr. Ajay Seth, IAS, Principal Secretary to Govt. Education Department (Primary and Secondary Education), Govt. of Karnataka.*
- v) *NCTE Agenda item No. 8 related to “Flexibility in requirement of and for new TEIs in Hilly, Metropolitan / Urban Areas” and approved minutes thereof.*
- vi) *NCTE Amendment notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 The representation received from the Institution along with above references has been examined and it is observed that the two issues raised by the SRC, while contemplating a show cause notice, are as under:-*
  - i) *AzimPremji University is not govt. institution. Therefore, the recent amendment is not relevant to them.*
  - ii) *Also, the lease period is only 3 years whereas the amendment talks of an interim recognition for 5 years within which time the applicant is expected to develop own facilities and shift into them”. As regards issue No. (i) the representation of the AzimPremji University dated 28.09.2017 and letter of the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Karnataka dated 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 (copy enclosed) mentions that AzimPremji University is philanthropic private University established in 2010 under the Government of Karnataka Act, 2010. The first proviso of the NCTE notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 states that “Provided that in case of Central or State Government Institutions or Universities, recognition may be accorded for a period of five years, on land or premises, which is leased to them.”*

The definition of “University” as per Section 2 (n) of the NCTE Act, 1993 provides that “University means a University defined under clause (f) of section 2 of the University Grants commission Act, 1956 and includes an institution deemed to be a University under Section 32 of that Act.” As per Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, “University means a University established or incorporated by or under a Central Act, a Provincial Act or a State Act, and includes any such institution as may, in consultation with the University concerned, be recognized by the Commission in accordance with the regulations made in this behalf under this Act”.

Taking into account definitions referred in under the NCTE Act and UGC Act, provisions

under first proviso of the NCTE Amendment Regulation, 2014 vide notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 and representation of the AzimPremji University dated 28.09.2017 and letter of the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Karnataka dated 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2016, it is clear that the first proviso makes the amendment applicable to State and Central Government Institutions and Universities, (University referred in under the definition of the NCTE & UGC Act). Further the same is evidently clear from the Agenda placed and approved by the Council which deliberated the point that *“Also certain category of institutions i.e. Universities, State & Central Govt. Institutions are at items unable to obtain recognition because their land is on lease.”* Thus the status of AzimPremji University falls under the category of first proviso for consideration.

As regards issue No. (ii) the first proviso of the NCTE notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 provides that *“Provided that in case of Central or State Government Institutions or Universities, recognition may be accorded for a period of five years, on land or premises, which is leased to them.”* and the second proviso of the NCTE Notification dated 28.4.2017 provides that *“Provided further that such institutions shall be required to shift to premises with own land and building thereon, n conformity with the specifications in these regulations within a period of five years from the date of recognition.”* From the above provisions, it does not make it mandatory that the leased premises should be necessarily leased for 5 years. It is merely mandated that the recognition should not be for more than 5 years on such leased premises. In fact the intention behind such an amendment is revealed in the second proviso which makes it clear that such an institution having been recognized would necessarily shift to owned premises within 5 years of such recognition. Thus in the case of the applicant, M/s. AzimPremji University, if the lease itself is for 3 years then it could be directed that either they shift to owned premises within 3 years or they will provide evidence of lease beyond 3 years in case they are intending to shift to owned premises after a period of 3 years from the recognition, but in any case before 5 years from recognition. Hence as per the legal opinion and the clarification given above, you are requested to place this clarification before the Chairperson, SRC for consideration.”

On 12.10.2017, a reply to show cause notice dated 10.10.2017 is received by this office from the institution is as under:-

“We refer to the above show cause notice. The SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on September 21-22, 2017 had decided to issue the show cause notice based primarily on two points cited as 3.1 and 3.2 in page 5 of the notice. These are (i) The amendements mentioned in the NCTE gazette notification dated April 28, 2017 is not relevant to the case of AzimPremji University since it si not a state or central government institution and (2) That the lease period is only for 3 years whereas the amendment talks of an interim recognition for a period of 5 years.

The minutes of the meeting citing the above points were uploaded on the SRCwebsite. Our interpretation was that the amendment (specified in the NCTE gazette notification dated April, 28, 2017) was applicable to all Universities (under the NCTE ACT and



UGC ACT) and not restricted to state or central government institutions. In fact the Visiting Team Inspection was conducted with the full knowledge that AzimPremji University is a Private University is a Private University formed under the AzimPremji University Act, 2010 of the Government of Karnataka.

In line with this, we had immediately requested the NCTE HQ for a clarification vide letter to NCTE HQ dated September 29, 2017 (Attached as Annexure 1).

The NCTE HQ vide their letter to the Regional Director, SRC, NCTE copied to AzimPremji University ( Reference-Reg 1/6/2017-US (Regulations) HQ / 58368 dated October, 3, 2010. Attached as Annexure-2) has clarified that

1. The amendment is applicable to State and Centre government Institutions and Universities. The clarifications also clearly specifies AzimPremji University falls under the category of Universities as referred in the amendment.
2. That the amendment does not specify that the lease should not be more than 5 years on such leased premises.

Given the above unambiguous clarification, it is clear that the AzimPremji University may be considered for recognition to offer the Teacher Education programs from leased premises as prescribed in the NCTE notification dated April 28, 2017.

We request you to please consider our application and accord recognition.”

The SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 16<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2017 considered the Show Cause Notice Reply, Hqrs clarification and decided as under:-

1. NCTE (HQ) have clarified that all Univs., whether Central govt or state govt owned or not are eligible to benefit under the new amendment.
2. The lease clause refers to 5-years as the upper limit. A 3-year lease will therefore, suffice. Only, the interim recognition will only be for 3 years within that period they should shift to their own premises.
3. They satisfy the other requirements.
4. Issue LOI for BA.B.Ed (1 Unit) BSc.B.Ed (1 unit) and M.Ed (1 unit).

As per the online application received on 30.05.2016 and VT Report received on 02.06.2017, the institution has requested for B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed for one unit and M.Ed course for one unit. But as per the decision of SRC, during its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting, LOI is to be issued for B.A.B.Ed- 1 unit and B.Sc.B.Ed – 1unit and M.Ed- 1 unit. Accordingly, Letter of Intent for M.Ed Course of one unit was issued to the institution on 27.11.2017. The above matter was discussed with the Chairman, SRC on 27.11.2017 by the Regional Director and a letter was addressed to the institution asking to confirm whether the institution opting for either B.A.B.Ed course with 1 unit or B.Sc.B.Ed course with one unit and a letter was sent to the institution on 29.11.2017.

		<p>The SRC in its 348<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 05<sup>th</sup> – 06<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 considered the ratification and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“1. Issue of LOI for M.Ed (1 unit) is in order with our decision. 2. As soon as their clarification is received, issue LOI for the course(s) indicated regarding the integrated programmes.</p> <p>In the meantime, a letter was received by this office on 06.12.2017 from the institution requesting to offer one unit of the 4 year integrated B.Sc. B.Ed programme from the academic year 2018-19.</p> <p>As per the decision of 348<sup>th</sup> meeting of SRC, a Letter of Intent for offering B.Sc.B.Ed programme was issued to the institution on 08.12.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 15<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 considered the ratification and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1. “The University has clarified that they want only B.Sc.B.Ed( 1 unit) and not B.A.B.Ed ( unit) also. 2. The earlier decision of the SRC to issue LOI for one unit of each courses is, therefore, reviewed and modified to issue LOI only for B.Sc.B.Ed( 1unit). 3. The advance action taken by the SRO to seek clarification from the University is ratified. The action taken to issue a modified LOI also ratified.”</p> <p>The institution has submitted LOI reply on 23.01.2018.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>1 .LOI reply is seen.</b> <b>2.1. University seal is there at the end. The signature in the earlier pages tallies with the signature in the last page.</b> <b>2.2. The applicant institution is itself the University.</b> <b>3.1. They have given a list of 1 Principal + 2 Asst. Profs (Perspectives) + 4 Asst Profs (Pedagogy) +3 Asst Profs (MPA ; MFA ; Ph.Ed)</b> <b>3.2. All are qualified.</b> <b>4. FDRs for 7 +5 lakhs received.</b> <b>5. Issue FR for BSc.B.Ed (1 Unit) w.e.f. 2018-19.</b></p>
2	SRCAPP2016 30064 M.Ed 1Unit Azim Premji	<p><b>AzimPremji University, PES Campus, Pixel Park, B Block, Electronic City, Hosur Road, (Behind Nice Road), Bangalore (U)-560010, Karnataka.</b></p> <p>AzimPremji Foundation for Development, PES Campus, Pixel Park B Block, Electric City, Hosur Road (Behind Nice Road), Anekal, Bangalore, Karnataka has submitted an</p>

<p>University, PES Campus, Bangalore, Karnataka</p>	<p>online application for offering M.Ed and B.A.B.Ed / B.Sc.B.Ed course in the name of AzimPremji University, PES Campus, Pixel Park, B Block, Electronic City, Hosur Road, ( Behind Nice Road), Bangalore (U)-560010, Karnataka on 30.05.2016 and hard copy of the application was received on 07.06.2016.</p> <p>Letter was addressed to the Secretary to Government, Education Department, Government of Karnataka seeking recommendation /comments in respect of the application received by the SRC-NCTE for recognition of the proposed B.P.Ed course, on 22.06.2016. Reminder –I was issued on 01.10.2016. Reminder-II was sent to the Government on 02.11.2016.</p> <p>Recommendation of the State Government was received by this office after the completion of 90 days from the date of issue of the letters to the State Government vide Govt. Order No:ED 281 URC 2016, Bangalore, dated 15.12.2016 for B.A., B.Ed / B.Sc.B.Ed and vide order no. ED 282 URC 2016, Bangalore, dated 14.12.2016 for M.Ed course.</p> <p>The online application was scrutinized along with hard copy of the application.</p> <p>The SRC in its 324<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 07<sup>th</sup> – 08<sup>th</sup> December, 2016, considered the scrutiny of the application and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <i>“Four entities are involved- AzimPremji Trust; AzimPremji Foundation for Development; Peoples Education Society; and AzimPremji University.</i></li><li>2. <i>The promoter society is the Foundation, They have no title to the lands.</i></li><li>3. <i>The University is the institution concerned. They have only 'lease hold title'acquired from a private party. This is not admissible under the 2014 Regulations.</i></li><li>4. <i>AzimPremji Trust and Peoples Education Society are not legally relevant to this case.</i></li><li>5. <i>EC is not given.</i></li><li>6. <i>LUC is not given.</i></li><li>7. <i>BP is not given.</i></li><li>8. <i>BCC is not given. Building is reported to be still under construction.</i></li><li>9. <i>For M.Ed –NAAC certificate is not given.</i></li><li>10. <i>Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.”</i></li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 08.12.2016. The institution has submitted reply through online on 29.12.2016 and hard copy on 30.12.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 327<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 19<sup>th</sup>&amp; 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2017 considered the notice reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <i>“The SRC did not mean to question the academic standing of the AzimPremji University.</i></li></ol>
---	--

2. The SRC has to function strictly under the NCTE Regulations. It has no power or discretion to relax the Regulations. Only the Council has that power.
3. The AzimPremji University may approach the NCTE (HQ) for obtaining the relaxation required by them. Thereafter, they can approach the SRC for appropriate further attention/action.”

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 25.01.2017.

But till date the institution has not submitted any reply for further action. The SRC in its 335<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 11<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 considered the matter of non submission of reply of the institution and decided as under:-

1. “There are too many deficiencies in this case.
2. They have not cared to address any one of them substantively.
3. Reject the application.
4. Return FDRs, if any.
5. Close the file. ”

The SRC in its 336<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 reconsidered the matter and decided as under:-

1. “The communication of the NCTE (HQ) about the proposed amendment to the Regulations is seen. Circulate copies to all the Members. We can discuss in the next meeting.
2. SRO has brought up the case of AzimPremji University for consideration towards possible review w.r.t. the proposed amendment.
3. We find it difficult to accept this agenda item for consideration. There is no error apparent on the face of the record to warrant review. There is no other justification to reopen a decision taken by us on 11.4.2017. That the SRO has not yet issued the order is not relevant for our consideration.”

As per the decision of SRC a rejection order was issued to the institution vide order No: F.No./NCTE/SRC/SRCAPP201630034/M.Ed/B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed/KA/2017-18/92951, dated 24.04.2017.

Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC, the institution filed an appeal before the appellate authority, NCTE Hqrs.

The appellate authority vide order F.No. 89/221/2017Appeal/7<sup>th</sup> Meeting-2017 dated 01.05.2017 has remand back the case of AzimPremji University, Anekal, Karnataka.

The SRC in its 338<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 1<sup>st</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 considered the matter

and decided as under:-

- “1. As described our SCN on 08.12.2016, there are four main entities in this case:  
AzimPremji University; Premji Foundation for Development; AzimPremji Trust; and peoples Education Society.
2. documents given show that all land dealings ( sale or lease) are between P.E.S. and A.P. Trust.
- 3.1 The A.P. Foundation is the promoter Society. They have no title ( freehold or lease).
- 3.2 The A.P. University is the institution concerned. They have no title ( freehold or leasehold)
- 4.1 NCTE ( Council) has amended the Regulation to relax the norms relating to landarea requirement in hill-areas and urban areas; even ‘lease ’ has been allowed.
- 4.2 That being so, the earlier considerations relating to land-holding need not anymore be a hurdle to further processing this case.
- 4.3 Availability of 1000 sq.mts of land for supporting a super-structure of built-up area is the minimum requirement indicated.
- 5.1 We can now get the VT inspection done.
- 5.2 Cause composite inspection for M.Ed( 1 unit) and B.A.B.Ed / B.Sc.B.Ed ( 2 units).
- 5.3 Ask the V.T. to collect all relevant documents. Title-deeds ( if any); LUC & EC for the Sy. Nos. involved; and B.P.and BCC;”

VT members names were generated through online VT module for inspection during the period 14.05.2017 to 03.06.2017. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 30.05.2017 and 31.05.2017 and the VT report along with documents received on 02.06.2017.

The SRC in its 342<sup>nd</sup> meeting held during 05<sup>th</sup> – 06<sup>th</sup> July, 2017 considered the VT report and decided as under:-

1. “The Composite VT Inspection report is exhaustive and gives many details.
2. The ( recently) amended Regulations have raised many new conditions.
3. SRO should list the various issues/ conditions in a tabular format and give against each the correct factual position relating to the AzimPremji University.”

Further, an e-mail received by this office from the Under Secretary ( Regulations), NCTE, Hqrs on 08.09.2017 stated as under:-

“I am directed to refer to your email letter dated 09.08.2017 on the subject noted

above and to say that through the NCTE Notification dated 28.04.2017. It is hereby clarified that an exemption has been carved out to the main existing provision 8(4) in Regulation. Thus the provisions mentioned below 8 (4) pertain to different situations where either a teacher education institution is running or proposed to be run on land which is not owned by it or even where the land area is less than required as per the main provision. Thus each provision indicates different situations for which specific prescriptions have been given for relaxing the land area requirement or even the land ownership norms. The amended part of sub regulation (4) is stated below:

“No institution shall be granted recognition under these regulations unless the institution or society sponsoring the institution is in possession of required land free from all encumbrances on the date of application and the said land shall be either on ownership basis or on lease from the Government or Government institutions for a period of not less than thirty years subject to the relevant laws of the concerned State or Union Territory.

Provided that in cases of Central or State Government Institutions or Universities, recognition may be accorded for a period of five years on land or premises, which is leased to them.

Provided further that such institution shall be required to shift to premises with own land and building thereon, in conformity with the specification in these regulations within a period of five years from the date of recognition.

Provided also that in case of Central or State Government Institutions or Universities, recognition may be accorded on land or premises, which is leased to them for a period of thirty year or more.

Provided also that in cases of Cities notified as Category X and Y by the Government of India for the purposes of house rent allowance, any University or College which has been in existence for the last ten academic years on the date of application and not in possession of land as per National Council for Teacher Education norms, be allowed to apply for new Teacher Education Programmes or additional Intake exclusively on the basis of the availability of built up area as per National Council for Teacher Education Norms, if the institution has at least one thousand sq. meter of land area on which the required infrastructure is built up.”

2. The case under reference pertain to the first proviso and the requirement here would be that it shall be a State Central Govt. institution or a University which is proposing to run a teacher education programme from land/premises which are leased to it. The approval by RC is to be given for five years and within five years the said institution is expected to move to its own premises. The proviso is specific and is on standalone basis for facilitating a TEI which

		<p>propose to be run from premises which are not owned by it.</p> <p>3. Needless to say, all other norms pertaining to building size, teaching faculty etc. will be required as per the existing regulations in this regard. Therefore Regional Director is advised to keep the above discussion in mind while processing the case under consideration.”</p> <p>The SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 21<sup>st</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2017 considered the decision of 342<sup>nd</sup> meeting and Reply from the Hqrs. and decided to issue Show Cause Notice for the following deficiencies:</p> <p>“1. The NCTE (HQ) has sent a clarification regarding the recently amended regulation. The effective position is that govt institutions/Univs can be given recognition for 5 years even on leased land or premises. 2. The V.T.I report is examined. 3.1 AzimPremjiUniv is not a govt institution. Therefore, the recent amendment is not relevant to them. 3.2 Also, the lease period is only 3 years whereas the amendment talks of an interim recognition for 5 years within which time the applicant is expected to develop own facilities and shift into them. 4 In the result, and for the reasons given above, the AzimPremjiUniv does not qualify for consideration at all. 5 Issue SCN accordingly.”</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 27.09.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail received from Mr. R.C.Chopra, Section Officer on 27.09.2017 requesting to send the original records with brief of the institution. Hence, the original file with brief of the institution is forwarded herewith.</p> <p>A reply of the NCTE, Hqrs dated 03.10.2017 is received by this office on 06.10.2017 is as under:-</p> <p>“I am directed to refer to the representation dated 28.09.2017 of AzimPremji University with reference to the show cause notice decided by the Southern Regional Committee in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21-22 September 2017 and to say that legal opinion on the following issues have been obtained from the NCTE paneled legal Counsel of Hon’ble Supreme Court which are stated below:-</p> <p>i) <i>Representation dated 28.09.2017 received from AzimPremji University.</i> ii) <i>NCTE clarification vide letter no. NCTE Reg. 1/6/2017 –US (Reg)-HQ dated 07.09.2017.</i> iii) <i>SCN by the SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting dated 21 and 22 Sept. 2017.</i></p>
--	--	---

	<p>iv) Letter No. PRS/PS/60/2016 date 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 received from Mr. Ajay Seth, IAS, Principal Secretary to Govt. Education Department (Primary and Secondary Education), Govt. of Karnataka.</p> <p>v) NCTE Agenda item No. 8 related to “Flexibility in requirement of and for new TEIs in Hilly, Metropolitan / Urban Areas” and approved minutes thereof.</p> <p>vi) NCTE Amendment notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 The representation received from the Institution along with above references has been examined and it is observed that the two issues raised by the SRC, while contemplating a show cause notice, are as under:-</p> <p>i) AzimPremji University is not govt. institution. Therefore, the recent amendment is not relevant to them.</p> <p>ii) Also, the lease period is only 3 years whereas the amendment talks of an interim recognition for 5 years within which time the applicant is expected to develop own facilities and shift into them”. As regards issue No. (i) the representation of the AzimPremji University dated 28.09.2017 and letter of the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Karnataka dated 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 (copy enclosed) mentions that AzimPremji University is philanthropic private University established in 2010 under the Government of Karnataka Act, 2010. The first proviso of the NCTE notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 states that “Provided that in case of Central or State Government Institutions or Universities, recognition may be accorded for a period of five years, on land or premises, which is leased to them.”</p> <p>The definition of “University” as per Section 2 (n) of the NCTE Act, 1993 provides that “University means a University defined under clause (f) of section 2 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 and includes an institution deemed to be a University under Section 32 of that Act.” As per Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, “University means a University established or incorporated by or under a Central Act, a Provincial Act or a State Act, and includes any such institution as may, in consultation with the University concerned, be recognized by the Commission in accordance with the regulations made in this behalf under this Act”.</p> <p>Taking into account definitions referred in under the NCTE Act and UGC Act, provisions under first proviso of the NCTE Amendment Regulation, 2014 vide notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 and representation of the AzimPremji University dated 28.09.2017 and letter of the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Karnataka dated 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2016, it is clear that the first proviso makes the amendment applicable to State and Central Government Institutions and Universities, (University referred in under the definition of the NCTE &amp; UGC Act). Further the same is evidently clear from the Agenda placed and approved by the Council which deliberated the point that “Also certain category of institutions i.e. Universities, State &amp; Central Govt. Institutions are at items unable to obtain recognition because their land is on lease.” Thus the status of</p>
--	---



AzimPremji University falls under the category of first proviso for consideration.

As regards issue No. (ii) the first proviso of the NCTE notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 provides that *“Provided that in case of Central or State Government Institutions or Universities, recognition may be accorded for a period of five years, on land or premises, which is leased to them.”* and the second proviso of the NCTE Notification dated 28.4.2017 provides that *“Provided further that such institutions shall be required to shift to premises with own land and building thereon, in conformity with the specifications in these regulations within a period of five years from the date of recognition.”* From the above provisions, it does not make it mandatory that the leased premises should be necessarily leased for 5 years. It is merely mandated that the recognition should not be for more than 5 years on such leased premises. In fact the intention behind such an amendment is revealed in the second proviso which makes it clear that such an institution having been recognized would necessarily shift to owned premises within 5 years of such recognition. Thus in the case of the applicant, M/s. AzimPremji University, if the lease itself is for 3 years then it could be directed that either they shift to owned premises within 3 years or they will provide evidence of lease beyond 3 years in case they are intending to shift to owned premises after a period of 3 years from the recognition, but in any case before 5 years from recognition. Hence as per the legal opinion and the clarification given above, you are requested to place this clarification before the Chairperson, SRC for consideration.”

On 12.10.2017, a reply to show cause notice dated 10.10.2017 is received by this office from the institution is as under:-

“We refer to the above show cause notice. The SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on September 21-22, 2017 had decided to issue the show cause notice based primarily on two points cited as 3.1 and 3.2 in page 5 of the notice. These are (i) The amendments mentioned in the NCTE gazette notification dated April 28, 2017 is not relevant to the case of Azim Premji University since it is not a state or central government institution and (2) That the lease period is only for 3 years whereas the amendment talks of an interim recognition for a period of 5 years.

The minutes of the meeting citing the above points were uploaded on the SRC website. Our interpretation was that the amendment (specified in the NCTE gazette notification dated April, 28, 2017) was applicable to all Universities (under the NCTE ACT and UGC ACT) and not restricted to state or central government institutions. In fact the Visiting Team Inspection was conducted with the full knowledge that AzimPremji University is a Private University is a Private University formed under the AzimPremji University Act, 2010 of the Government of Karnataka.

In line with this, we had immediately requested the NCTE HQ for a clarification vide letter to NCTE HQ dated September 29, 2017 (Attached as Annexure 1).

The NCTE HQ vide their letter to the Regional Director, SRC, NCTE copied to

AzimPremji University ( Reference-Reg 1/6/2017-US (Regulations) HQ / 58368 dated October, 3, 2010. Attached as Annexure-2) has clarified that

1. The amendment is applicable to State and Centre government Institutions and Universities. The clarifications also clearly specifies AzimPremji University falls under the category of Universities as referred in the amendment.
2. That the amendment does not specify that the lease should not be more than 5 years on such leased premises.

Given the above unambiguous clarification, it is clear that the AzimPremji University may be considered for recognition to offer the Teacher Education programs from leased premises as prescribed in the NCTE notification dated April 28, 2017.

We request you to please consider our application and accord recognition.”

The SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 16<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2017 considered the Show Cause Notice Reply, Hqrs clarification and decided as under:-

1. NCTE (HQ) have clarified that all Univs., whether Central govt or state govt owned or not are eligible to benefit under the new amendment.
2. The lease clause refers to 5-years as the upper limit. A 3-year lease will therefore, suffice. Only, the interim recognition will only be for 3 years within that period they should shift to their own premises.
3. They satisfy the other requirements.
4. Issue LOI for BA.B.Ed (1 Unit) BSc.B.Ed (1 unit) and M.Ed (1 unit).

As per the online application received on 30.05.2016 and VT Report received on 02.06.2017, the institution has requested for B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed for one unit and M.Ed course for one unit. But as per the decision of SRC, during its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting, LOI is to be issued for B.A.B.Ed- 1 unit and B.Sc.B.Ed – 1unit and M.Ed- 1 unit. Accordingly, Letter of Intent for M.Ed Course of one unit was issued to the institution on 27.11.2017.

The above matter was discussed with the Chairman, SRC on 27.11.2017 by the Regional Director and a letter was addressed to the institution asking to confirm whether the institution opting for either B.A.B.Ed course with 1 unit or B.Sc.B.Ed course with one unit and a letter was sent to the institution on 29.11.2017.

The SRC in its 348<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 05<sup>th</sup> – 06<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 considered the ratification and decided as under:-

- “1. Issue of LOI for M.Ed (1 unit) is in order with our decision.
2. As soon as their clarification is received, issue LOI for the course(s) indicated regarding the integrated programmes.

In the meantime, a letter was received by this office on 06.12.2017 from the institution requesting to offer one unit of the 4 year integrated B.Sc. B.Ed programme from the

		<p>academic year 2018-19.</p> <p>As per the decision of 347<sup>th</sup> meeting of SRC, a Letter of Intent for offering M.Ed programmewas issued to the institution on 27.11.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted LOI reply on 23.01.2018.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the LOI reply of the institution and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. LOI reply is seen.</b></li> <li><b>2.1. University seal is there at the end. The signature in the earlier pages tallies with the signature in the last page.</b></li> <li><b>2.2. The applicant institution is itself the University.</b></li> <li><b>3.1. They have given a list of 1 Principal, 2 Profs, 2 Associate Profs and 6 Asst Profs. All are qualified.</b></li> <li><b>3.2. Principal must have 10 years experience. But, certificates have been given only for 4 years.</b></li> <li><b>4. Issue notice accordingly for rectification.</b></li> </ol>
3	<p>SRCAPP2589 M.Ed (1Unit) CSI College of Education, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala</p>	<p><b>CSI College of Education, Plot No.422/4,419/6, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District-695502, Kerala.</b></p> <p>Society for Higher Education of SIUC Community of South Kerala Diocese of Church of South India, Plot No.419/6422/4, Cheruvarakonam Street, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluka, Thiruvananthapuram District - 695502 applied for grant of recognition to CSI College of Education, Plot No.422/4,419/6, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District-695502, Kerala for offering M.Ed course of 2 years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 28.05.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 03.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 05.06.2015, followed by Reminder- I on 12.06.2015 and Reminder- II on 30.11.2015.</p> <p>The Sub clause (7) of clause 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</p> <p>The SRC in its 295<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> - 30<sup>th</sup> November &amp; 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2015</p>

considered the matter, documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:-

1. LUC is to be given.
2. BP approved by competent authority is to be given.
3. EC is to be given.
4. Society Registration certificate and Bye-laws to be given.
5. BCC should be produced during VT Inspection.
6. FDRs should be given later.
7. Cause Composite Inspection.
8. Ask VT to particularly check on the deficiencies and collect all documents.

As per the decision of SRC, a composite inspection was conducted on 04.02.2016 and the Visiting team report was received on 05.02.2016.

The SRC in its 302<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 09<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 considered the VT report and decided as under:-

1. No Video.
2. BCC not in format.
3. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per decision of SRC, based on website information, the institution submitted show cause notice reply on 03.03.2016 and 21.04.2016.

The SRC in its 311<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-

*“The building is good. BCC has also been issued by competent authority But it is not in the prescribed format, Obtain a proper BCC and issue LOI for M.Ed (1 unit).”*

As per the decision of SRC, LOI and letter was issued to the institution on 25.04.2016 for submission of BCC.

On 02.05.2016 and 04.06.2015 a letter was received by this office from the institution along with BCC and photocopy of the FDRs.

The institution submitted reply to the LOI on 28.06.2016 and stating as under:-

*“As per our application for M.Ed Course (Application ID:SRCAPP2589) an inspection team visited our college during 1<sup>st</sup> week of February and based on the VT report a Letter of Intent Prior to grant of recognition was issued subject to the appointment of qualified staff. For staff appointment a selection committee was constituted with Dr.G.R.Santhosh Kumar, Chairman, Board of Studies (Education), University of Kerala as University Nominee, Rev.D. Jacob, Treasurer, CSI, south Kerala*

*Diocese as Management Representative, Prof Jacob Mathew, Former Principal, Government college of Teacher Education, Thiruvananthapuram as Management Nominee and Dr. Sajith C Raj, Principal, CSI college of Education, Parassala as its member. Based on the interview held on 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2016, Two Professors, Two Associate Professors and Six Assistant Professors were selected and appointment as M.Ed Faculty. The list of selected candidates was forwarded to the University of Kerala along with their original documents for Approval/Endorsement which is being processed by the university.*

*All the other conditions from 3 to 7 as specified in the letter of intent are being fulfilled by us and is ready for your kind perusal. It is known from the University that the Process of Approval/ Endorsement of staff appointment may take nearly 2 months.*

*Since the institution has fulfilled all the requirements of LOI except approved staff list which is only due to the delay in processing by the university, I humbly request your good self to be kind enough to extend the date of submission of approved staff list at least to 2 months from this date enabling us to obtain recognition to start the course during the academic year 2017-2018.”*

The SRC in its 317<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. Faculty list is not approved.
2. Original FDRs – not given.
3. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.

Based on the website information of the SRC decision, the institution has submitted a reply on 12.08.2016 along with original FDRs.

As per decision of SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 29.09.2016, The Institution submitted Show cause notice reply on 19.10.2016.

The SRC, in its 323<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. They want time to submit Faculty list.
2. Give time till 31.12.2016.

As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 29.11.2016. The institution has submitted representation on 30.12.2016 and stating as under:-

“The Faculty list for the proposed M.Ed course in CSI College of Education, Parasala was submitted to the University of Kerala and was placed in the sub-committee of the syndicate which usually meets prior to the Syndicate meeting. Two defects were noticed by the sub- committee and both of them were rectified by the college immediately. The revised faculty list will be placed in the next syndicate meeting

for final approval. A letter from the Registrar of the University of Kerala in this regard is enclosed. As we have already rectified all the other defects noticed by NCTE, I request your good self to be kind enough to extend the time limit for the submission of approved faculty list so that we could get the recognition from NCTE for the M.Ed course for the academic year 2017-18”.

The SRC in its 329<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 06<sup>th</sup> to 07<sup>th</sup> February, 2017 considered the matter and decide as under:-

1. We have given them enough time to give the faculty list.
2. We cannot wait indefinitely.
3. Reject the application.
4. Return FDRs, if any.
5. Close the file.

As per the decision of the SRC, Rejection order was issued to the institution on 17.02.2017.

Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE Hqrs and the Appellate Authority vide No. F.No.89-277/E-1894/2017 Appeal/12<sup>th</sup> Meeting-2017 dated 10.08.2017 received by this office on 29.08.2017 and stating as under:-

*“.....Appeal Committee noted that a Letter of Intent (LOI) dated 25.04.2016 was issued to appellant institution inter alia requiring the appellant institution to submit list of faculty duly approved by the affiliating body. Appeal Committee further noted in response to a Show cause Notice (SCN) dated 29.09.2016, the appellant made a written request to SRC vide its letter dated 18.10.2016 and 28.12.2016 to extend the time limit for submission of approved faculty list. SRC considered the request made by appellant institute vide its letter dated 18.10.16 and extended the time limit for submission of the list upto 31.12.2016. The request made by appellant vide its letter dated 28.12.2016 was not taken cognigence of for granting further extension on the ground that enough time has already been given.*

*AND WHEREAS during the course of appeal presentation on 30.06.2017, appellant appraised the Appeal Committee that the University of Kerala has approved the list of faculty on 12.04.2017. Appeal committee therefore, decided to remand back the case to SRC for consideration of the list of faculty which appellant institution should submit to SRC within 15 days of the issue of Appeal orders.*

*AND WHEREAS after perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents o record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, Appeal committee concluded to remand back the case to SRC, Bangalore with a request to consider the faculty list which the appellant institution should submit within 15 days of the issue of Appeal orders.*

*NOW THEREFORE the council hereby remands back the case of CSI college of Education, Parassala, Cheruvakonam, Neyyattinkara, Kerala to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above.*

The SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2017 considered the matter and decided to Process.

The application and faculty list submitted by the institution was processed and placed before SRC in its 346<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. We issued LOI on 25.04.2016 for M.Ed (1 unit)
2. They have given the reply only now.
3. Faculty list is approved. One Faculty member, Prof and HOD (Psy.) Dr. Ida Nancy has only 54% in P.G. (Psy) degree. She is, therefore, not qualified.
4. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of the SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 31.10.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 17.11.2017.

The SRC in its 352<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> January, 2018 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. Their reply, citing the UGC ordinance on the point, is seen.
2. Their contention is accepted.
- 3.1 FDRs have not been given.
- 3.2 Issue FR for M.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2018-19 after collecting the FDRs in order.
4. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of the SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 15.01.2018. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 19.01.2018 & 30.01.2018.

**The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:**

- 1. LOI notice reply seen.**
- 2. The decision to clear the case for FR was taken on 15.1.18.**
- 3. Now that FDRs have been received, issue FR for M.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2018-19**

4	SRCAPP2016 30137 D.P.SE 1Unit Oasis Diploma in Pre School Education, Warangal, Telangana	<p><b>Oasis Diploma in Pre School Education, Deshaipet Road, Oasis Colony, Warangal Taluk, Deshaipet Road City, Warangal District-506002, Telangana</b></p> <p>Oasis Education Society, Warangal Village, Deshaipet Road, Warangal Taluk &amp; City, Warangal District-506002, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Oasis Diploma in Pre School Education, Deshaipet Road, Oasis Colony, Warangal Taluk, Deshaipet Road City, Warangal District-506002, Telangana for offering D.P.S.E course for two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 28.06.2016. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 28.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 12.07.2016, followed by Reminder-I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder-II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Government after the period of 90 days as per Regulations is over; hence, the application is processed. As per public notice for 2017-18 there is no ban for D.P.S.E course in the State of Telangana.</p> <p>The application has been scrutinized through online along with hard copy of application and placed before the SRC in its 325<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.1. There are 3 titles deeds. Each shows different land areas for sy.no. 287. There is also confusion caused by a Municipal building occupying 15552 sqft of plinth area.</li><li>1.2. LUC issued by Tahsildar shows 3022 sqm. Is with the Oasis Education society. Land required is only 3000 sq.mts.</li><li>2. EC is in order.</li><li>3. LUC is in order.</li><li>4. BP-not approved by competent authority. Built up area approved is 4043 sqmts,</li><li>5. BCC-not approved by competent authority.</li><li>6. FDRs-not given</li><li>7. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.</li></ol> <p>Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution through online mode on 21.12.2016. The institution has not submitted its reply.</p> <p>The SRC in its 329<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 06<sup>th</sup> – 07<sup>th</sup> February, 2017, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. NOC (issued by Director of School Education) is given.</li><li>2. Reply to SCN not received.</li><li>3. According to the computer programme in force, non-submission of reply to SCN should lead to rejection of the case. It will be unfortunate if this case, which fulfils most of the requirements for VT inspection has to be rejected</li></ol>
---	---	---



- because of the technical difficulty in the computer programme.  
4. Remind them for an early reply.

Accordingly, a letter to the institution was sent on 15.02.2017 conveying the 329<sup>th</sup> SRC decision.

The institution has submitted its reply on 27.02.2017.

The SRC in its 332<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 28.02.2017 to 03.03.2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. Their reply to the Show Cause Notice is satisfactory.
2. Cause VT inspection.
3. The FDR already given (3+5 lakhs) is for the D.El.Ed. course. For DPSE(2 units) they should give FDRs(7+5 lakhs) separately for each unit. The D.El.Ed. F.D.Rs also should be increased to 7+5 lakhs.
4. In view of the time-limit prescribed by the Supreme Court for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2017-18, nothing can be done after 3.3.17. But, if the Supreme Court extends the time-limit, there will be a chance for this case to make it for the 2017-18 course. Request them, therefore, to accept short-notice for the VT inspection.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members through online on 09.03.2017. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> March 2017 and the VT report along with CD received on 31.03.2017.

The documents received along with VT report is processed and placed before the SRC in its 335<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. Title is clear. Land area is adequate.
2. Affidavit not given.
3. LUC/EC are in order.
4. BP is given. Built-up area shown is 4043.73 sq.mts.
- 5.1 BCC is given. Built-up area is same as in BP.
- 5.2 Built-up area required is 3000 [DPSE(1 unit)+D.El.Ed.(1Unit)2500]+[DPSE(1 unit)500]
- 6 Built-up area is adequate.
- 7 FDRs are required, in originals in joint account, @7+5 lakhs for each unit of each course.
- 8 Issue LOI for DPSE (2 units).

As per decision of SRC, letter of intent was sent to the institution through online on 18.04.2017. The institution submitted its reply on 01.05.2017.

The SRC in its 338<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> – 03<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 considered the LOI reply and decided as under:

1. Their LOI reply is seen.
2. The Faculty list is examined:
  - The list is not approved.
  - Service Certificate of HoD is not given.
  - Lect(ECC) is not qualified.
  - Lect.(Creative & PA) is not qualified.
  - There is an overall shortfall of 5 Lecturers.
3. Faculty list is not uploaded in the website.
4. FDRs have been given; but, not in joint account.
5. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent to the institution on 08.05.2017.

The institution submitted show cause notice reply along with documents on 05.06.2017.

The SRC in its 341<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 considered and decided as under;

1. All requirements have been met.
2. Since, after 2.5.17, we can consider cases for FR only w.e.f. 2018-19. They are given time till 31.1.18 for submission of the approved staff list.

Accordingly, as directed by SRC letter was sent to the institution on 29.06.2017.

The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 28.12.2017 is requested to kindly look into our above submission and issue appropriate orders for extension of time for the submission of Staff Approval of our college so as to start DPSE course in our Telangana from 2018-19.

The SRC in its 354<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> January, 2018 considered the matter and decided as under;

2. Their reply does not meet our requirements.
  - 2.1. Their reply to our LOI is incomplete without the approved faculty list.
  - 2.2. In view of the Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3.3.18, for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19, we can not indefinitely wait for the approved faculty list.
3. The faculty list must come by 31.1.18 so that we will have time to process the case and consider issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19.
4. Issue SCN accordingly.

		<p>Before issuance of show cause notice institution submitted its written representation and stating as under;</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“.....I submit that we approached the Government of Telangana for the approval of the Faculty for DPSE course and made several requests for the same. The Government may issue necessary orders in the month of February, 2018 and likely we are expecting the necessary orders by the last week of Feb 2018.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Hence, we request you to consider the submission approved Faculty list of DSPSE by 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2018. Besides as per the directions of the Honorable Supreme Court pertaining to issue of FR, we earnestly plead you to consider the request for the submission of approved faculty list on or before 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2018.</i></p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. They want time to file the Faculty list.</b></li> <li><b>2. Give time till 28.02.18.</b></li> <li><b>3. Issue SCN accordingly</b></li> </ol>
5	<p>SRCAPP2016 30143 B.Ed 2 Units Muthukkaru ppan Memorial Educational Trust, Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p><b>Muthukkaruppan Memorial Educational Trust, Sillangulam Village, M.K.N Nagar, Ottapidaram Taluk &amp; City, Tuticorin District-628718, Tamil Nadu.</b></p> <p>Muthukkaruppan Memorial Educational Trust, Sillankulam Village, M.K.N. Nagar, Ottapidaram Taluk &amp; City, Tuticorin District-628718, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Muthukkaruppan Memorial Educational Trust, Sillangulam Village, M.K.N Nagar, Ottapidaram Taluk &amp; City, Tuticorin District-628718, Tamil Nadu for offering B.Ed course of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 21.06.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 05.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.08.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.10.2016 and Reminder II on 11.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations was over. Hence, the application was processed. As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for B.Ed course in the State of Tamilnadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application of the institution was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and documents and the same was placed before SRC in its placed before SRC in its 327<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. NOC is given.</b></li> </ol>

2. Title is in order. Land area is adequate.
3. LUC is in order. Plot area details not given.
4. EC is not in original. It shows 'lease'.
5. BP is approved. Built-up area shown is 4063.01 sq.mts.
6. BCC – not given.
7. FDRs – not given.
8. Cause inspection.

As per the decision of SRC, inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode during 01.02.2017 to 21.02.2017.

Inspection of the institution was conducted on 21.02.2017 and VT report was received by this office through e-mail on 22.02.2017 and hard copy on 27.02.2017.

The SRC in its 332<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> February to 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2017 considered the VT Report and decided as under:-

1. Sy.No. 399/12B is not relevant to this case.
2. EC covers only 398/1; it does not cover 39/12A.
3. They are not offering any other course. The proposed B.Ed. (2 units) will, therefore, be hit by the 'stand alone' clause.
4. Issue SCN for rejection.

As per the decision of the SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution through online on 07.03.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 10.03.2017.

The SCN reply was placed before SRC in its 333<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> March, 2017 and the Committee considered and decided as under:-

1. Their replies are satisfactory.
2. FDRs are required @ 7+5 lakhs per unit. They have to give one more set.
3. Issue LOI for B.Ed.(2 units).

As per the decision of SRC, a Letter of Intent was issued to the institution through hard copy on 24.04.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the LOI through e-mail on 03.05.2017.

The same was placed before SRC in its 338<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> to 03<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. In confirmation of the decisions taken in the telephonic communication last night.
2. The Faculty list is not approved. We cannot act on this.
3. Reject the application.
4. Return the FDRs.

5. Close the file.

As per the decision of SRC, a rejection order was issued to the institution on 08.05.2017.

Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE-Hq, as required by NCTE-Hq the brief of the case along with original file of the institution was sent on 08.09.2017.

The Appellate Authority vide No.89-551/E-11859/2017 Appeal/18<sup>th</sup> Meeting - 2017 dated 29.11.2017 was received by this office on 06.12.2017 and 07.12.2017 and stating as under:-

*“..... the Committee noted that the appellant has submitted the letter of the Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Chennai dt. 04.05.2017 approving the faculty of the appellant's college for B.Ed. course, the list of faculty and other documents required in the letter of intent to the SRC, which were received on 12.05.2017. Since, the appellant has explained the reasons for the delayed approval of the faculty by the affiliating university, the committee concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to consider the documents submitted to them and take further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014.*

*AND WHEREAS after perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to SRC with a direction to consider the documents submitted to them and take further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014.*

*NOW THEREFORE, the Council hereby remands back the case of Muthikkaruppan Memorial College of Education, Sillangulam, M.K.N. Nagar, Ottapidaram, Tamil Nadu to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above”.*

The SRC its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 considered the matter and decided to Process.

The application was processed and placed before SRC in its 351<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

- 1.Their LOI – reply is examined.
- 2.Faculty list is examined.:
  - (i) It is duly approved.
  - (ii) 8 Assistant Professors in Pedagogy are required. 2 are not qualified because of their M.Com & M.Sc (Computer Sc.) qualifications. Out of the remaining 6, AP (Social) Ms. Krishnaveni does not have M.Ed.

		<p>3. Issue SCN accordingly.</p> <p>As per the decision of the SRC, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 03.01.2018. Based on website information, the institution has submitted LOI notice reply on 04.01.2018.</p> <p>The SCN reply was placed before SRC in its 353<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2018 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Their reply dated 04.01.2018 is seen.</li> <li>2. They have made 3 new appointments to rectify the deficiencies.</li> <li>3.1. Appointment of a History Asst Prof, strictly speaking, cannot be said to meet the requirement of an Assistant Professor in Sociology.</li> <li>3.2. They will have to recruit a duly qualified Assistant Professor in Sociology / Philosophy.</li> <li>4. Issue SCN accordingly.</li> </ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 19.01.2018. The institution has submitted a reply on 19.01.2018.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The LOI Notice reply is seen</b></li> <li><b>2. The reply is not satisfactory ; The entry 'Sociology' is hand-written.</b></li> <li><b>2.2. It is not clear whether this over-writing is approved by the University.</b></li> <li><b>2.3. But, the mark list for MA confirms that he did 'Sociology'.</b></li> <li><b>3. Issue FR for B.Ed (2 Units) w.e.f. 2018-19.</b></li> </ol>
6	<p>SRCAPP2016 30048 B.Ed-AI, M.Ed S.V.I College of Education, Puukottai, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p><b>S.V.I College of Education, Sethurappatti Bus Stop, Trichy Viralimalai Main Road, Iluppur Taluk, Pudukottai District-620012,Tamil Nadu.</b></p> <p>Sangamirtham Social Trust, Crawford Village, 67, Madurai Main Road, Tiruchanapalli Taluk &amp; City, Tiruchanapalli District-620012, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to S.V.I College of Education, Sethurappatti Bus Stop, Trichy-Viralimalai Main Road, Iluppur Taluk, Pudukottai District-620012,Tamil Nadu for offering B.Ed-AI course of two years duration and M.Ed course of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 27.05.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 07.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016, followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Govt. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.</p>

As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for B.Ed & M.Ed courses in the State of Tamil Nadu.

The application has been scrutinized online along with hard copy of application and placed before SRC in its 325<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. They can not apply for two different courses-B.Ed-AI and M.Ed – in the same application. They must choose one course and indicate.
2. Once the clarification is received, process for the course concerned and put up.

As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution through online on 05.01.2017.

The institution has submitted its written representation on 16.01.2017.

The written representation was placed before SRC in its 328<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. The institution has insisted on maintaining the request for both the courses.
2. According to current instructions and practice such functioning is not permissible.
3. Give them one more opportunity to choose any one course failing which we will be constrained to reject the application.
4. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per a Show Cause Notice was sent to the institution through online mode. as already decided by the SRC in its 328<sup>th</sup> meeting, SCN issued.

As the case was being processed online after the decision of SRC it was observed that there is no such option to send another SCN in the dash board. The options available are either to reject the reply or to accept for preliminary scrutiny.

In view of the above, a clarification is sought from Mr. Ibrahim vide this office mail dated 20.01.2017 and the same is placed in the file. Reply is awaited.

The SRC in its 331<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> February, 2017, considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. The clarification given is noted.
2. But, it does not fully solve our problem. Pursue with NCTE(HQ).

	<p>Accordingly, a letter send to the NCTE(HQ) through e-mail on 23.02.2017.</p> <p>The decision of 328<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Show Cause Notice issued to the institution through On-line on 27.02.2017.</p> <p>Court Notice was received by this office on 13.03.2017 in W.P No 5784 of 2017 filed by SVI College of Education.</p> <p>The institution submitted the Show Cause Notice reply through On-line on 16.03.2017 and received hard copy on 20.03.2017 and stated as under:-</p> <p><i>“.....With reference to the above cited subject, we have filed a case at Honorable High Court – Chennai W.P.No:5784 of 2017 – regarding challenging the impugned Show Cause Notice for intake of B.Ed additional intake and M.Ed course came up for hearing on 10.03.2017 before Hon’ble Single Judge, Mr. Justice N. Kirubakaran. After hearing arguments from both counsels, the Hon’ble Judge ordered notice to be issued to be issued to the Respondents and the same has been compiled with. He further posted the matter for final hearing on 27.03.2017 for composite inspection for both B.Ed (AI) &amp; M.Ed courses.</i></p> <p><i>So the case is pending at Honorable High Court Chennai in this situation we request to NCTE/SRC to consider that for not to take decision till the final judgment.”</i></p> <p>The Court order dated 10.03.2017 received by this office on 27.03.2017 in W.P No.5784 of 2017 filed by SVI College of Education.</p> <p><i>“Unless some serious efforts are taken by the respective respondents, Unemployment of the graduates/diplomats would loom large and the institution would be manufacturing only graduates without any employment and it will not be in the interest of the sociery making unemployment as acute problem. The above queries have to answer by the respondent on or before 27.03.2017. as far as writ petition is concerned the respondents have to file their counter by 27.03.2017</i></p> <p><i>Post ht matter on 27.03.2017.</i></p> <p>The matter was placed before SRC in its 334<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 and the committee considered and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The matter relating to joint application for and composite inspection of B.Ed.-A.I.(1 unit) and M.Ed.(1 unit) is pending in the Hon’ble Court.</li><li>2. Await further instructions from the Court.</li></ol> <p>A letter was addressed to the Advocate Shri.J.Harikrishna on 05.04.2017 and 13.04.2017 along with duly signed Vakalatnam and Brief of the case in W.P No.5784 of</p>
--	--



	<p>2017 filed by SVI College of Education, Thirucy, Tamilnadu.</p> <p>A letter dated 04.04.2017 received on 10.04.2017 from the advocate Shri.M.T Arunan in W.P No 5784 of 2017 filed by SVI College of Education.</p> <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was sent to the Advocate Shri.J.Harikrishna on 21.04.2017.</p> <p>A reply was received from Shri.J.Harikrishna letter dated 11.04.2017 received by this office on 24.04.2017 regarding in W.P No.5784 of 2017 filed by SVI College of Education rep by its Chairperson, Thirucy, Tamilnadu.</p> <p>An email was received by this office on 11.04.2017 &amp; 12.04.2017 from the Advocate Shri.J.Harikrishna attaching the letter intimation about the proceedings in W.P No.5784 of 2017.</p> <p>Forwarding of Signed Vakalatnama to the Advocate Shri.Harikrishna on 25.04.2017.</p> <p>An email was received on 27.04.2017 in W.P No.5784 of 2017 filed by SVI College of Education enclosed copy the NCTE Hqrs letter dated 26.04.2017.</p> <p>An email was received by this office on 01.05.2017 enclosed copy of the Hqrs letter dated No.F.64-6/2017NCTE/Legal dated 28.04.2017.</p> <p>An email was received on 13.05.2017 &amp; 16.05.2017 enclosed copy of the Vakalatnama to be filed in the High court of Madras a draft Counter Affidavit in W.P No.5784 of 2017 was received by this office on 15.05.2017</p> <p>NCTE Hqrs letter dated 15.05.2017 was received by this office through email on 15.05.2017.</p> <p>The Corrected counter Affidavit in W.P No.5784 of 2017 received by this office on 22.06.2017 from the Shri Harikrishnan Jakkula filed by SVI College of Education.</p> <p>NCTE Hqrs letter dated 22.06.2017 received by this office through email 23.06.2017 &amp; Hardcopy received on 28.06.2017 regarding W.P© No.5784/2017 and WMP Nos.6185 to 6187/2017 titled SVI College of Education Vs RD,SRC and other before the High Court of Madras.</p> <p>A letter was sent to the Advocate Shri.Harikrishna on 28.06.2017 enclosed copy of duly signed 1+2 Counter Affidavit in respect of W.P No 5784 of 2017.</p> <p>An email dated 30.06.2017 information in respect of ERC, NRC and WRC in W.P© No.5784/2017 filed by SVI College of Education.</p> <p>An email was received on 03.07.2017 along with fair counter affidavit in W.P No 5784 of</p>
--	---

	<p>2017. Counter affidavit was forwarded to Shri.Harikrishna on 13.07.2017.</p> <p>NCTE Hqrs letter dated 14.07.2017 received through email on 17.07.2017 and hard copy received on 24.07.2017 regarding Various information desired by the Hon'ble High court of Madras in WP No.5784/2017 and WMP Nos.6185 to 6187/2017 titled SVI College of Education Vs, RD SRC and other.</p> <p>An email sent to Legal on 18.07.2017 Forwarding Court order in WP No 5784 of 2017 filed by SVI College of Education.</p> <p>An Email dated 14.07.2017 forwarded by NCTE Hqrs in WP No 5784 of 2017 filed by SVI College of Education sent to through email on 18.07.2017. and reply was received from Shri J Harikrishnan.</p> <p>A letter dated 10.07.2017 received on 19.07.2017 from the Shri M.T Arunan WP No 5784 of 2017 the High Court of Madras.</p> <p>An email was received by this office on 07.08.2017 from the Shri J Harikrishnan, Advocate.</p> <p>NCTE Hqrs letter dated 01.8.2017 received by SRO on 08.08.2017 regarding WP No 5784 of 2017 and WMP Nos.6185 to 6187/2017 titled SVI College of Education Vs. RD, SRC and other.</p> <p>On 09.08.2017 a letter was addressed to Dr Sumita Das Majumder NCTE Hqrs seeking WP (C)No 5784 of 2017 and WMP Nos.6187 to 6187/2017 titled SVI College of Education Vs. RD, SRC and other.</p> <p>A letter dated 13.07.2017 received on 09.08.2017 from the Advocate Shri. Harikrishnan regarding WP No 5784 of 2017 SVI College of Education, Rep by Its Chairperson, Thercy Tamil Nadu Vs-The RD SRC NCTE, Bangalore and 4 other, on the file of High court of Judicature at Madras.</p> <p>Clarification on Various queries raised by the High Court on 10.03.2017 in WP (C) No.5784/2017 titled SVI College of Education Vs RD, SRC and other was received through email on 09.08.2017.</p> <p>NCTE Hqrs letter dated 24.8.2017 received by SRO on 28.08.2017 &amp; 30.08.2017 regarding WP No 5784 of 2017 and WMP Nos.6187/2017 titled SVI College of Education Vs. RD, SRC and other.</p> <p>An email was received by this office on 13.10.2017 from Dr Sumita Das Majumder Under Secretary regarding WP No.5784/2017 filed by SVI College of Education (Reminder I)</p>
--	---

An email was received by this office on 17.10.2017 from the Advocate J Harikrishnan regarding the W.P No 21197/2017 filed by Acharya College of Education, Puducherry and W.P No 5784/2017 filed By SVI College of Education are posed hearing on 23.10.2017.

An email was received by this office on 04.12.2017 from the Advocate Shri Harikrishnan Jakkula in WP No.5784 of 2017 SVI College of Education regarding (telephonic conversation) Clarification which was raised by the Advocate .

An email was received by this office on 19.12.2017 from the Advocate Shri Harikrishnan in WP No.5784 of 2017 SVI College of Education has listed today for the compliances of Quires Raised by the Honourable court on 03.08.2017 enclosed copy of the web order.

A letter dated 18.11.2017 received by this office on 18.12.2017 request to composite inspection for our College as per the direction Honourable High Court order at Madras and stating as under:-

*“With reference above cited, the Honourable High Court of madras directed the NCTE for the Composite Inspection for B.Ed (AI) and M.Ed course S.V.I. College of Education (Ref 2).*

*As per the court order it indicates that as*

*“Further the first respondent is directed to make a composite inspection of the petitioner within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. On such inspection, the first respondent is directed to pass appropriate orders based on the inspection report within a period of two weeks thereof”*

*Hence we request you to inspect our premises as early as possible & Grand Recognition for our college. The copy of the above direction is enclosed herewith for your kind perusal & action please. We are ready in all aspects for the inspection by the NCTE”.*

The Court order was placed before SRC in its 350<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

- 1.1. They have B.Ed (2 units) already.
- 1.2. They want B.Ed-AI (1) unit and M.Ed (1 unit)
- 2.1. Land area required is 3000 sq mts.
- 2.2. Built up area required is also 3000 sq mts.
- 3.1 NCTE (HQ) has clarified that 2 programmes can be jointly applied for in one application. The court has also ordered so. Therefore this application for B.Ed-AI (1 unit) and M.Ed (1 unit) can be considered.
- 3.2. In this case B.Ed (2 units) was a stand alone programme . In the normal

	<p>course, vertical expansion beyond 2 units would not have been possible. But, they have applied for M.Ed Which would make it a composite institution. Therefore, B.Ed-AI (1 unit) will be admissible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. They have given the affiliating Universities NOC.</li><li>5. Experience of running B.Ed programme for more than 5 years is there.</li><li>6. NAAC certificate is there.</li><li>7. Title was verified only recently w.r.t. the shifting case, Land area is adequate.</li><li>8. LUC &amp; EC are in order.</li><li>9. BP is approved. Built up area permissible is 3642 sqmts.</li><li>10. BCC is approved. Built up area shown is 3642 sqmts which is more than the 3000 sqmts required.</li><li>11.1. In compliance of the court order cause composite inspection for B.Ed-AI (1 unit) and M.Ed (1 unit).</li><li>11.2 Ask VT to collect FDRs in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7+5 lakhs for M.Ed (1 unit).</li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 19.01.2018 and inspection of the institution was scheduled during 14.01.2018 to 03.02.2018.</p> <p>An e-mail was received from NCTE-Hqrs letter dated 10.01.2018 received by this office on 11.01.2018 and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>“As you are well aware that in the WP© No. 5784/2017 titled SVI College of Education Vs. RD, SRC and others before the Hon’ble High Court Madras initially the RD, SRC was only 01 respondent and later on vide order dt. 10.03.2017, the Hon’ble High Court of Madras by its order dt. 1.03.2017 was pleased to implead suo-motu the Director, National Council for Teacher Education, New Delhi, State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its Secretary Higher Education Department fort St. George, Chennai. Tamil Nadu Teacher Education University, Chennai, and the Director, Employment and Training, Alandur Road, Thiru-Vi-Ka Industrial Estate, Guindy, Chennai 32, as the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> respondents and posed 10 queries and directed to furnish the details incorporated in paragraph 7 of the order dated 10.03.2017 which is self-explanatory in nature.</i></p> <p>2. The NCTE(HQ) issued directions to you to file counter affidavit on behalf on SRC and NCTE(HQ) in the Hon’ble High Court vide latter No. F.64-61/2017NCTE/Legal dt. 30.05.2017 and letter F.No.64-61/2017NCTE/legal 56333 dt. 1/02.08.2017and F.No. 64-61/2017/NCTE/Legal dt. 09.08.2017 and F.No. 64-61/2017/NCTE/Legal dt. 24/25.08.2017 and final letter No. F.No. 04.01/2017/NCTE/legal dt. 1/02.01.2018.</p> <p>3. You are requesting to send copies of replies filed by the RD, SRC on behalf of</p>
--	---

*NCTE(HQ)/SRC immediately with copy of WP© no. 5784/2017 titled SVI College of Education Vs. RD, SRC and 04 others and copies of order dt. 10.03.2017 and any other order issued in this court case”.*

An e-mail was received from Advocate on 22.12.2017 and stating that *“In continuation of my Telephonic conversation the above titled case was listed on 19.12.2017 before his lordship Shri. Justice N. Kirubakaran for answering further quires raised by the court on 03.08.2017 by the government and the same has been posted to 2 weeks for answering the same and also SOU MOTOLY impleaded the ministry of HRD and filling of the counter by the ministry of HRD within two weeks time. I already forwarded the copy of the order. The order of the Court dated 03.08.2017 please be complied to avoid the multiplicity of the proceedings”.*

An e-mail was received from legal Section regarding WP© No. 5784/2017 titled SVI College of Education Vs. RD, SRC and others before the Hon’ble High Court of Madras and stating that *“please refer NCTE HQ letter No. 64-61/2017NCTE/Legal dated 12.01.2018 for sending parawise comments and factual report so that same may be forwarded to Ms. Sunita Kumari, central Govt. Standing Counsel with copy to MHRD.*

*You are requesting to send parawise comments and factual report at the earliest”.*

An e-mail was sent to Legal section along with copies of relevant documents on 24.01.2018.

The inspection was conducted to the institution on 23.01.2018 and 24.01.2018, received VT report along with documents on 29.01.2018.

The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:

1. Title to lands is there.
2. LUC is in order.
3. EC is given. EC shows ‘encumbrance’ (mortgage?) .
4. BCC is in order. Built up area shown is 3462 sq mt.
5. 5.1.BP is given. Built-up area shown is 3462 sqmt which is more than the 3000 sqmt required.
- 5.2. BCC does not show the type of roofing. They must clarify.
6. FDRs in original in joint account with a 5 year validity @ 7 + 5 lakhs per programme are required.
7. Issue SCN accordingly.
8. Keep HQ and lawyer informed.

7	<p>SRCAPP2250 B.P.Ed 1Unit Davangere University, Davangere,</p>	<p><b>Davangere University, Plot No.1, 26 &amp; 27, Rangavanahalli, Tholahunase, Davanagere District-577002, Karnataka.</b></p> <p>Davangere University, Shivagangathri, Plot No.1, 26 &amp; 27, Bada Road, Tholahuna Village &amp; Post, Davangere Taluk, Davanagere District-577002, Karnataka had applied for grant of recognition to Davangere University, Plot No.1, 26 &amp; 27, Rangavanahalli Tholahunase, Davanagere District-577002, Karnataka for offering B.P.Ed course of Two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 05.05.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 28.05.2015.</p> <p>The Institution submitted No Objection Certificate dated 25.05.2015 issued by the Davangere University along with the hard copy of application. The application is processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A letter for Recommendation of State Govt was sent on 03.06.2015 followed by Reminder on 21.07.2015 and Reminder –II on 03.11.2016.</p> <p>The Sub-Clause (3) of Clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The “(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution is deficient as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to submit Print out of the application made online within 15 days of the submission of the online application. (Online application dated 05.05.2015 had hard copy received on 28.05.2015)</li> <li>• The application is not duly signed by the applicant on all pages as per Sub-section(3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014</li> </ul> <p>The Southern Regional Committee in its 291<sup>st</sup> meeting held during 20<sup>th</sup>&amp; 21<sup>st</sup> August, 2016 considered the matter, and after careful perusal of the original application for B.P.Ed course for the session 2016-17 submitted on-line on 05.05.2015 and hard copy on 28.05.2015 decided to Summarily reject the application as per clause 7 2(b) of Regulations 2014 on the following ground:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to submit Print out of the application made online within 15 days of the submission of the online application.</li> </ul>
---	---	---

As per the decision of SRC, a rejection order issued to the institution on 15.10.2015.

On 19.01.2016 a letter was received by this office from the NCTE Hqrs regarding acceptance of hard copy of application up to 15.07.2015 as under:

"I am directed to refer to this office letter of even no. dated 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2015 conveying therein orders of Chairperson in paragraph 4 of the letter that 15<sup>th</sup> July 2015 will be the last date for submission of hardcopy of the application for the academic session 2015-16.

Irrespective of the date of online submission. In this regard attention is invited to subsequent letter dated 07<sup>th</sup> September, 2015, wherein under the last line of paragraph I, the position as it exists in clause 7 of the Regulation 2014 has been indicated. It is hereby clarified that inclusion of this line was an inadvertent mistake therefore was not necessary and may be ignored. As such the directions of the Chairperson NCTE, as conveyed in this office vide above mentioned letter dated 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2014, extending the date of acceptance of the hardcopy of the application for 2016-17, up to 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2015 is reiterated for compliance.

The SRC in its 304<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 19<sup>th</sup> & 20<sup>th</sup> February, 2015 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. This is a reopened delayed submission case
2. BP for the proposed programme is not given.
3. BCC is not in format
4. Earmarking of land for B.P.Ed is not indicated.
5. Cause Composite inspection
6. Ask VT to Collect all relevant documents  
Exp. BP & BCC and also check on earmarking of lands.

As per the decision of SRC, a composite inspection of the institution was conducted on 17.03.2016 and VT report was received on 28.03.2016.

The SRC in its 308<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 28<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2016 considered the matter and report and other relevant documents of the institution and decided as under:-

1. The University has not submitted BCC approved by the competent authority.
2. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 16.05.2016. The institution submitted reply to the Show cause notice on 03.06.2016.

The SRC, in its 317<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 considered the show cause notice reply and decided as under:-

1. In the Show Cause Notice, by a clerical error, some irrelevant issues were added. The Show Cause Notice is reviewed and the irrelevant entries at Sl. Nos. 6 & 7 are deleted.
2. They have submitted a proper Building Plan.
3. But, the BCC is still not in the prescribed format.
4. Issue Show Cause Notice again for BCC.

As per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice issued to the institution on 07.09.2016. The institution submitted reply on 27.09.2016.

The SRC in its 323<sup>rd</sup> meeting held during 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 considered the written representation and decided as under:-

“Issue LOI for B.P.Ed( 1 unit)”

As per the decision of SRC, Letter of Intent was issued to the institution on 29.11.2016. Even till date the institution has not submitted LOI reply. The institution was not submitted LOI reply till date.

The SRC in its 330<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 12<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2017 considered the matter of non-submission of LOI reply and decided as under:-

1. “LOI for B.P.Ed( 1 unit) was issued on 29.11.2016.
2. They have not cared to reply even by the extended dateline.
3. Reject the application.
4. Return FDRs, if any.
5. Close the file.”

As per the decision of SRC a Rejection order was issued to the institution vide Order No. F.No.NCTE/SRCAPP2250/B.P.Ed/KA/2016-17/91888, dated 17.02.2017.

Aggrieved by the Rejection order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal before the appellate authority at NCTE Hqrs. Accordingly, a letter along with original file was sent to NCTE, Hqrs for appeal on 08.09.2017.

The appellate authority vide order F.No. 89-519/E-7702/2017 Appeal/18<sup>th</sup> Meeting-2017 dated 29.11.2017 is received by this office on 07.12.2017 has stated as under:-

“Appeal committee noted that appellant University was issued a Letter of Intent ( LOI ) dated 29.11.2016 seeking compliance within a period of two months. The appellate authority University replied to LOI on 30.01.2017 simply seeking permission to start the programme on assurance that terms and condition laid down in the LOI will be brought to the notice of University Academic Council for implementation on priority basis.



Appeal Committee noted that appellant even on the date of appeal hearing i.e.27.09.2017 was not able to provide list of faculty appointed after seeking departmental approvals. Appeal Committee, however, noted that impugned refusal order was issued without giving a formal opportunity to the appellant institution to submit written representation on the proposed ground of refusal as required under proviso to article 3(b) of the NCTE Act. Appeal Committee, therefore, decided to remand back the case to SRC Bangalore for issue of Show Cause Notice and considering the written representation if any submitted by the appellant.

After perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, Appeal Committee concluded to remand back the case to SRC for issue of SCN as required under the proviso of 14 (3) (b) of the NCTE Act.

The council hereby remands back the case of Davanagere University, Tholahunasi, Davanagere, Karnataka to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above.”

The SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 15<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 considered the appellate authority order and decided to “process”. Accordingly as per the decision of SRC the application was processed.

The SRC in its 350<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 21<sup>st</sup>– 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2017 considered the processing of the application and decided as under:-

2. The Appellate Authority’s remand order is noted.
  - 2.1. Let us issue a formal SCN asking them to explain why their application can not be rejected for non-receipt of a substantive reply to our LOI within the time-limit ; fact, even till date.
  - 2.2. Make it clear that we cannot issue conditional FRs.

As per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 03.01.2018.

The institution has submitted show cause notice reply on 29.01.2018.

**The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:**

- 1. As directed by the Appellate Authority, a SCN was issued.**
- 2. They have still not given a proper LOI reply.**
  - 3.1 They have requested for relaxation of norms for a Government University.**
  - 3.2 The SRC has no power to relax the regulations.**
  - 4.1 They had to appoint faculty and submit an approved faculty list. They have not done that. They have given only an assurance that all the faculty required would be recruited.**

		<p><b>4.2 They have proposed a conditional FR to be issued. The SRC has no power to do that.</b></p> <p><b>5. Reject the application.</b></p>
8	<p>SRCAPP 14884 BA.B.Ed BSc.B.Ed 2 Units Sree Dattha Brindavan Institute of Teachers Education, Mahbubnagar Telangana</p>	<p><b>Sree Dattha Brindavan Institute of Teachers Education, Plot/Khasara No.Sy.No.54, Plot No.Sy.No.54 PART Singaram X Street, Kavarampally Sivar Village, Narayanpet Post &amp; Taluk, Mahabubnagar City, Mahbubnagar District – 509210, Telangana.</b></p> <p>Vjayanthi Educational Society, Plot No.Sy 54 PART, Singaram X Roads, Kavarampally Sivar Village, Narayanpet Post, Mahabubnagar Taluk &amp; City, Mahbubnagar District – 509210, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Sree Dattha Brindavan Institute of Teachers Education, Plot/Khasara No.Sy.No.54, Plot No.Sy.No.54 PART Singaram X Street, Kavarampally Sivar Village, Narayanpet Post &amp; Taluk, Mahabubnagar City, Mahbubnagar District – 509210, Telangana for offering B.A,B.Sc course for four years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee , NCTE through online on 30.06.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 10.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter was sent to State Government for recommendation on 16.07.2015, followed by Reminder-I on 22.02.2016.</p> <p>Sub-clause (3) of clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was found deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The institution has not submitted NOC from the affiliating body, along with application.</li> <li>2. Application is not signed by the applicant on every page of application as per Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014.</li> <li>3. Registered photocopy land document submitted in Telugu version (Notarized English version to be submitted).</li> </ol> <p>The matter was placed before SRC for in its 292<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 29-30 Sept, 2015</p>

and the committee considered the matter and decided to issue Show Cause Notice for Non Submission of NOC issued by the affiliating body along with application.

Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 21.10.2015. The institution submitted written representation on 16.12.2015

The SRC in its 297<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> -28<sup>th</sup>December, 2015 considered the matter and decided to “Delayed submission of NOC, cannot be condoned. Reject”

The SRC in its 300<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> – 31<sup>st</sup> January 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:

- *Keeping in mind the over-all public interest, the Committee revised its earlier stand to reject all cases of non-submission or delayed submission of NOC's and decided to reopen and process all such rejected cases by accepting NOCs even now irrespective of their dates of issue.*

The application was processed and placed before SRC in its 303<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2016. The committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. Contiguity with existing B.Ed
2. EC, BCC, BP, not legible and not approved by competent authority.
3. Cause Composite Inspection
4. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents
5. Ask whether they want B.A.B.Ed or B.Sc B.Ed

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 20.02.2016. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.02.2016. The VT report was received in this office of SRC-NCTE on 24.02.2016.

The SRC in its 305<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> – 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 considered the VT report and all relevant documents and decided as under:

1. BCC is not in format
2. BP is not issued by competent authority.
3. Issue SCN accordingly.

Before issuance of show cause notice as per the website information, the institution submitted written representation on 02.03.2016.

The SRC in its 306<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup>-04<sup>th</sup> March, 2016 considered the show cause notice reply and decided as under:

1. Documents and facilities are in order.
2. Issue LOI for B.Sc; B.Ed (2 Units)

3. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished.
4. Only if these are given on or before 3.3.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter of intent was issued to the institution on 17.03.2016. The institution submitted its written representation on 10.05.2016.

The SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 considered the letter of intent reply and decided as under.

1. The approved Faculty list is not complete. Subject of specialization at PG level in Pedagogy and Perspectives is not mentioned.
2. Ask them to furnish full details.
3. This case cannot longer be considered for 2016-17. It can be considered only for 2017-18.

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 01.06.2016. The institution submitted its written representation on 03.06.2016 along with staff list stating as under:

*“ with reference to the subject cited above and also your letter dated 01.06.2016 mentioned in the reference cited above we are herewith submitting the compliance report to the letter dated 01.06.2016 for B.ScB.Ed integrated course as desired.*

*We therefore request the NCTE authorities to kindly consider the same and initiate further necessary action for the grant of formal recognition for the B.ScB.Ed 4 years integrated course for the academic year 2016-17.*

The SRC in its 317<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> July 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:

- The subject specialization at PG level has now been given. But, it is not clear who is the Principal. Ask them to clarify.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 19.09.2016. The institution submitted written representation on 05.10.2016 along with staff list. It stated as under:

*“...With reference to the subject cited above, in reply to the letter cited we are herewith enclosing the principal selection committee proceeding and duly approved by the concerned university mentioning the principal specialization particulars at PG level along with the M.Ed qualification. Further it I to inform that since long years he is our regular principal duly ratified by the concerned university. As required by the NCTE authorities letter dated 01-06-2016 we have submitted all the particulars, once again we are submitting the approved letter by*

*the Register Palmuru University dated 30-04-2016 along with the selection proceedings and relevant documents for your kind consideration. Further we request you to grant of approval for B.Sc B.Ed four years integrated course to our institution."*

The SRC in its 328<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. NOC of the affiliating body is there.
2. The State Govt. has not given a specific NOC in this case. They have given only a common letter of Objection for many cases. No reasons have been given. As decided already by the NCTE (HQ) this cannot be recognized as a valid NOC.
3. They have a running B.Ed. course (APS05633).
4. They had earlier applied for another B.Sc. B.Ed. (2 units) separately.
5. All the three cases should be considered together.
6. It is clarified that they want B.A.B.Ed (2 units) in this case (30065) and B.Sc.B.Ed. (2 units) in the earlier case (14884). Process accordingly.
7. Title is clear. Land area is adequate for all 3 courses.
8. LUC/EC are in order.
9. BP is not approved.
10. BCC is in order. Built up area (5000 sq.mts) is adequate for all the 3 courses.
11. The faculty list given in the old case (14884) is in order. Issue FR for B.Sc.B.Ed (2 units) after obtaining approved BP.
12. Cause composite inspection in the B.A.B.Ed (2 units) case (30065). Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.

A letter sent to the institution on 10.02.2017 conveying the decision of 328<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The institution submitted its representation on 13.02.2017 along with the BP and the BCC.

The SRC in its 331<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. All documents have been received.
2. All conditions have been fulfilled.
3. Issue FR for BSc.B.Ed (2 units) as already decided w.e.f 2017-18.

It is observed from the file, the original FDR's are not submitted. Hence, again the matter was placed before SRC in its 332<sup>nd</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> Feb – 04<sup>th</sup> March, 2017 considered and decided as under:

1. In the 331<sup>st</sup> meeting it was decided to issue FR for B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units)

w.e.f. 2017-18 after they submitted FDRs.

2. Subsequent scrutiny has revealed that they presented photocopies of FDRs that had already been committed to another course started earlier.
3. In the light of this misrepresentation, the earlier decision is reviewed and cancelled. Do not issue FR for B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units).
4. Reject the application.
5. Return FDRs, if any.
6. Close the file.

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC rejection order was sent to the institution on 10.03.2017.

Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE-Hq, as required by NCTE-Hq the brief of the case along with original file of the institution was sent on 12.09.2017.

The Appellate Authority vide No.89-579/E-13765/2017 Appeal/19<sup>th</sup> meeting - 2017 dated 07.12.2017 was received by this office on 15.12.2017 and the committee concluded that:-

“.....The Committee noted that the appellant wrote a letter dated 08.03.2017, after the SRC in their 332<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> Feb to 4<sup>th</sup> March, 2017, decided to reject the application, and another letter dated 4.05.2017 after issue of the rejection order o 10.03.2017, explaining the position about the FDR's for various courses, which could not be considered by the SRC. Since, the only issue pending after the SRC decided to grant recognition is submission of FDR's, the Committee concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to consider the clarifications furnished by the appellant about the FDR's and take further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014.

AND WHEREAS after perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, *the Committee concluded that the matter deserves to be remanded to SRC with a direction to consider the clarification furnished by the appellant about the FDR's and take further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014.*

NOW THEREFORE, *the Council hereby remands back the case of Sree Dattha Brindavan Institute of Teachers Education, Kavarampally Sivar, Narayanpet, Mahabubnagar, Telangana to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above.*”

The SRC in its 350<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In accordance with the appellate order, the applicants letter dt.04.05.2017 is considered.</li> <li>2. The said letter is only a request for the SRO to sign a 'joint application form'. There is no reference to their submitting earlier a photo copy of the FDRs relating to another case for consideration as fresh FDRs in this case.</li> <li>3. The SRO reports that there is no system of the SRO signing application forms for FDRs. Parties obtain FDRs in the joint names and submit them for signature. The SRO categorically states that so far there has not been a single case in which they have had to sign application forms for issue of joint FDRs.</li> <li>4.1 The application of the Institute was rejected in March 2017 for the reason that they tried to misrepresent facts and mislead the SRC.</li> <li>4.2 Nothing new has happened since then; and, there is nothing on record to show that they had not tried to misrepresent facts and mislead the SRC.</li> <li>5. In the result, and for the reasons given above, even after considering their communication dt.04.05.2017 as directed by the Appellate Authority, there is no ground to establish their bona fides. That being so, their application deserves to be rejected again.</li> <li>6. Issue SCN accordingly.</li> </ol> <p>Accordingly, as directed by SRC show cause notice was issued to the institution on 03.01.2016.</p> <p>The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 22.01.2018.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1.Their reply is seen.</b></li> <li><b>2.1. They have furnished the required FDRs in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ more than Rs 24 lakhs.</b></li> <li><b>2.2. Sign the FDRs to make them jointly accountable.</b></li> <li><b>3.1. Now that the FDRs have been received and they have cited the Banks conditionality in support of their bona fides, issue FR for BSc.B.Ed (2 units) w.e.f.2018-19.</b></li> <li><b>3.2. Also, restore recognition for BA.B.Ed (2 Units) retrospectively.</b></li> </ol>
9	SRCAPP3011 B.Ed- Distance (500 intake) Institute of Distance	<p><b>Institute of Distance Education University of Madras, Khasara No.3173, Plot No. 133/137, Chepauk Village and Taluk, Triplicane Post, Chennai City and District-600005, Tamil Nadu.</b></p> <p>Institute of Distance Education, University of Madras, Plot No. 133/137, Wallajah Road, Chepauk Village and Taluk, Triplicane Post, Chennai City and District-600005, Tamil</p>

<p>Education University of Madras, Chennai, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Institute of Distance Education University of Madras, Khasara No.3173, Plot No. 133/137, Chepauk Village and Taluk, Triplicane Post, Chennai City and District-600005, Tamil Nadu for offering B.Ed-Distance mode of two years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.05.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 22.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 25.06.2015, and Reminder-I on 11.11.2016.</p> <p>Sub-clause (2) of clause 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(2) The application shall be summarily rejected under one or more of the following circumstance-</i></p> <p><i>(a) Failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the National Council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 on or before the date of submission of online application;</i></p> <p><i>(b) Failure to submit print out of the applications made online along with the land documents as required under sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 within fifteen days of the submission of the online application”.</i></p> <p><i>Sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 reads as under:-</i></p> <p><i>“While submitting the application online a copy of the registered land document issued by the competent authority, indicating that the society or institution applying for the programme possesses land on the date of application, shall be attached along with the application.”</i></p> <p>Sub-clause (3) of clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution is deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The institution has not submitted hard copy of application within 15 days of online submission.</li></ul>
--	--



- The application is not duly signed by the applicant on all pages as per Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014.

The SRC in its 291<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> -21<sup>st</sup> August, 2015 considered the matter, and after careful perusal of the original application for B.Ed (DE) course for the session 2016-17 submitted on-line on 30.05.2015 and hard copy on 22.06.2015 decided to Summarily Reject the application as per clause 7 2(b) of Regulations 2014 on the following ground:

- The institution has not submitted hard copy of application within 15 days of online submission.

As per the decision of SRC, rejection order was issued to the institution 13.10.2015.

Meantime letter dated 14.01.2016 was received on 19.01.2016 from NCTE Hqrs regarding Acceptance of hardcopy of applications for 2016-17. The letter stated that *"I am directed to refer to this office letter even no. dated 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2015 conveying therein orders of Chairperson in paragraph 4 of the letter that 15<sup>th</sup> July 2015 will be the last date for submission of hardcopy of application for the academic session 2015-16, irrespective of the date of online submission. In this regard, attention is invited to a subsequent letter dated 7<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 wherein under the last line of paragraph 1, the position as it exists in clause 7 of the Regulations 2014 has been indicated. It is hereby clarified that inclusion of this line was an inadvertent mistake, therefore was not necessary and may be ignored. As such, the directions of the chairperson NCTE, as conveyed in this office vide above mentioned letter dated 15<sup>th</sup> July 2014, extending the date of acceptance of the hardcopy of the applications for 2016-17, up to 15<sup>th</sup> July 2015 is reiterated for compliance"*

An email dated 18.01.2016 was received from NCTE Hqrs with the request to send original records of the institution along with comments on the appeal.

The SRC in its 300<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> -30<sup>th</sup> January, 2016 considered the matter and decided as follows:

*"..keeping in mind the over-all public interest , the committee revised its earlier stand to reject all cases of non-submission or delayed submission of NOC's and decided to reopen and process all such rejected cases by accepting NOCs even now irrespective of their dates of issue".*

A letter was sent to NCTE Hqrs on 03.02.2016 stated that the file required to be placed before SRC, hence the file not sent to the NCTE-Hqrs.

The matter was again placed for reconsideration before SRC in its 304<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> & 20<sup>th</sup> February, 2016, The Committee considered matter and decided as under:

1. BP is not approved by competent authority.

2. BCC to be submitted.
3. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.
4. Cause Composite Inspection.

As per the decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members on 17.03.2016. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.03.2016 and VT report along with documents received on 28.03.2016.

The SRC in its 308<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> -30<sup>th</sup> March 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:-

- Details of study centers not given.

Accordingly, a letter was sent to the institution on 16.08.2016, The institution has not submitted reply.

The SRC in its 323<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 considered the matter and decided as follows:

1. BCC is not yet given.
2. Duly approved BP is also not yet given.
3. Details of study centres are also not given.
4. Other details listed in Cl.9, Appendix 10 of the Regulations are not given.
5. Issue SCN accordingly.

As for the decision of the SRC, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 30.11.2016. Reply to the SCN was received from the institution on 26.12.2016.

The SRC in its 326<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 04<sup>th</sup> & 05<sup>th</sup> January, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. BCC is not in the prescribed format.
2. Same photocopy of BP is submitted for B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. without any apportionment, demarcation, etc. details.
3. Details of clause 9, appendix-10 of Regulations are still not given.
4. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of the SRC, a show cause Notice was issued to the institution on 18.01.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 10.02.2017.

The SRC in its 330<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. The BP with details of convenience apportionment and earmarking of built-up

area has to be given duly approved by the Competent authority. Only a photocopy has been repeated.

2. BCC format is given in the SRC website. Building Completion Certificate should be given in that format duly approved by the competent authority.
3. Project documents and study material should be ready before the recognition can be given. Issue a letter accordingly.

As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 14.02.2017. The institution has submitted representation on 03.03.2017.

The SRC in its 332<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> February to 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2017 the committee considered the reply and documents and decided as under:-

1. Details of Study centres are given.
2. But, Study material not yet shown. To say that they will be borrowed from IGNOU is not enough.
3. BP-total plan is approved by the University Engineer. But, earmarking and formal allocation of that space for B.Ed.-DE is required.
4. BCC is duly approved. But, only a photocopy is given. Original or a certified copy is required.
5. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued on 09.03.2017. The institution has not submitted reply so far.

The SRC in its 334<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017 considered the non – submission of reply and decided as under:-

1. The SCN was issued on 9.3.17. There has been no reply so far.
2. Only a small action remains to be taken after LOI. Give further time till 18.4.17.
3. Put up on 19.4.17.

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 07.04.2017.

The institution has submitted the show cause notice reply on 30.03.2017. The SRC, in its 335<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. BP is not approved by competent authority.
2. BCC is approved. But, every page should be signed. Also, it should indicate the date of approval/issue. The title shows it to be a building for Diploma in Elementary Education. This should be corrected.
3. Study material are still not ready. Whether approval of UGC is required is not

	<p>clear.</p> <p>4. Issue SCN accordingly.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, a show cause Notice was issue to the University on 20.04.2017. The University has submitted reply to the SCN on 01.05.2017.</p> <p>The reply was placed before SRC in its 338<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> to 03<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Their reply is seen.</li><li>2. BP and BCC are now in order.</li><li>3.1 They have admitted that study materials are not ready. They have requested for some 'gestation period'.</li><li>3.2 We have no discretion to issue FR without the study material being ready.</li><li>3.3. But, we have no difficulty in giving more time for preparation of study material. Only, because of a Supreme Court prescribed time-limit of 2.5.17, for issue of FR w.e.f. 2017-18, we will not be able, after 2.5.17, to issue FR w.e.f. 2017-18.</li><li>3.4 Time is given till 1.8.17 for preparation of study material.</li><li>4. Inform accordingly.</li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the University on 09.05.2017. The university submitted a letter dated 26.07.2017 received by this office on 02.08.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>"With reference to the above, I would like to inform you that the institute of Distance Education, University of Madras has already initiated necessary arrangements to prepare the study material on its own and the work is under progress. Hence it is required to provide another 2 months gestation time in order to complete the B.Ed lesson writing work."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup>, September, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. They have requested for more time to prepare the study material.</li><li>2. Give time till 30.11.2017.</li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the University on 04.10.2017. The University submitted its written representation regarding extension of time on 17.11.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>"With reference to the above, I would like to inform you that the institute of Distance Education, University of Madras has already initiated necessary arrangements to prepare the study material on its own and the work is under progress. Hence, it is requested to provide another three months gestation time in</i></p>
--	---

*order to complete the B.Ed lesson writing work”.*

The matter was placed before SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. They have repeatedly been asking for time.
2. Give a last extension up to 31.12.2017.
3. It has been clarified that the study centres have also to be recognised T.E.Is conducting B.Ed course continuously for the last 5 years. Ask them to confirm this understanding.
4. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per decision of SRC, a Show Cause notice was issued to the University on 27.12.2017.

Now, the University submitted a letter dated 29.12.2017 received by this office on 01.01.2018 regarding extension of time for further period of one month required for the preparation of lesson materials along with acceptance letter from the two colleges to conduct the PCP. Classes and stating as under:-

*“With reference to the above, I am pleased inform you that the University of Madras has made all required arrangements to conduct the PCP Classes for the B.Ed. Degree course at the following colleges (Study Centers) which are affiliating to the Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University and they are conducting the B.Ed Degree course for more than five years. The following colleges have given their consent to conduct the PCP Classes.*

1. *Jaya College of Education, Chennai.*
2. *Annai Velankani College of Education, Chennai.*
3. *NKT. National College of Education for Women, Chennai.*

*Further, I am to inform you that the Board of Studies met and designed the curriculum, Syllabi and study materials in self Learning Method. The study materials for the 1<sup>st</sup> year is almost completed and we will print it and mail you within a month. The materials will be mailed as and when ready from next week.*

*Hence, we kindly request to you permit us to conduct the B.Ed programme from the academic year 2018-19”.*

The matter was placed before SRC in its 352<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 04<sup>th</sup> to 05<sup>th</sup> January, 2018 and the Committee considered the reply and decided as under:-

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Two issues remain to be settled.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Eligibility of the Study Centres ; and,</li> <li>(ii) Availability of approved study material.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2.1. As regards 'study centres', the Madras University has confirmed availability of 3 eligible study centers.</li> <li>2.2. The study centres have to have NCTE Recognition. Please request them to give the NCTE recognition code nos.</li> <li>2.3. We have to point out that, according to the Regulations, a study centre can have only 50 students. In other words they will need 10 study centres (and, not just 3) for a 500 intake-strength.</li> <li>3. Study material have to be in accordance with Appendix-10 of the Regulations; and, have to be in place before grant of FR. This Committee does not have the authority to issue conditional FRs.</li> <li>4. Issue SCN accordingly.</li> </ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause notice was issued to the institution on 15.01.2018. The institution has submitted reply on 19.01.2018.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The Madras University reply shows that the study Material of the TNOU has been adopted by them through an MOU with the TNOU.</b></li> <li><b>2. The 10 Study Centres listed are affiliated to the TNTEU.</b></li> <li><b>3. Issue FR for B.Ed (Distance-500 intake) w.e.f. 2018-19.</b></li> <li><b>4. Ask the Madras University to furnish for our record purposes the NCTE recognition code numbers as already required by us.</b></li> </ol>
10	SRCAPP2016 30099 BA.B.Ed BSc.B.Ed Pope John Paul II College of Education, Pondicherry	<p><b>Pope John Paul II College of Education, Reddiarpalayam Village, Villianur Main Road, Reddiarpalayam City, Pondicherry District-605010, Pondicherry</b></p> <p>Le Conseil D Administration De L Archdiocese De Pondicherry, Villianur Main Road, Reddiarpalayam Taluk, Pondicherry City &amp; District-605010, Pondicherry had applied for grant of recognition to Pope John Paul II College of Education, Reddiarpalayam Village, Villianur Main Road, Reddiarpalayam City, Pondicherry District-605010, Pondicherry for offering BA.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed-AI integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 06.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on</p>

22.06.2016, followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Govt. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.

As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for BA.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed-AI course in the State of Pondicherry.

The application was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application.

The scrutiny of the application was considered by SRC in its 325<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2016, and the Committee decided as under;

1. The application is for Additional intake. Since the status of the basic units themselves is in dispute, this application cannot be processed before setting the basic issue.
2. In their letter dt. 3.10.2016, they have sought (retrospective) recognition for the 3 integrated courses run by them without NCTE recognition.
- 3.1 SRC, has no authority to issue retrospective recognition.
- 3.2. The three integrated courses in reference - B.SC. B.Ed (Maths), BA.B.Ed(English) and B.Sc. B.Ed (Computer Science) were not in the NCTE list of approved courses before Notification of the 2014 Regulations.
4. Issue Show Cause Notice Accordingly.

As per the decision of the SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to institution through online on 21.12.2016.

The institution has submitted representation on 05.01.2017 regarding Pu- Extension of Provisional Affiliation for the B.Ed & B.Ed (Integrated) course in pope John Paul II College of Education, Puducherry for the academic year 2016-17.

The institution has submitted replies to the Show Cause Notice along with relevant documents on 09.01.2017 and 13.01.2017.

The SRC in its 328<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

- This item is withdrawn from agenda.

A letter was addressed to the Shri Dr.S.K Chauhan Research officer, NCTE, New Delhi on 09.02.2017.

A letter dated 04.02.2017 received on 09.02.2017 from Mr. S.P Veerappan, Former state Vice- president Bharathiyar janatha Party regarding requesting for probing irregularities in giving Affiliation- on Pondicherry University has complaint alleging

irregularities in grant of affiliation for 4 year integrated courses in Pope John Paul-II College of Education.

A complaint letter was received by this office on 13.03.2017 regarding Rampant irregularities in the admission of 4 year integrated B.Ed course at Pope John Paul college on collusion with the authorities of Pondicherry University.

A letter was addressed to the Shri K.V Chowdary Central Vigilance Commissioner, New Delhi on 13.03.2017 seeking Veracity of the complaint the same was returned undelivered on 15.03.2017.

On 20.03.2017 an email was received by this office, NCTE Hqrs letter dated 17.03.2017 and stating as under:-

*"I am directed to the to your letter No.SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP201630099/PU/2017 /91630 dated 07.02.2017 and the enclosures such as the recognition order of the institution dated 23.03.1997 and 22.03.2000 and to say that the conditional recognition to the institution was granted vide letter dated 23.03.1997 under certain conditions which were to be fulfilled by the institution. Again the institution was issued recognition vide order dated 22.03.2000 for one year i.e 2001-2001 with a direction to set right the deficiency pointed out in the order before commencement of the session 2000-2001 under compliance to SRC not latter that 31.01.2000. Now it is not clear to the NCTE whether the recognition of the institution was continued further after 2000 till 2014. No order of recognition is enclosed with the documents provided by the SRC. However it is found that the SRC has issued a order of recognition dated 30.05.2015. it appears that this order of recognition has been issued after the year 2000 i.e after passing of 14 years. The Regional committee needs to clarify whether the institution was issued any recognition order after 2001. If no then the institution remains unrecognised from 2001 to 2014.*

A letter was received by this office on 21.03.2017, Pondicherry University, R.V Nagar, Kalapet, puducherry a letter was addressed to the Mr S.P Veerappan on 28.02.2017, regarding Complaint alleging irregularities in grant of affiliation for 4 year Integrated course in Pope John Paul-II College of Education, Puducherry.

An email & Hard copy (As per the decision of 325<sup>th</sup> meeting SCN reply) was received by this office on 24.03.2017 from Pope John Paul II College of Education.

As per online application it is mentioned that B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed (4 year integrated) was granted recognition by SRC on 10.05.2004 with an intake 150.

The institution was applied for B.Sc.B.Ed/B.A.B.Ed (4 year integrated) AI intake on 31.05.2016 and hard copy on 06.06.2016.



The matter was placed before SRC in its 324<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decide as under:-

1. This case cannot be decided at our level. This has to be referred again to NCTE(HQ).
- 2.1 There are 4 courses in reference: B.Ed.(Eng.); B.Sc.Ed.(Maths); B.Sc. Ed.(Comp.Sc.); and, B.Com.Ed.
- 2.2 Our records have no trace of B.Com.Ed.
- 2.3 In 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 SRC had issued recognition order. But, they referred to a 4-year integrated course and not with reference to subject details. Again, no communication/order after 2001 is available.
- 2.4 They refer to submission of Annual Appraisal Reports. No such reports are readily available in our records.
- 2.5 There is a mention of a recognition order dt. 30.5.15. Available records show, this was an order relating to the new 2 – year B.Ed. Probably, the 1-year B.Ed. sanctioned long ago was revised as a 2- year B.Ed. under the 2014 Regulations and a fresh recognition order was issued.
3. There is no other document in our files about the other three integrated courses. The revised 2014 Regulations do not refer to courses like B.Ed.-Eng ; B.Sc.Ed. – Computer Sc.; B.Sc.Ed.(Maths); and, B.Com.Ed. If such courses had been sanctioned in the past, they will have to be reckoned with as 'innovative courses'. They will have to be regularized into regular courses following a procedure prescribed by NCTE(HQ); or, they will have to be converted into courses now recognized by the 2014 Regulations.
4. Send a comprehensive note drawing the chronological developments in this case to the NCTE (HQ. Make it clear that, after 2001, we have issued no orders in this case.
5. We cannot sanction A.I. at this stage to any of these courses since that will imply incidental recognition of such courses. We can proceed further only after and only in accordance with further guidelines from NCTE (HQ).
6. Process accordingly and put up in May 2017.

A letter dated 03.04.2017 received by this office on 07.04.2017 from Pope John Paul II College of Education regarding Request for letter stating that the issue of Conduct of 4 year Integrated Courses in our College is pending.

As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was addressed to the Members Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi on 20.04.2017

Again, a letter was sent to the NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi on 09.05.2017 seeking clarifications desired by SRC in its 334<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017 in relation to Pope John II College of Education, Puducherry.

An email dated 06.05.2017 and Hard copy received by this office on 08.05.2017 from

		<p>Pope John Paul II College of Education.</p> <p>We would like to kind to bring to your kind attention that, the Pondicherry University sent a letter stating that.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“your are required to sent the copy of the NCTE recognition order for the four-year B.Ed Integrated course... At least under new Regulation NCTE (2014)... immediatly for releasing the result of the students of the above course”. (Annexure-12)</p> <p>As on now, the future of the students is at stake, they cannot write their arrears if any, and also they cannot sit for the final examination due in the month of May 2017. Particularly the final year students (Fourth year) are very much affected as they will not be able to apply for the higher studies. Some of the final year students are already selected as teachers through the campus interview, find it difficult to join the duty when the schools are open.</p> <p>Most of our students are coming from financially poor families. The poor parents are anxious and worried about the future of their children.</p> <p>There is no other college in Pondicherry state that offers Four-year Integrated B.Ed Course. We are unable to admit students who apply for this four-year integrated course.</p> <p>The grant of Revised Recognition order for the Four-year integrated course will be boon to the poor parents and children who wish to join this four-year integrated course.</p> <p><i>We request your good self to consider the deplorable condition of all our 600 students and their parents, and relieve them from worries and anxieties by granting the required Revised Recognition order.</i></p> <p>The institution has submitted representation on 11.05.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>On 04.05.017 we sent letter to your good self requesting for Revised Regulation order as per 2014 norms. That letter also gives some points for clarification of the observations made in 334<sup>th</sup> meeting of SRC-30<sup>th</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup> march, 2017.</i></p> <p>May we request your good self to accept the correction as follows:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%; padding: 5px;"> <p>If such courses had been sanctioned in the past, they will have to be reckoned with as ‘innovative courses’. They will have to be regularized into regular courses following a procedure prescribed by NCTE(HQ); or, they will have to be converted into courses now recognized by the 2014 Regulations.</p> </td> <td style="width: 30%; padding: 5px;"> <p>We leave it to the discretion of the SRC to decided in favour of our institution.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>If such courses had been sanctioned in the past, they will have to be reckoned with as ‘innovative courses’. They will have to be regularized into regular courses following a procedure prescribed by NCTE(HQ); or, they will have to be converted into courses now recognized by the 2014 Regulations.</p>	<p>We leave it to the discretion of the SRC to decided in favour of our institution.</p>
<p>If such courses had been sanctioned in the past, they will have to be reckoned with as ‘innovative courses’. They will have to be regularized into regular courses following a procedure prescribed by NCTE(HQ); or, they will have to be converted into courses now recognized by the 2014 Regulations.</p>	<p>We leave it to the discretion of the SRC to decided in favour of our institution.</p>			

An email was received by this office on 11.05.2017 and Hard copy received on 12.05.2017 regarding second clarification for the SCN issued on 21.12.2016 to Pope John Paul II College of Education, Pondicherry.

A letter dated 10.05.2017 received by this office on 15.05.2017 from Shri.Dr. Kiran Bedi Lieutenant Governor Raj Nivas, Puducherry and stating as under:-

*“ In continuation of the telephonic conversation had with you on 08.05.2017 evening regarding recognition of the four-year integrated course (BSc., B.Ed) offered by Pope John Paul II College of Education, I Understand that the college principal has given additional particulars for considering their application for grant of recognition. Copy of the letter is enclosed.*

*The process of examining the explanation submitted by the college may kindly be expedited in the interest of the students, whose future is at stake”.*

An email was received on 16.05.2017 and a letter dated 16.05.2017 received by this office on 19.05.2017 from Shri. Mukesh Kumar, under secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi and stating as under:-

*I am directed to invite your kind attention to your letter No. letter No.SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP201630099/PU/2017/91630 dated 07.02.2017 and the NCTE Hq. letter No.49-03/2016/NCTE/N&S/51537 dated 20.03.2017. Reply of which is still awaited.*

*In this connection it is to further inform you that the institution vide letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 has represented that the college has the NCTE recognition from 2000-2001. It also submitted self-affidavit to come under NCTE new Regulation 2014. But it received a show cause notice NCTE, SRC for which clarification was given (copy enclosed). It was discussed in 334 SRC Meeting for which also an explanation was submitted copy enclosed. Due to the want of recognition the University withheld the result and not allowed the students to sit for examinations due in May, 2017 (a copy of the letter dated 09.05.2017 received from the institution is enclosed).*

*The matter has been further examined in the NCTE Hq. and it has been observed that as per provisions under NCTE Act, 1993, the recognition of the institution continues till NCTE withdraws it under section 147 of the NCTE Act. Moreover, the then Regional Director, SRC-Sh. M.Vasudev had filed an Affidavit in W.P.o.15488 and 15489 of 2003 (clause 9(b) stating that the SRC in its 62<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 18.07.2003 has approved an intake of 150 students from the year 2003-04. The institution had also enclosed the copies of earlier conditional recognition orders issued by SRC.*

*In View of the above the Regional Direction, SRC is requested to clarify the following:-*

(i) Whether the recognition of the institution has been withdrawn by SRC after filling of the Affidavit by the RD-SRC in W.P.15488 and 15489 of 2003.

*Reply may be sent by return e-mail/fax.*

Reply sent through e-office on 17.05.2017.

A letter dated 13.05.2017 received by this office on 18.05.2017 from Shri. S.P Veerappan, Ex-Vice president, Bharatiya Janata Party, Pondicherry and stating as under:-

*"I would like to inform you sir, that Mr. R.Perumal, Secretary, retired employees union of Pondicherry University has sent one letter dt.04.03.2017 with 325<sup>th</sup> meeting of SRC held on 19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> December 2016 minutes copy of NCTE regarding 4 year integrated course for which Pondicherry University has granted Affiliation without recognition—moreover more irregularity is going on.*

*Take suitable action against erring officials for public interest without delay. Copy of this letter to CBI".*

A letter was addressed to the Members Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi on 31.05.2017.

An email was received by this office on 25.05.2017 from Shri. R. Sridharan, P.S to L.G, Rajnivas, Puducherry enclosing a copy of D.O letter of Hon'ble Lt. Governor, Puducherry.

Another letter was received from Shri. S.P Veerappan, Ex-Vice president, Bharatiya Janata Party, Pondicherry on 26.05.2017.

An email was sent to Shri. Mukesh Kumar, under secretary, NCTE Hqrs on 07.06.2017. The SRC in its 340<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> to 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decide as under:-

1. It will be illogical to give FR for B.Sc.B.Ed.-A.I. when there is no B.Sc.B.Ed.(Basic Unit). How can there be a First Floor without a Ground Floor?
2. They have B.Sc. Ed. in different subjects. These are not in the list of recognized courses listed in the NCTE Regulations.
3. This has been SRCs stand in earlier similar cases.
4. We have referred the case to NCTE(HQ). Let us await their response

NCTE Hqrs letter received by this office on 14.06.2017 and 19.06.2017, from Dr. Prabhu

Kumar Yadav, Under Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi and stating as under:-

*"I am directed to refer to the letter dated 09.05.2017 received from Secretary Pope John Paul II College of Education Pondicherry, the SRC letter dated 07.02.2017 seeking clarification about the recognition of the institution, and the reply of the NCTE Hq. letter dated 17.03.2017 w.r.t recognition status of the existing B.A.B.Ed/ B.Sc.B.Ed. four years integrated programme of the institution on the subject noted above.*

*It needs to be stated that SRC, NCTE went on granting conditional recognition on year to year basis from the academic session 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2002-2003, 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 on the basis of submission of PAR on or before the fixed dated made by SRC.*

- 2. However, this action of SRC is seen to be clearly against the directions contained in the NCTE Hqtrs. Letter file no.3-6/PS/CP/NCTE/2000/1995 dated 14.06.2000 issued by the then Chairperson of the NCTE (which was also issued to SRC) stating inter alia that as per the Chapter 4 of the NCTE Act, an institution can either be recognised or conditionally recognised or refused recognition. There is not provision of grant of recognition on year-to year basis in the NCTE Act.*
- 3. And whereas as per the above said direction/instruction from the Chairperson NCTE, the conditional recognition on year to year basis granted to the institution as stated above in para-1 is against the direction of the NCTE Hqrs. The action of the SRC of giving year on year recognition is illegal in the light of the instructions of NCTE Hqrs. Since this letter was issued in the year 2000 all subsequent acts of the SRC in violation of such orders would be illegal, not only in the light of such directions but also in the light of a plain reading of the extant provisions of the NCTE Act.*
- 4. And whereas looking at the records provided by SRC and the institution concerned it is observed that RD SRC has filed an affidavit to the Hon'ble High Court of Madras with reference of W.P No. 15488 of 2003 and 15489 of 2003 in which it is stated that the petitioner institution has got the approval from the year 2003-04 and therefore, the student shall be permitted to take examination from the year 2003-04 and not before the date of recognition.*
- 5. And whereas SRC NCTE may be clarified that the act of the SRC after 2000 of issuing year to – year recognition was not in conformity with the direction of the NCTE Hqrs and therefore it may be treated illegal. Moreover as per the guidelines issued by the NCTE Hqrs. Dated 26.05.2000 it is stated that recognition in respect of those institution which fail to meet/comply with the norms for the concerned teacher education course within the given time frame may be withdrawn by invoking Section 17 of the NCTE Act.*
- 6. Considering the totality of facts & circumstances, and the letter of the NCTE Act, the NCTE Regulation, letter of the then Chairperson NCTE dated 14.06.2000 and 26.05.2000, and also affidavit filed by RD SRC to the Hon'ble High Court of Madras with reference to W.P No.15488 of 2003 and 15489 of 2003 in which it is stated that*

*the petition institution has got the approval from the year 2003-2004 and therefore the student shall be permitted to take examination from the year 2003-04, the SRC is communicated this clarification that the institution stands recognized from the academic session 2003-2004 onwards, especially since there is no withdrawal of recognition of the institution for BA B.Ed/B.Sc B.Ed 4 year integrated programme as informed by RD SRC vide file no.NCTE-Reg1022/1/2017-Regulation Section-SRC/93301 dated 17.05.2017”.*

The SRC in its 341<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 and the Committee considered the clarification from NCTE Hqrs and decided as under:-

1. The clarification from NCTE(HQ) is not clear enough for further action.
2. They have stated that, since there was no withdrawal of recognition of the ‘institution’ for a 4 – year integrated programme, the institution stands recognized from the academic year 2003-2004 onwards. (The annual recognition was for 2004-2005 and not 2003-2004).
3. It is important here to recognize the position that the recognition then granted by the SRC was an ‘ annual recognition’. The sequence of events prevailing was grant of annual recognition → submission of annual PAR → submission of a request for renewal of the annual recognition → renewal of the annual recognition..
4. In this case, the renewal of recognition had a time-limit of 31.3.2005. It had also a specific stipulation that the institution shall submit an annual PAR before the expiry of recognition. And, there was a requirement of a request for renewal of the annual recognition which would not be considered in the absence of fulfillment of the stipulated conditions.
5. There was no submission of PAR. There was no request for renewal of the recognition. There was no order of SRC for renewal of the ‘annual’ recognition. In other words, the ‘annual’ recognition for 2004-2005 perished at the end of the academic year.
6. That the applicant institution assumed it to be a case of recognition in perpetuity, cannot alter this stark factual position.
7. To invoke issues like ‘ future of students being at stake’ is to distort this factual position. The Hon. Supreme Court has clearly directed that institutions should not be allowed to resort to such emotional blackmailing. They should function as responsible institutions to prevent development of such situations. And, the students involved are not young children who cannot distinguish what is right and what is wrong. They cannot enter into institutions and/or courses without verifying their credentials and then wait about their future. This instruction of the Supreme Court will be equally applicable to this case also.

8. That being so, the NCTE(HQ) may be requested to reconsider the case and give us revised guidance.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to Dr. Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Under Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi on 13.07.2017.

An email was received from the institution on 16.06.2017 and hard copy received on 21.06.2017 regarding requesting for issuing the order.

A letter was received from Pondicherry University on 22.06.2017.

A letter was received from the institution regarding grant of permission for additional intake in B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed on 28.06.2017. Again a letter received from the institution on 04.07.2017 along with PAR.

NCTE Hqrs letter received by this office through e-mail on 12.07.2017, from Dr. Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Under Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi and stating as under:-

*I am directed to refer to the Minutes of 341<sup>st</sup> meeting held from 15 to 16 June 2017 and the clarification issued to SRC by the NCTE Hqtrs. Letter dated 14.06.2017 regarding Pope John Paul II College of Education Pondicherry. The said minutes have been carefully perused.*

*2. Taking the above decision of SRC and the factual position obtained from RD, SRC and the institution concerned, the following points are noteworthy:*

- i. The recognition granted to the institution by SRC was conditional for the year 2004-2005 and the last date of submitted PAR by the institution to SRC was 31.03.2005. As per information furnished by SRC, the institution did not submit PAR to SRC office whereas the institution asserts that they have submitted PAR to SRC and SRC did not take any cognizance of it.*
- ii. The then RD SRC had filed an affidavit before the High Court Madras in the case of W .P. No. 15488 of 2003 and 15489 of 2003 in which it was stated that the petitioner institution has got the approval from the year 2003-2004 and therefore, the students shall be permitted to take examination from the year 2003-2004.*
- iii. It appears to be correct in the light of the direction of NCTE Hqtrs. issued to all Regional Committees vide letter file no. 3-6/Panchayath Secretary/CP/NCTE/2000/1995 dated 14.06.2000 by the then Chairperson of the NCTE stating that an institution can either be recognition or conditionally*

		<p>recognized or refused recognition. There is no provision of grant of recognition on year-to-year basis in the NCTE Act.</p> <p>iv. The Chairperson NCTE's letter dated 26.05.2000 (guidelines issued to all Regional Committee) states that recognition in respect of those institution which fail to meet/comply with the norms for the concerned teacher education course within the given time frame may be withdrawn by invoking Section 17 of the NCTE Act.</p> <p>v. It is also stated that as per Section 17 (i) of the NCTE Act where the Regional Committee, on its own motion or on representation received from ant person, is satisfied that a recognized institution has contravened any of the provisions of this Act, or the rules, regulations, orders made or issued thereunder, or any condition subject to which recognition under sub-section (3) of section 14 or permission under sub-section (3) of section 15 was granted, it may withdraw recognition of such recognized institution, for reasons to be recorded in writing: provided that no such order against the recognized institution shall be passed unless a reasonable opportunity of making representation against the proposed order has been given to such recognized institution.</p> <p>vi. The above facts including the RD SRC's letter file no. NCTE-Reg1022/1/2017-Regulation Section-SRC/93301 dated 17.05.2017 show that the Regional Committee did not withdraw the recognition of the institution. The regional Committee is seen to not have proceeded formally for withdrawing recognition through issue of any show cause notice to the institution and thereby not taking any action against the institution for discontinuing the programme. It appears that the guidelines of the NCTE HQtrs. Issued to the Regional Committee vide letter dated 26.03.2000 have been disobeyed. Moreover it is observed that the spirit of the NCTE Act 1993 as mentioned in section 17(1) has been not taken into cognizance by SRC NCTE.</p> <p>vii. The conditional recognition granted for 2004-05 academic session is illegal as per the affidavit already filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras stating that the institution is recognized from 2003-2004. The Regional Committee could have reviewed this matter under section 17(1) of the NCTE Act in case any infarction of law or extent regulations were brought to its notice.</p> <p>viii. A per para 2 (ii) above it is obvious that the institution is recognized from</p>
--	--	---



*2003-2004 onwards as per affidavit filed by the then RD SRC before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras and the RD SRC's letter dated 17.05.2017 makes is clear that the recognition has not been withdrawn specifically.*

*Hence SRC NCTE is advised to take action according to the express directions given through our earlier letter dated File No. 49-3/2016/NCTE/N&S/54617, dated 14.06.2017.*

ix. SRC NCTE is also asked to clarify the following points:

a) *Whether the guidelines dated 26.05.2000 issued by the then Chairperson NCTE were adhered to by the SRC in terms of shopping the practice of granting recognition on yearly basis and whether there are other institutions which are liable to suffer on account of not obeying the express directions contained in letter dated 26.05.2000.*

The matter was placed before SRC in 343<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> to 02<sup>nd</sup> August, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-

- Put up in the next meeting on 17 August, 2017.

The same was placed before SRC in its 344<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2017, considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. *In the light of the clarification issued by the NCTE Hqrs. In their letter file No. 49-3/2016/NCTE/N&S/54617 dt 14.06.2017. recognition of the institution of the institution is deemed to have continued from 2003-04 onwards for the four year integrated course - B.Sc.B.Ed.(maths) B.Sc.B.Ed.(Comp.Sc.), B.A.B.Ed.(English) and B.Com.B.Ed. However, for coming under the 2014 Regulations, they will have to adhere to the norms prescribed thereunder.*
2. *The case can be considered for B.Sc.B.Ed. and B.A.B.Ed without referring to subjects as the new Regulations of NCTE, 2014 do not contemplate on the courses with subject-name-suffixes.*
3. *It is also to be pointed out that Computer Science and Commerce cannot be accepted as they are not pedagogic subjects according to the 2014 Regulations. Hence, the Recognition for programmes, B.Sc.B.Ed (Computer Science) and B.Com B.Ed has to be withdrawn immediately w.e.f 2017-18 onwards. No admission should be made for these two programmes in future. But students admitted in earlier years should be entitled to complete their courses. The lawyer may be asked to apprise the court as above.*

*Further RPRO issue for the other two existing programmes namely, B.Sc.B.ed (Maths) and BA.B.Ed(English) can be considered without suffixing the subject names in future, implying thereby that the recognition for the programmes with subject –suffixes, 'Maths' & English has to be deemed to have been withdrawn w.e.f 2017-18.*

*The institution is running B.Ed and M.Ed programmes in addition to the four year integrated programmes on the same campus. The documents need to be examined and the premises have to be inspected to check whether they have adhered to the norms/standards prescribed by the 2014 Regulation.*

The institution also filed Court case in the High Court of Judicature at Madras in W. P. No. 21122 of 2017. A brief was sent to the Shri.G. Jehanathan, advocate on 21.08.2017.

A complaint received by this office from C. Ganesan, President Sc/St, VDP, office.T.V malai Road, Vadhanur, Pondicherry on 14.08.2017. A Veracity of complaint letter was sent to C. Ganesan, President Sc/St, VDP, office.T.V malai Road, Vadhanur, Pondicherry on 12.09.2017.

The petitioner advocate has submitted document to quote Tagore Govt College is also offering B.Sc.B.Ed (Maths), (Comp Science) & B.A.B.Ed (English) an e-mail sent to Shri.G. Jehanathan, advocate on 13.09.2017 intimating the similar case of Tagore Govt. College is being placed before SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting. An email was received from the Shri.G. Jehanathan, advocate on 18.09.2017 and stating as under:-

*"The above referred matter came up. Before his lordship K Ravichandra Babu J on 15.09.2017 when the petr council argued I conveyed decision made in SRC meet 344 (wrongly mentioned as 346) and about strict adherence of NCTE 2014 norms relates to. Nomenclature issue the justice passed an interim order is that the petr institution may admit students without referring any subjects and also judge made it clear that the admissions subject to outcome of this writ petition and respond ent. Directed to file counter by. Two weeks."*

An email was received on 19.09.2017 in W.P.No. 21122/2017 filed by Pope John Paul College of Education Vs NCTE before High Court of Madras at Chennai and stating that "Please refer your e-mail dt. 11.09.2017 and 12.09.2017 in respect of approval of counter affidavit in the matter mentioned above.

*2. The counter affidavit received from you has been examined at NCTE(Hq) found in order which is approved by the competent authority.*

*3. You are requested to file the fair counter affidavit as per requirement of the court as early as possible and a fair copy may be sent to NCTE(Hq) for record".*

A letter was addressed to the advocate, Shri. G. Jehanathan, on 20.09.2017 along with duly signed Counter affidavit.

The matter was placed before SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

- This matter was considered by the SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting on 21.09.2017. The decisions taken have been communicated to the SRO's Standing Counsel in the T.N. High Court. They have not been uploaded on the website because of the case being sub judice.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the advocate, Shri. G. Jehanathan, on 26.09.2017.

A court order dated 15.09.2017 in W.P.No. 21122 of 2017 and WMP No. 21995 of 2017 in the Hon'ble High Court of Madras received by this office on 27.09.2017 and stating as under:-

“The learned counsel appearing for the National Council of Teacher Education, seeks further time to file counter. However, based on instruction, he submitted that the petitioner is not entitled to admit the students in B.A.B.Ed., and B.Sc.B.Ed, course by specifically stating the subjects in which those integrated courses are taught for. Therefore, he submitted that the petitioner can admit the students for B.A. B.Ed., and B.Sc., B.Ed., without reference to the subjects for the existing intake as permitted by the NCTE already.

2. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner institution will certainly admit the students without mentioning the subjects for B.A. B.Ed., and B.Sc.B.Ed, integrated course, however, subject to the outcome of the order to be passed in this writ petition.

3. Accordingly, there will be an interim direction permitting the petitioner institution to admit the students for B.A. B.Ed., and B.Sc. B.Ed, integrated course for the existing sanctioned strength alone, without referring to the relevant subjects to which those courses are said to be offered.

4. Post the matter after four weeks for filing counter”.

An e-mail from advocate on 19.12.2017 and stating that *“The above referred subject has been posted before his lordship justice NKKJ I have filled counter affidavit on our behalf. The W.P posted for next hg by 4 weeks g. jehanathan counsel for NCTE”*.

Now, again court order dated 13.10.2017 in W.P.No. 21122 of 2017 in the Hon'ble High Court of madras received by this office on 21.12.2017 and stating as under:-

*“These petitions coming on for orders upon perusing the petitions and the respective affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of M/S. XAVIER AULRAJ Senior Counsel for M/S.A.ARUL MARY Advocate for the petitioner in both the petitions and of M/S.C.T.RAMESH, Additional Government pleader on behalf of the 1, 2 respondents in both the petitions and of M/S. STALIN ABHIMANYU, standing Counsel for the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent in both the petitions and of M/S.G. JEHANATHAN, Advocate for the 4 & 5 respondents in both the petitions the Court made the following order:-*

*Through the matter has been listed seeking clarification with regard to the admission to be made by the petitioner institution with reference to the courses, namely, B.Sc.B.Ed (Computer Science) and B.Com B.Ed, the original order dated is itself comprehensive and no further clarification is required”.*

The matter was placed before SRC in its 353<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2018 and the Committee considered and decided “Noted the matter”.

As per the decision of SRC, the documents are processed.

**The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:**

- 1. This case has got quite complicated.**
- 2.1. This is an application for A.I. We found it difficult to consider “A.I” when the “base” was not there.**
- 2.2. This anomaly has been resolved by the advice given by NCTE (HQ) that recognition once given is deemed to have continued unless and until it is withdrawn.**
- 3.1. Then, there was the problem about adding subjectwise nomenclatures to the courses.**
- 3.2. This problem has been resolved by the court order that the college shall drop the nomenclatures as required by us.**
- 4.1. We have now to deal with the problem confronting us by the Supreme-Court order that henceforth case shall be processed under any Regulation other than the 2014 Regulations.**
- 4.2. If we have to process this “A.I.” case under the 2014 Regulations then, we should be sure that the “base” is approved under the 2014 Regulations too.**
- 4.3. In other words, the original cases will all have to be treated as RPRO cases ; and, inspected for conformity with the 2014 Regulations.**
- 4.4. Only after issue of ‘fresh’ FR to them under the 2014 Regulations can we take up this “A.I.” application for consideration.**
- 5. Accordingly, ask them to pay the fees for V.T. Inspections in the 3 old ‘basic unit’ cases-B.Sc.B.Ed (Maths), BA.B.Ed (English), and BSc.B.Ed (Computer Science).**

		<p><b>6.1. Cause VT Inspections in those cases and put up after processing the documents.</b></p> <p><b>6.2. This "A.I." case can be taken up thereafter</b></p>
11	<p>SRCAPP2016 30180 D.El.Ed-AI Govt.D.I.E.T, Hyderabad, Telangana</p>	<p><b>Govt. D.I.E.T., Hyderabad, Neredmet Street, Vinayaknagar Street, Secundrabad Taluk, Neredmet City, Hyderabad District-500056, Telangana</b></p> <p>Govt D.I.E.T Hyderabad, Secundrabad Taluk, Vinayaknagar City, Hyderabad District-500056, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Govt. D.I.E.T., Hyderabad, Neredmet Street, Vinayaknagar Street, Secundrabad Taluk, Neredmet City, Hyderabad District-500056, Telangana for offering D.El.Ed-AI course for two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 16.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.08.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.10.2016 and Reminder II on 11.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Government, the period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is ban for D.El.Ed-AI course in the State of Telangana. The institution has not submitted Minority Certificate.</p> <p>The institution has sent an e-mail dated: 23.12.2016, it stated as under:</p> <p>"It is hereby informed that the Govt. DIET, Hyderabad has submitted an online application on 30.06.2016 with Application No. SRCAPP201630180 and hard copy of the same is submitted on 05.07.2016 seeking recognition for D.P.S.E Programme from 2017-2018. But, an error was committed by the Govt. DIET, Hyderabad while submitting the online application, i.e., the name of the Programme was selected as D.El.Ed. instead of D.P.S.E. Further, the permission was accorded by the Government for D.P.S.E and the "No Objection Certificate" was issued by the SCERT, TS is also for D.P.S.E Programme but not for D.El.Ed Programme.</p> <p>In this connection, the Principal (FAC), Govt, DIET, Hyderabad has addressed a letter to SRC, NCTE cited at ref.1 above dated: 12.07.2016 informing the error made while submitting the online application with a request to consider the application for D.P.S.E and accord permission to start Diploma in Pre School Education (D.P.S.E) instead of Diploma in Elementary Education (D.El.Ed.)</p> <p>However, the letters sent by the SRC, NCTE through email cited at ref. 2 &amp; 3 above to the Principal Secretary to Government, TS for recommendation for</p>

conducting the programme are showing the name of the programme as D.El.Ed instead of D.P.S.E.

As such, it is once again requested to consider the application (Application No. SRCAPP201630180) submitted by the Govt. DIET, Hyderabad for grant of recognition for D.P.S.E from 2017-2018 but not for D.El.Ed Programme."

The application has been scrutinized through online along with hard copy of application and placed before the SRC in its 327<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. There is confusion about the courses recognized and operated by the DIET. They may clarify the position and give intake details, etc.
2. They have applied for D.El.Ed.-A.I. when they actually want DPSE.
3. The SRC has no discretion to make the change required by them. They may approach the NCTE (HQ) to get permission for making the change and, thereafter, approach SRC for further appropriate attention/action.

A letter to the institution was sent on 25.01.2017 conveying the decision of 329<sup>th</sup> SRC meeting.

The institution has submitted its reply on 27.02.2017.

The SRC in its 332<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> February to 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2017, considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Their reply is noted.
2. They have approached the NCTE (HQ) for approval to change the course(applied for) from D.El.Ed. to DPSE.
3. Await NCTE (HQ)'s response.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the NCTE Hqrs New Delhi on 02.05.2017.

The SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> December 2017, considered the matter and decided as under;

1. No reply has yet been received from NCTE (HQ).
2. Remind.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, Reminder -1 letter was sent to the NCTE Hqrs New Delhi on 27.12.2017.

Reply from NCTE Hqrs not received till date

		<p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. No reply yet either to us or to the applicant from NCTE (HQ).</b></li> <li><b>2. Wait till 28.02.18 or the receipt of reply whichever is earlier</b></li> </ol>
12	<p>SRCAPP2016 30176 D.P.SE (1 Unit) Govt. Dist. Institute of Education and Training, Rangareddy, Telangana</p>	<p><b>Govt. Dist. Institute of Education and Training, Vikarabad Village, BTS Colony Street, Vikarabad Taluk &amp; City, Rangareddy District-501101, Telangana</b></p> <p>Government District Institute of Education and Training (Govt. DIET), BTS Colony, Vikarabad Taluk &amp; City, Rangareddy District-501101, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Govt. Dist. Institute of Education and Training, Vikarabad Village, BTS Colony Street, Vikarabad Taluk &amp; City, Rangareddy District-501101, Telangana for offering D.P.S.E course for two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 14.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.08.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.10.2016 and Reminder II on 11.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Government, the period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application is processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for D.P.S.E course in the State of Telangana.</p> <p>The documents were processed and placed before the SRC in its 327<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NOC is there.</li> <li>2. Ask them to file a copy of the allotment letter relating to the Govt. land given.</li> <li>3. LUC/EC not required.</li> <li>4. BP is not legible. Built-up area is not mentioned.</li> <li>5. BCC is duly approved, shows temporary structure with asbestos roofing.</li> <li>6. Cause inspection.</li> </ol> <p>Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members through online on 29.01.2017. The inspection of the institution was conducted and the VT report along with CD received on 21.03.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 334<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> – 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017, considered the VT report along with documents and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land allotment is by the Government.</li> <li>2. EC is not necessary.</li> </ol>

3. LUC is there.
4. BP is there.
5. Built up area as per BCC excluding asbestos roofing is 230 sq.mts. It is inadequate. BCC shows asbestos roofing.
6. FDR not given
7. Issue Show Cause Notice.

Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to institution on 07.04.2017. The institution submitted its reply on 24.04.2017.

The SRC in its 337<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> & 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. They want DPSE (1 unit).
2. According to BCC, 1657 sq.mts. of RCC roofing in GF + 793 sq.mts. of RCC roofing in FF is there. This is confirmed by visiting team.
  - 3.1 But, 1183 sq.mts of asbestos roofing in FF is there.
  - 3.2 The M.P. Hall of the course is fully of asbestos roofing.
4. Whereas built-up area is adequate and other requirements are met, the presence of extensive asbestos roofing prevents any further consideration.
5. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 27.04.2017. The institution submitted its reply on 01.05.2017.

The SRC in its 338<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> – 03<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. They admit that Asbestos roofing was there. But, they claim that it has been removed and replaced by RCC roofing.
2. In their earlier communication dated 24 April they had stated that action will be taken to remove asbestos and replace it with RCC. How they achieved all this in such a short span of time is astounding.
3. Their contention is that they have enough RCC area available besides (and, beside) the asbestos area. In this connection, it is necessary to note that according to the Regulations, presence of asbestos even if it is outside the 'prescribed area' it will be objectionable.
4. Be that as it may, it has been our practice to cause inspection of any new construction claimed.
5. Accordingly, cause inspection.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent on 08.05.2017 to the institution through online mode fixed between 18.05.2017 to 06.07.2017.

Inspection of the institution was cancelled by the system in online mode due to non-



acceptance of visit by one or both the VT members within 10 days from the date of intimation.

The SRC in its 340<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> – 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. The VT Inspection ordered has been cancelled because of withdrawal of one of the VT members.
2. Generate the VT Inspection order again.
3. Inform the DIET and express regret for inconvenience caused.

Accordingly, VT was scheduled through online mode on 20.06.2017.

A letter to the institution was sent on 29.06.2017.

Accordingly, the inspection of the institution was conducted on 21.07.2017 & 22.07.2017 and the VT report along with CD received on 26.07.2017.

The SRC in its 340<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> – 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. Title is clear. Govt land.
2. LUC/EC are in order.
3. Land area required is 2500 Sq mts they have more than 5 acres.
4. Built up area required is 3500 sq mts. They have 6408 Sq ft (595 sq mt) for the existing D.El.Ed (3 units). This is inadequate. We will have deal with this separately.
5. For DPSE (1 unit) they need 1500 sq mts. They have 2451 sq mts. (They have certified that all the asbestos roofing replaced) But, the V.T. has reported in July 17 that the asbestos area is still there. Get this position verified before proceeding further.
6. FDRs & Fees are not required

Accordingly as per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 12.12.2017

The institution is not submitted reply till date.

**The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:**

1. **No reply even now from the applicant D.I.E.T.**
2. **Reject the application**

13	<p>SRCAPP 14847 B.Ed 2 Units Sri S Ramasamy Naidu Memorial College of Education, Virudhnagar, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p><b>Sri S Ramasamy Naidu Memorial College of Education, Plot No.266/4, Sadyampatti, Sattur, Virudhunagar-626203, Tamil Nadu.</b></p> <p>The Managing Committee of Sri S Ramasamy Naidu Memorial College, Plot no.266/4, Elayirampannai Road, Sadayampati, Sattur, Virudhunagar - 626203, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Sri S Ramasamy Naidu Memorial College of Education, Plot No.266/4, Sadyampatti, Sattur, Virudhunagar-626203, Tamil Nadu for offering B.Ed course for two years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 07.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter to the State Government for recommendation was sent on 16.07.2015, followed by Reminder-I on 02.05.2016.</p> <p>Sub-clause (3) of Clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The institution has not submitted NOC from the affiliating body.</li> </ul> <p>The matter was placed before SRC for in its 292<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 29-30 Sept, 2015 and the committee considered the matter and decided to issue Show Cause Notice for Non Submission of NOC issued by the affiliating body along with application.</p> <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 21.10.2015. The institution did not submit reply even after 21 days of stipulated period from the date of receipt.</p> <p>The SRC in its 298<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> - 10<sup>th</sup> January 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Rejected for Non-submission of reply to SCN issued for non-submission of NOC.</i></li> </ul> <p>Rejection order was issued to the institution on 15.02.2016. The SRC in its 300<sup>th</sup></p>
----	--	--

meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> -30<sup>th</sup> January, 2016 considered the matter and decided as follows:

*“Keeping in mind the over-all public interest, the committee revised its earlier stand to reject all cases of non-submission or delayed submission of NOCs, and decided to reopen and process all such rejected cases by accepting NOCs even now irrespective of their dates of issue”.*

The institution submitted its written representation along with NOC on 02.05.2016. The SRC in its 313<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2016, considered the matter and decided to “Process and put up”.

The application was processed and placed before SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> -28<sup>th</sup> May 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. NOC has been received by us by 2 May 2016, the extended time-limit.
2. Cause Inspection.
3. BP not approved by competent authority. BCC is not given,
4. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.

As per the decision of SRC, inspection letter was issued to the institution on 04.08.2016. VT Members names were generated through On-line VT module for inspection during the period on 01.08.2016 to 20.08.2016, Visiting Team report was received on 27.8.2016.

The SRC in its 323<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 considered the matter and decided to issue show cause notice on the following grounds:

1. EC is there. Shows mortgage of land to Bank of India.
2. There is no supporting course to provide composite status. The proposed B.Ed course is a stand-alone course.
3. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of the SRC, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution 30.11.2016 Reply to the SCN was received from the institution on 16.12.2016.

The SRC, in its 336<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 04<sup>th</sup> to 05<sup>th</sup> January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. The stand-alone issue has been satisfactorily addressed.
2. But, the mortgage issue remains. SRC does not have the authority to relax this condition with ref. to the quantum of outstanding loans.
3. Reject the application.
4. Return FDRs, if any.

5. Close the file.

As per the decision of the SRC, Rejection order was issued to the institution on 19.01.2017.

On 26.04.2017, an office Memorandum is received from NCTE Hq vide File No.91-10<sup>th</sup> Mtg./2017- Appeal dated 25.04.2017 with a request to send the original file of Sri S Ramasamy Naidu Memorial College of Education, Plot No.266/4, Sadyampatti, Sattur, Virudhunagar-626203, Tamil Nadu.

On 27.04.2017, a letter was addressed to The Members Secretary, NCTE, New Delhi. Forwarding (Original file) of records relating to Sri S Ramasamy Naidu Memorial College of Education.

The Appellate Authority vide No. F.No.89-203/2017 Appeal/10<sup>th</sup> Meeting-2017 dated: 21.06.2017 received by this office on 30.06.2017 and stating as under:-

*“..... In the appeal and during personal presentation it was submitted that “they have one Government Aided Arts and Science College started in 1970 and a Polytechnic College started in 2009. They obtained a loan from Bank of Indian, When they started this latter College. At the time of the visit of NCTE Inspection visiting team to their proposed B.Ed College, the Managing Committee owned Rs.49,40,370 to the Bank of India. Now they have repaid the full loan amount to the Bank and received the property documents. As on date, they have no financial liability with any Bank. In view of above explanations, they requested to accept their proposal and accord permission for starting a new B.Ed College. The appellant enclosed copies of the Certificates dt.28.03.2016 and 23.02.2017 issued by Bank of India about the closure of the loan accounts and a Non Encumbrance Certificate dt.27.02.2017.*

*The Committee, noting from the submission of the appellant that the loan, which was taken for the polytechnic college has been cleared and the competent authority (Registering office) has also issued a Non Encumbrance Certificate, concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to take further action as per the NCTE Regulation, 2014.*

*AND WHEREAS after perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to S.R.C with a direction to take further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014.*

*NOW THEREFORE, the council hereby remands back the case of Sri S. Ramasamy Naidu Memorial College of Education, Sattur, Virudhunagar, Tamil Nadu to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above”.*

The matter was placed before SRC in its 342<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> July 2017 and

the committee considered and decided to Process the application with direction to RD to issue the communication drafted by the SRC confidentially to the Chairperson (NCTE). A letter was addressed to Chairperson NCTE Hqrs was sent on 13.07.2017 along with brief of the case. A letter was received from the institution on 23.08.2017 and stating as under:-

*"We are pleased to inform you that we preferred an appeal to NCTE, Delhi against the Order No.SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP14847/B.Ed/TN/2017-18/91198, dated 19.01.2017.*

*The NCTE, Delhi considered our appeal on 06.05.2017 and concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to take further action.*

*The 342<sup>nd</sup> meeting of SRC held on 5-6 July, 2017 considered the matter and directed the SRC to process. So far we have not received any communication from your office. Hence, we request you to look into the matter and do the needful".*

The reply not received from Chairperson, NCTE Hqrs. The same was placed before SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. The institution has reminded us for action on the Appellate Authority's order.
2. We have not yet received any reply from NCTE (HQ). Remind.

As per the decision of SRC, a reminder letter was sent to the Chair-Person NCTE Hqrs on 04.10.2017. The reply not received till date.

As per the decision of SRC in 342<sup>nd</sup> meeting the documents submitted by the President along with bank loan statement on 16.12.2016.

The matter was placed before SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2017 and the committee considered as under.

1. We have still not received any response from the NCTE (HQ).
2. Remind.
3. Put up on 15.12.2017

As per the decision of SRC, a reminder III was sent to the Chairperson, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi, on 28.11.2017.

The reply was not received from Chairperson, NCTE-Hqrs till date. The matter was placed before SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reply has still been received from NCTE (HQ).</li> <li>2. Let us not wait any more. Even if we have doubts about the appellate order, let us accept it and proceed with action.</li> <li>3. Process the case for LOI.</li> </ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC in 349<sup>th</sup> meeting the documents are processed and placed before SRC in its 350<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As directed by the Appellate Authority, the case is reopened for reconsideration.</li> <li>2. Title is clear. Land area is adequate.</li> <li>3. LUC is in order.</li> <li>4. EC is only up to 9.3.16. The Bank of Baroda letter dt 12.12.2016 talks of “no over dues..” ; it does not certify “...no loans pending for repayment..”. The appeal order refers to a bank of Baroda letter dt. 23.02.2017 ; but, we have not been given that. Therefore, request them to furnish the latest EC (issued by Sub-Registrar.)</li> <li>5. BP is in order. Built-up area shown is 2392 sq mts.</li> <li>6. BCC is in order. But, it covers Sy nos 266/1, 266/2 and 266/4 whereas the BP covers only Sy.no 266/4. The built-up area shown, however, is same. Ask them to clarify this discrepancy.</li> <li>7. FDRs are in order.</li> <li>8. Issue SCN accordingly.</li> </ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause notice was issued to the institution on 03.01.2018</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply till date.’</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1.Latest EC has still not been received.</b></li> <li><b>2.Reject the application</b></li> </ol>
14	SRCAPP 14099 B.Ed Amaravathi College of Education, Guntur, Andhra	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Amaravathi College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.281, Medikondur Street &amp; Village, Medikonduru Post, Taluk &amp; City, Guntur District-522438, Andhra Pradesh</b></p> <p>Praveen Educational Society, Plot No. 4-5, Medikonduru Road &amp; City, Medikonduru Post, Taluk &amp; City, Guntur District-522438, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Amaravathi College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.281, Medikondur Street &amp; Village, Medikonduru Post, Taluk &amp; City, Guntur District-522438, Andhra</p>

Pradesh	<p>Pradesh for offering B.Ed course for two years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee , NCTE through online on 27.06.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 08.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 16.07.2015, followed by Reminder-I on 31.08.2015 and Reminder-II on 19.10.2015. A letter to institution for furnishing information on 'Composite' character on 31.08.2015.</p> <p>The institution sent reply for Composite character, received by SRC on 18.09.2015.</p> <p>The Scrutiny of application for causing inspection was prepared and placed before SRC in its 293<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup> October, 2015 and the Committee decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. They have asked for a capacity of 100 which means 2 units. But, the built up area is inadequate for 2 units.</li><li>2. The applicant may be asked to decided whether they will opt for one unit; or, whether they will increase the built-up area to qualify for 2 units; or, whether they will drop the application.</li><li>3. Apprise the applicant of these deficiencies for necessary action.</li><li>4. Ask the VT to check in particular these points.</li><li>5. Ask the VT to collect all the relevant documents.</li><li>6. Cause (Composite) inspection accordingly.</li></ol> <p>The institution sent a letter on 26.12.2015 stating as follows:</p> <p><i>"I bring to your kind notice that as composite college we had applied B.Ed &amp; D.El.Ed in one campus, but due to un avoidable circumstances' construction is not completed.</i></p> <p><i>Hence I request you to kindly postpone B.Ed inspection after March 2016. We are ready for D.El.Ed inspection. Kindly consider our appeal."</i></p> <p>AND WHEREAS, the SRC in its 298<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> -10<sup>th</sup> January 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is a case of composite inspection. It is not possible, therefore, to split the inspection as requested by them. Inform accordingly; and, go ahead with the VT Inspection as planned.</li></ul> <p>As per decision of SRC, inspection intimation letter was sent to the institution on</p>
---------	---

16.01.2016. The inspection has not been conducted so far.

The SRC in its 324<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 07<sup>th</sup> & 08<sup>th</sup> December, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. The VT Inspection was once postponed already w.r.t. their request.
2. They have now not responded to our letter.
3. Let us write again giving the date(s) of inspection and cause inspection.

As per decision of SRC, inspection intimation and names of VT Members were generated through online VT module. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 12.01.2017. VT report along with documents and CD received on 19.01.2017.

The SRC in its 329<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 06<sup>th</sup>-07<sup>th</sup> February 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. Title is clear. Enough land is there.
2. LUC is in order.
3. EC is there. Latest EC is required.
4. BP is in order. Built-up area shown is 4010 sq.mts.
5. BCC is in order. Built-up area is adequate. There is a discrepancy in the Sy.No... instead of 281 it is shown as 181. Ask them to get it corrected.
6. FDRs not given.
7. Issue LOI for B.Ed.(2 units) and D.El.Ed.(2 units).
8. Ask them to submit corrected BCC and latest EC along with the faculty list.
9. They should give latest by 28.2.2017 to be able to get FR w.e.f. 2017-18.

As per decision of SRC, LOI and information letter was sent on 10.02.2017.

The SRC in its 332<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> Feb to 03<sup>rd</sup> March 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. No reply to our LOI has been received.
2. Let us give them some more time.
3. Put up 2.3.2017.

The institution has not submitted LOI reply till date.

The SRC in its 332<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> Feb & 04<sup>th</sup> March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. There is no reply yet to the LOI issued by us on 10.02.2017.
2. Give further time till 23.03.2017.
3. Put up in the meeting on 24.03.2017.



As per decision of SRC letter was sent on 08.03.2017. The institution has not submitted LOI reply till date.

The SRC in its 334<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. No reply to LOI has been received even now.
2. Give further time till 10.04.2017.
3. Put up in the next meeting on 11.04.2017.

As per decision of SRC a letter was sent to the institution on 06.04.2017.

The institution submitted LOI reply for B.Ed course along with documents and submitted EC & BCC as per 329<sup>th</sup> SRC decision on 10.04.2017.

The SRC in its 335<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Latest EC is given. Only photocopy. Obtain the original for our record.
2. BCC-Photocopy of the same BCC has been given with only the Sy.No. corrected. A duly corrected and duly approved BCC is required.
3. Faculty list is in order.
4. Website address to be given.
5. Issue a Notice accordingly.
6. Put up on 20.4.17.

As per decision of SRC, LOI notice was sent to the institution on 21.04.2017.

The institution has not submitted reply till date for the LOI notice issued on 21.04.2017.

The SRC in its 339<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> & 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Reply to LOI for D.El.Ed.(2 units) is not received. Give more time till 30.9.17.
- 2.1 In the B.Ed.(2 units) case, original EC and a duly corrected and duly approved BCC are required.
- 2.2 Give more time till 30.9.17.
3. Issue Notice accordingly, separately for D.El.Ed.(2 units) and B.Ed.(2 units).
4. It may be clarified to them that, after 2.5.17 time limit prescribed by the Supreme Court, it will not be possible for us to grant FR w.e.f. 2017-18.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was issued on 07.06.2017.

The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 05.10.2017.;

		<p>The SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> &amp; 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1.1 As in the D.El.Ed case (no. SRCAPP14100) here, again, there is confusion about the BCC.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1.2 There is also some problem with the BCC. The original document (submitted on 08.07.2015) and the second BCC submitted on 05.10.2017 both bear the same date (06.05.2015) of inspection. Surprisingly, both are signed by different Engineers. Also, the built up area shown widely varies. The BCC given on 06.05.2015 shows a built up area of 1510 sq mts whereas the BCC given on 05.10.2017 shows a built-up area of 4010 sq mts.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1.3 Ask them to clarify.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was issued to the institution on 03.01.2018.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted any reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1.The applicant has not cared to clarify the BCC issue even till date. 2. Reject the application</p>
15	<p>SRCAPP3244 D.El.Ed 2 Units Dr. Zakir Hussain College of Elementary Education, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p><b>Dr. Zakir Hussain College of Elementary Education, Plot No. 24-122, Prasad Nagar Street, Ibrahimpatnam Village &amp; Post, Ibrahimpatnam Taluk, Krishna District-521456, Andhra Pradesh</b></p> <p>The India Education Trust, Plot No. 24-122, Prasad Nagar Street, Ibrahimpatnam Village &amp; Post, Ibrahimpatnam Taluk, Krishna District-521456, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Dr. Zakir Hussain College of Elementary Education, Plot No. 24-122, Prasad Nagar Street, Ibrahimpatnam Village &amp; Post, Ibrahimpatnam Taluk, Krishna District-521456, Andhra Pradesh for offering D.El.Ed course for two years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.05.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 15.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter was sent to State Government for recommendation on 22.06.2015.</p> <p>Sub-clause (2) of clause 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(2) The application shall be summarily rejected under one or more of the following</i></p>

	<p><i>circumstance-</i></p> <p>(a) <i>Failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the National Council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 on or before the date of submission of online application;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Failure to submit print out of the applications made online along with the land documents as required under sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 within fifteen days of the submission of the online application. “</i></p> <p><i>Sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 reads as under:-</i></p> <p><i>“While submitting the application online a copy of the registered land document issued by the competent authority, indicating that the society or institution applying for the programme possesses land on the date of application, shall be attached along with the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was found deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The institution has not submitted hard copy of application within 15 days of online submission.</li><li>• The institution has submitted lease deed dated 11.09.1990.</li><li>• The hard copy of application is not duly signed by the applicant on every page, as per Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014.</li></ul> <p>The SRC in its 291<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> -21<sup>st</sup> August, 2015 considered the matter and decided to Summarily Reject the application as per 72(b) of Regulations 2014 on the following ground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The institution has not submitted hard copy of application within 15 days of online submission.</li><li>• The institution has submitted lease deed dated 11.09.1990.</li></ul> <p>Accordingly, rejection order was issued to the institution on 20.10.2015.</p> <p>Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE-Hqrs vide the appellate authority order F.No.89-183/2015 Appeal/1<sup>st</sup> Meeting-2016 dated 25.02.2016 stating as under:</p> <p><i>“...Appeal Committee noted that NCTE had issued instructions to all regional Committee offices that 15.07.2015 shall be the last date for submission of hard copy of application irrespective of the date of online application. Hard copy of the application of appellant institution was received in the office of S.R.C on 15.06.2015 which is well within the time limit prescribed.</i></p> <p><i>And Whereas, Appeal Committee further noted that the appellant Trust i.e. India</i></p>
--	--

*Education Trust' had submitted copy of registered Lease deed in respect of land measuring 24 acres and 45 cents located in village Ibrahim Patnam, Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh. The Lessor in this case is Government Inam Khazi and the land belonged to AP Wakf Board, Hyderabad. The Wakf Board had agreed to lease out the land vide their resolution no.73/73 dated 28/02/73 and government of Andhra Pradesh had accorded permission as per their G.O MS.no.429 services (Wakf) Department dated 25.03.75. Appeal Committee noted that above facts have been narrated in the copy of registered Lease Deed, the refusal order dated 20.10.2015 issued by SRC Bangalore on the two grounds (i) submission of hard copy after 15 days of online application and (ii) submission of lease deed dated 11.09.1990 is not sustainable. Appeal Committee, therefore decided to remand back the case to SRC Bangalore for further processing of the application.*

*AND WHEREAS, after perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to SRC for further processing of the application.*

*NOW THEREFORE, the Council hereby remands back the case of Dr. Zakir Hussain College of Elementary Education, Ibrahimpatnam, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above.*

The SRC in its 309<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 considered the appeal remand back case and decided as under:

- To be kept in abeyance till reply is received for 14072.

The institution submitted written representation along with documents on 02.05.2016. (For 14072/B.Ed & 3244/D.El.Ed).

The SRC in its 313<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 02<sup>nd</sup> & 03<sup>rd</sup> May, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. Cause inspection.
2. VT to collect all relevant documents.

Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent on 03.08.2016. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 01.10.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 07.10.2016.

The SRC in its 328<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2017 considered the VT report along with original files of the institution and decided as under:

1. Title is clear.
2. LUC & EC are clear.

3. BP & BCC are clear.
4. The allied B.Ed. case (no.14072) has been rejected. In other words, the D.El.Ed. course becomes a 'stand alone' course.
5. NOC from SCERT is there.
6. Issue SCN for rejection on the 'stand alone' character.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 10.02.2017. The institution has not submitted reply till date.

The SRC in its 332<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> Feb - 04<sup>th</sup> March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. No reply has been received to our SCN issued on 10.02.2017.
2. Give time till 24.03.2017,
3. Put up in the meeting on 24.03.2017.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 08.03.2017.

The SRC in its 333<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. *Their reply is satisfactory.*
2. *Issue LOI for D.El.Ed (2 units).*
3. *FDR's @ 7+5 lakhs per unit are required.*

Accordingly, Letter of intent was issued to the institution on 28.03.2017. The institution submitted written representation on 23.05.2017.

The SRC in its 340<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> & 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Their request for more time to give reply to LOI is accepted.
2. Giver more time till 31.12.2017.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 15.06.2017. The institution submitted LOI reply along with documents on 17.10.2017.

The SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup>, November 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Faculty list given is in order. Only, photographs are not there in the list approved by the Director. But, the Principal, DIET, has given a certified list with photographs.
2. Service Certificate of Principal is not given.
3. Website address is not given.

		<p>4. Issue SCN accordingly</p> <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 27.11.2017.</p> <p>The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 06.12.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> &amp; 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Their reply to the LOI is examined.</li> <li>2. Faculty list is in order.</li> <li>3. Service Certificate of Principal is in order.</li> <li>4. Website is in order.</li> <li>5. On double checking we find that the built-up area is only 1768 sq mts which is less than the 2000 sq mts required. They should explain.</li> <li>6. Issue notice accordingly.</li> </ol> <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was issued to the institution on 27.12.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Their reply to our Notice has not yet been received.</b></li> <li><b>2. We can accommodate D.El.Ed (1 unit) in the built-up area available.</b></li> <li><b>3. Issue FR for D.El.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2018-19.</b></li> </ol>
16	<p>SRCAPP2016 30061 BA.B.Ed BSc.B.Ed Mother Teresa Women's University, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p><b>Mother Teresa Women's University, Kodaikanal Village, Anandagiri 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Kodaikanal Taluk &amp; City, Dindigul District-624101, Tamil Nadu.</b></p> <p>Mother Teresa Women's University, Anandagiri 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Kodaikanal Taluk &amp; City, Dindigul District-624101, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Mother Teresa Women's University, Kodaikanal Village, Anandagiri 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Kodaikanal Taluk &amp; City, Dindigul District-624101, Tamil Nadu for offering B.A.B.Ed,B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.05.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 04.07.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. Positive Recommendation were received from the Higher Education Department, Chennai on 24.11.2016. Hence, the application was processed.</p>

	<p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there was not ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.B.Ed course in the State of Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and placed before SRC in its 326<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 04<sup>th</sup> – 05<sup>th</sup> January 2016, and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. State University case.</li><li>2. Title is automatically established.</li><li>3. LUC/EC....Not necessary.</li><li>4. BP is not legible. Sy.No. not given.</li><li>5. BCC is not in format. Sy.No., Built-up area, etc., not given.</li><li>6. Cause inspection for B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit)</li><li>7. Ask VT to collect proper BP and BCC.</li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations, 2014 the same was communicated to the V.T.Members through on-line mode on 28.01.2017.</p> <p>VT members names were generated through online VT module for inspection during the period from 08.02.2017 to 28.02.2017.</p> <p>The Inspection conducted by VT Members on 17.02.2017. VT report received by e-mail on 20.02.2017 and hard copy received on 21.02.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 331<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Not giving VT report online is a technical deficiency reported by the V.T. - Ignored.</li><li>2. BP is in order. BCC is in order.</li><li>3. Built-up area is inadequate.</li><li>4. Issue Show Cause Notice for rejection.</li></ol> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, a Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 06.04.2017. The University has submitted reply to the SCN on 26.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 337<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> – 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Their reply to the SCN is not satisfactory.</li><li>2. BP is in order.</li><li>3. Built-up area is still not clearly shown. As can be seen from the BCC given, the built-up area available is (72.20+144.71+143.45)360.36 sqmts</li><li>3.2 Other than this BCC, the other documents are not in the approved format of</li></ol>
--	---

		<p>BCC.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. In the event, all we can say is that 360.36 sq.mts. of built-up area is available. If other areas are available, ask them to give the relevant BCCs in support.</li><li>5. Issue SCN accordingly.</li></ol> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, Show Cause Notice was issued to the University on 28.04.2017.</p> <p>The university has not replied to our Show Cause Notice reply so far. Hence, the matter was placed before SRC in its 339<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. No reply has been received to our SCN dt. 28.4.17.</li><li>2. Give more time till 30.9.17.</li><li>3. It may be clarified to them that, after 2.5.17 time limit prescribed by the Supreme Court, it will not be possible for us to grant FR w.e.f. 2017-18.</li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the University on 30.05.2017</p> <p>The University submitted reply on 31.05.2017. The same was placed before SRC in its 341<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The applicant university has certainly responded with concern.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2.1 But, still, the position relating to built-up area is not clear. For B.Sc.B.Ed (1 unit) they will need 1500 sq.mt. All that they have shown is a block of bulding that has 360.62 Sq.mts.</li><li>2.2 They have given 2 BCCs. They are bot Copies of each other. The only difference is that the approving authority is different. The built-up area does not change.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2.3.1. They have given details of the Science Block, Humanities Block and, M.P.Hall. Every where they have given 2 sets. It is not clear whether, on the ground, there are two sets of buildings.</li><li>2.3.2. There is no earmarking of area for the B.Sc.B.Ed course. Where will the new course be accommodated? How will it function in clisperesed locations? What will happen to the courses already running in the different blocks?</li><li>2.3.3. Another point to reckon with is that the BP shows only an area of 360.62 sq.mts. How can we accept that the BCC for B.Sc.BE.d exceeds the limit of 36.62 sq.mts. set by the BP and reach a level of 3960.49 sq.mts?</li></ol></li></ol></li><li>3 We have no doubt that the applicant university is genuinely concerned to</li></ol>
--	--	---



		<p>run a B.Sc.B.Ed course for the benefit of girls there. But, the SRC also has to consider cases only within the four corners of the NCTE Regulations.</p> <p>4. Since, after 2.5.17, we can consider cases for FR only w.e.f. 2018-19, there is enough time available for them to clarify the position; and, if necessary, even to construct additional built-up area. Therefore, issue a letter requesting them to look at the issue carefully, understand its implication and, provide appropriate solution in a realistic and acceptable manner.</p> <p>5. Issue letter accordingly.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the University on 28.06.2017.</p> <p>The University has not submitted reply till date. The matter was placed before SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reply has as yet been received.</li> <li>2. Give further time till 31.01.2018.</li> </ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the University on 27.12.2017 given time till 31.01.2018 to submit reply.</p> <p>The University has not submitted any reply till date.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. They have still not responded to our Notice about inadequate built-up area.</b></li> <li><b>2. A SCN has already been issued.</b></li> <li><b>3. Reject the application</b></li> </ol>
17	SRCAPP2016 30105 BA.B.Ed BSc.B.Ed 2Units Kongunadu Integrated College of Education, Tamil Nadu	<p><b>Kongunadu Integrated College of Education, Velagoundampatti Village, Tiruchengode Street, Tiruchengode Taluk, Namakkal District-637212, Tamil Nadu.</b></p> <p>Rajen Educational Charitable Trust, Velagoundampatti Village, Tiruchengode Road &amp; Mandal, Namakkal City &amp; District, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Kongunadu Integrated College of Education, Velagoundampatti Village, Tiruchengode Street, Tiruchengode Taluk, Namakkal District-637212, Tamil Nadu for offering B.A.B.Ed., B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course for four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 02.06.2016. The institution submitted the hard copy</p>

of the application on 08.06.2016.

As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Govt. The period of 90 days as per Regulations was over. Hence, the application was processed.

As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Tamil Nadu.

As per the direction, the application was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and placed before SRC in its 326<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> January, 2017. The Committee considered and decided as under:-

1. NOC is given.
2. They have to clarify whether they want B.A.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit)+B.Sc.B.Ed.( 1 unit).
3. Title deed is given. Only photocopies are given. We need photocopies certified by the Sub-Registrar. Title is clear.
4. LUC is given.
5. Latest EC, in original, covering all Sy. Nos. of the Trust is required.
6. BP is approved in photocopy. No date is given. Obtain the original BP.
7. BCC is approved. Built-up area shown is 3035.69 sq.mts.
8. Hard copy not signed on every page.
9. FDRs not given.
10. Cause Inspection.
11. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.

As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations, 2014 inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode during 01/02/2017 to 21/02/2017.

Inspection of the institution was conducted on 17.02.2017 and the hard copy of the VT Report was received by this office on 22.02.2017.

The SRC in its 331<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. This will be a case of B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit) and B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit).
2. Built-up area required is 1500(B.A.B.Ed.)+1500(B.Sc.B.Ed.)+2000 (B.Ed.-2 units) as against availability of only 3035 sq.mts.
3. Latest EC in original is required.
4. FDRs for the new courses are not given.
5. Issue SCN for rejection.

Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 12.04.2017. The institution has submitted the Show Cause Notice reply on 21.04.2017.

The SRC in its 337<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. Their reply is satisfactory.
- 1.1 Issue LOI for B.A.B.Ed (1 unit)
- 1.2 Issue LOI for B.Sc B.Sc (1 unit)

Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, LOI was issued to the institution on 27.04.2017.

The institution has submitted representation on 27.06.2017 and stating as under:-

*“As per the instruction given in the above mentioned letter, we are preparing staff profile to get approval from our Tamil Nadu Teacher Education University, Chennai. After getting staff approval from our University, we will sent it to our NCTE office along with FDRs. so we kindly request you to extend the time to submit Annexure I,II and III for grant of recognition for B.A.B.Ed & B.Sc.B.Ed Integrated course in our campus. Kindly accept this and do the needful for us”.*

The matter was placed before SRC in its 343<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> to 02<sup>nd</sup> August, 2017 and the Committee considered and decided as under:-

1. Their request for time is accepted.
2. Give time till 30.11.2017.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 09.02.2017.

The institution submitted a letter dated 24.11.2017 received by this office on 30.11.2017.

*“Based on the instruction given by you in the above mentioned letter, we are preparing details of staff members to get approval from Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Chennai. For that, we have prepared staff profile for same subjects. But staff members for subjects like Economics, philosophy, Sociology, Fine Arts and Music are not yet appointed due to lack of availability of staff. We are given advertisement also. So we kindly request you to extend the time for 3 months to submit Annexure I, II III for grant of recognition for B.Sc.B.Ed./B.A.B.Ed., in our campus. Kindly do the needful”.*

The SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup>, December, 2017, the considered the matter and decided as under:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Give further time for reply to LOI up to 31.01.2018.”</li> </ul> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 26.12.2017. So far, the institution has not submitted its reply.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. They have still not given reply to our LOI.</li> <li>2. We can not wait indefinitely.</li> <li>3. Issue SCN for rejection</li> </ol>
18	B.Ed 2Units Sri Annama charya College of Education, Kadapa, Andhra Pradesh	<p><b>Sri Annamacharya College of Education, New Boyanapalli Post, Rajampet – 516115, Kadapa District, Andhra Pradesh</b></p> <p>Sri Tallapaka Annamacharya Educational Society, Boyanapalli, Rajampet, Kadapa District-516126, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Sri Annamacharya College of Education, New Boyanapalli Post, Rajampet – 516115, Kadapa District, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.Ed course for two years duration for the academic year 2002-2003 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE. The recognition was granted on 17.11.2003.</p> <p>As per our MIS records the B.Ed course relating to Sri Annamacharya does not exist, the concerned file is also not traceable.</p> <p>An e-mail received on 04.07.2017 from Shri. K. Ramakanth Reddy along with W.P.No.22167 of 2017 filed by Sri Annamacharya College of Education, New Boyanapalli, Rajampet, Kadapa Distirct, Andhra Pradesh.</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was sent to the Advocate Shri. K. Ramakanth Reddy on 11.07.2017.</p> <p>An E-mail received on 18.07.2017 from the Advocate Shri. K. Ramakanth Reddy stating that:</p> <p><i>“The Hon’ble Court wants to know by tomorrow evening “whether the Sri Annamacharya College of Education had recognition at any point and time. If it had recognition then whether the recognition was withdrawn”.</i></p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was sent to the Advocate Shri. K. Ramakanth Reddy on 19.07.2017, stating that the scanning of records is going on and due to this reason the file is not readily traceable.</p> <p>Yesterday Sri M. Penchalaiah, President , Sri Annamacharya College of Education</p>

visited this office and showed original copies of correspondence between institution and recognition order of B.Ed. He has also submitted a copy of affidavit dated 30.01.2015 for making compliance under Regulation, 2014.

He further informed that he has submitted willingness Affidavit for New Regulations, 2014. The institution has submitted its request several times to add their name in our SRC Website under Institution Recognition List. But it was not added.

As per his statement his institution named Sri Annamacharya College of Education has been granted B.Ed on 17.11.2003 (120 seats) and the SRC code is APS00345. As per MIS record this APSO code has been allotted to the Mahasathi College of Physical Education, Ulga, Karwar, Uttar Kannada(B.Ed Course – 120 Seats). He is likely to visit tomorrow and shall bring complete set of records for reconstructing the files. They are running D.El.Ed (APS02741) and D.El.Ed-AI (SRCAPP3381).

Records rooms and other racks have been thoroughly checked but their files were untraceable. Now, all of a sudden his D.Ed basic File bearing code APSO2741 is found kept on the upper side of the rack in the Andhra Pradesh Section.

As per D.Ed file the college is granted recognition vide order no. F.SRC/NCTE/D.Ed/2005-2006/2537 dt. 26.08.2005 for conducting D.El.Ed course from the academic session 2005-2006 with an annual intake of 50 students. The order has been signed by Sri.N. Mohan Das, Regional Director. This file also contains copy of B.Ed recognition order dated 17.11.2003.

1. In the changed scenario the status of the above mentioned institution for B.Ed and D.El.Ed stands recognized and we need to intimate to the Hon'ble Court that it was recognized by SRC.
2. The RPRO was not issued to the above said institution though they have submitted the necessary affidavit.

The agenda item is submitted for consideration for the following points:

- (i) We may issue RPRO from 2015-16 as the institution submitted Affidavit on 06.02.2015.
- (ii) Inform the court about the present status through our Advocate and request them to close the matter.
- (iii) Inform the RTI applicants afresh about the latest development including recognition status of the institution.

The SRC in its 344<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

- 1.1 No B.Ed. file relating to this college is available.

- 1.2 The copy of the FR for B.Ed. order available in their D.El.Ed. file shows a registration number which according to our MIS is in the name of some other institution.
- 1.3 That being so, we have to check details with the affiliating University to establish the authenticity of the document in reference.
2. Ask the Lawyer to apprise the Court accordingly and seek time to complete action as described in (1.3) above.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter were sent to the Advocate and Registrar on 24.08.2017.

Now, the institution submitted its written representation along with documents on 30.08.2017 and a court order received from High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad for the State of Telangana and State of Andhra Pradesh WP No. 22167 of 2017 received on 09.09.2017 and stating as under;

*".....it is submitted that as per subject cited I gave you representations many time. But you have not rectified after providing all the documents to you. You have not uploaded perfectly and made confusion to the students and public. It is the questing of reputation of college in the public. Once again I am giving chronologically as under:*

1. *As per Annexure – 1 cited above I purchased application form you on 31.12.2001 for Rs. 100/- the slip is here with attached along with applied application for recognition with request letter also Xerox copy is also attached with NOC of A.P., State Government copy attached herewith.*
2. *As per Annexure – II your office sent a letter Registered post dated 10.05.2002 stating that date of inspection i.e. on 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2002 copy of the same is herewith enclosed.*
3. *The Date of inspection on 5<sup>th</sup> June is not convenient to me so inspection date was stayed by WP.MP.No. 12204 of 2002 in W.P.No. 9940 of 2002 wire order copy is here with enclosed as Annexure – III.*
4. *As per Annexure – IV an order copy received from your office on 09.04.2003 through Registered post stating that they will consider my application for 2003-2004 copy is here with enclosed.*
5. *As per Annexure – V you have given me a hard copy for making fresh application for 2003-04 with code No. APS00345 from the time every correspondence made to that code No. APS00345. It is given by your office only for your reference not by college. If you give same number to any other college it is your mistake. Your mistake can not throw on the college to suffer lot. Copy of the same is here with attached.*
6. *As per Annexure – VI I purchased a fresh application for Rs. 100/- on 23.05.2003 and made application to you for recognition for 2003-2004 as per your order dated 19.06.2003. Copies are here with attached.*
7. *On 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2003 the inspection team visited the college and on 17.11.2003 send recognition order by RPAD copy is here with enclosed*

	<p>Annexure – VII.</p> <p>8. As per Annexure – VIII S.V University issued affiliation on 02.04.2004 copy is here with enclosed from 2003-04 to 2009-2010.</p> <p>9. As per Annexure – IX Kadapa Dist Colleges allotted to Y.V.University from S.V.University affiliation copies of Y.V.U from 2010-2011 to 2016-2017 are here with enclosed.</p> <p><i>It is further submitted that I have submitted all the documents from the day one to till now. The students are suffering a lot and complaining me that anything happen to their jobs and future they will go for legal action. In view of the students future take immediate step and upload correctly.</i></p> <p><i>I once again request you to issue the revised order from 2016-2016 as per new Regulations as per the affidavit submitted to you on 02.02.2015 on par with others.</i></p> <p><i>As per your uploaded on 17.08.2017 missing file in your office is not my responsible, i.e., only your office staff. As per 1.2 your office is allotted the M.S.Number i.i. APS00345 on 19.06.2003 to my college is for your convenience. If you allot same to any other college you have to rectify yourself. It is not college mistake.</i></p> <p><i>As per 1.3 of your up loaded, I am herewith sending you all the affiliation copies of the S.V. University from 2003-2004 to 2009-2010 and Y.V.University affiliation copies from 2010 to 2016 for your reference.</i></p> <p><i>So no need to take time. Kindly rectify the problem and issue revival order as per the affidavit submitted to you as per new Regulations 2014 to avoid all the further consequences as you have given to all the colleges in the state except my college.”</i></p> <p>WP No. 22167 of 2017 court order is stated as under; ORDER:</p> <p>The present Writ Petition come to be filed seeking to declare that action of the respondents in not including the name of the petitioner/institution in the recognized colleges list of NCTE website, as illegal, arbitrary and consequently to direct the respondents to include the name of the petitioner/college in the NCTE website.</p> <p>2) The averments in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition shows that the petitioner/institution obtained no objection certificate from the State Government on 27.12.2001 and thereafter the second respondent granted permission to the petitioner/college with an intake capacity of 100 for the academic year 2003-04 vide orders dt: 17.11.2003. The Government of A.P. issued G.O.Rt.No.76 dated 12.01.2004 and thereafter the concerned University granted affiliation which was being extended from time to time. On coming to know that the name of the petitioner/college was not shown in the web-site, the petitioner/college made a representation dated 17.07.2015 to upload the name of the petitioner/college, in the permitted colleges list and also sent a</p>
--	--

reminder on 30.06.2017. Their inaction is subject matter of challenge in the present Writ petition.

3) Learned counsel for the petitioner placed on record the proceedings dated 27.12.2001 issued by the Commissioner and Director of School Education, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad to show that the petitioner/college was granted no objection, so also G.O.Rt.No.76 dated 12.01.2004 issued by the Government of Andhra Pradesh and gazette publication by the National Council for Teacher Education dt: 17.11.2003 showing grant of recognition to the petitioner/college by invoking their power under Section 14(3)(a) of the NCTE Act. He also placed on record the affidavit given by the petitioner/college in the month of February 2015, as per the new guidelines, showing fulfillment of the revised norms relating to infrastructure, instructional facilities, enhanced amount of endowment and Reserve funds etc. The record also discloses that the petitioner/college was shown at Serial No. 334 of the Gazette list indicating the intake at 120 and such status was being granted on 17.11.2003. In view of the above, it is urged that the action of the authorities in not considering the representation is illegal, improper and incorrect. He further submits that the College is closed since last two years and if no orders are passed on the representation made, the petitioner would be put to irreparable loss.

(4) Sri. K. Ramakanth Reddy, learned standing counsel for respondents on instructions would submit that the representation made by the petitioner refers to an order dated 12.09.2006 passed in W.P.No.21604 of 2005, which has nothing to do with the petitioner/college and since the order relates to a different college, the authorities might not have acted on the said representation. In any event he submits that if the representation is still pending consideration, the authorities will deal with the same in accordance with law.

(5) At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that his representation dated 17.07.2015 made to Regional Director, SRC NCTE, Bangalore and the reminder dated: 30.06.2017 made to the very same authority seeking display of the name of the petitioner/college in the approved list of NCTE website are still pending consideration and hence seeks a direction to the authorities to pass appropriate orders.

(6) Having regard to the submissions made, the Writ Petition is disposed of directing the second respondent to deal with the representation dated: 17.07.2015 made by the petitioner/college seeking display of the name of the petitioner college in the approved list of NCTE website, if the same is still pending for consideration, in accordance with law, as early as possible preferably within a period of six weeks. No costs. Miscellaneous Petitions pending if any in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

On 14.09.2017 a legal notice received from Advocate S.A.K. Mynoddin, in pursuance of Court Order dated: 01.08.2017 in W.P.No. 22167 of 2017.



The SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. We have lost our file which has caused all this confusion.
- 2.1 The affiliating Univ. (S.V. Univ. subsequently changed to Yogi Vemana Univ.) has also not responded to our enquiry whether they have any records.
- 2.2 But, the college has given copies of all relevant documents recognition order, their affidavits, our acknowledgements, our reminders, etc
- 2.3 Significantly, the VTI report (in 2005) of the D.El.Ed course operated by them, refers to a B.Ed course recognized in their name in 2003.
- 2.4 If the B.Ed, course has indeed been running since 2003, surely the affiliating Univ will have records of Annual Affiliation Insp Reports, etc.
- 2.5 Send copies of the documents submitted by the College to both S.V. Univ and Yogivemana Univ. and request them to check their records and confirm. Inform them clearly that the court wants action within 6 weeks and, therefore, request for IMMEDIATE action.
3. The court order is dt. 01.08.2017 we received Advocate Moynuddin's notice only on 14.09.2017. Unfortunately, our own Lawyer (Shri. Rama Kanth Reddy) has not informed us at all !) Let us complete action by 31.10.2017.
4. Put up in the next meeting for review of progress of action.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter and documents were sent to the S.V.University and Yogi Vemana University on 04.10.2017.

On 11.10.2017 a letter received from Dr. Sumita Das Majumder, Under Secretary (Legal) regarding compliance of Court order dated 01.08.2017 in WP No. 22167/2017.

Accordingly, a letter was sent to Dr. Sumita Das Majumder on 23.10.2017.

A Reminder letter was sent to the both Universities of S.V.University and Yogi Vemana University on 26.10.2017 regarding 345<sup>th</sup> SRC decision.

Yogivemana Univesity submitted its reply on 15.11.2017 and S.V.University on 16.11.2017.

A contempt case filed in W.P.No.22167 of 2017 filed by the institution was received on 16.11.2017.

The SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. This case has been dragging on because we had no related papers about this college. We had, therefore, sought information from the affiliating Univ.
- 2.1 Late last evening, Yogi Vemana University has sent a reply confirming the

		<p>formally recognised status of the college.</p> <p>2.2. Let us, therefore, issue a communication to the college confirming their recognized status.</p> <p>2.3 Inform accordingly the students who had sought information on the point.</p> <p>3. SRO has received a Contempt of court notice yesterday in this case. Therefore, inform our lawyer of these latest development so that he can suitably apprise the court.</p> <p>4. Even after issuing such a communication to the college, we have to re-check the details of verify adherence to the norms &amp; standards under the 2014 Regulations before we can issue a Fresh FR under the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p>5. Take action accordingly.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the Advocate on 16.11.2017 and to the institution on 20.11.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail received from NCTE-Hqrs regarding requested to intimate factual position immediately to the Legal Counsel and NCTE(HQ).</p> <p>Accordingly, as directed a letter was sent to the NCTE-Hqrs on 20.11.2017.</p> <p>On 18.12.2017, an e-mail received from Shri.Ramakanth Reddy requested that the above institution is recognized by NCTE or not?</p> <p>As directed a letter was sent to the Advocate on 22.12.2017.</p> <p>The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 17.01.2018.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The Recognition issue has been settled. Inform the lawyer, if not already done, for purposes of apprising the court whenever the need arises.</b></li> <li><b>2. Now only the verification of conformity with the 2014 Regulations remains.</b></li> <li><b>3. This will, in other words, become an RPRO case.</b></li> <li><b>4. Check the details, process the documents and put up the case for further consideration after 3.3.18.</b></li> </ol>
19	APS02171 B.Ed 2Units Huliyyappa Malamma B.Ed College,	<p><b>Huliyyappa Malamma B.Ed College, Anandanagar, Bangalore – 560024 , Karnataka</b></p> <p>Huliyyappa Malamma B.Ed College ,Anandanagar, Bangalore – 560024 , Karnataka was granted recognition for offering B.Ed course of one year duration from the academic session 2004-2005 with an annual intake of 100 students with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises /building within three years from the date of</p>

Bangalore, Karnataka	<p>recognition ( in case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>SRC in its 176<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2009 considered the matter of shifting of premises of the institutions which have been granted recognition in temporary premises and decided to issue notice under section 17 of NCTE Act for further action. As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 07.02.2012.</p> <p>On 9.3.2012, the institution stated that right from starting of the college(from2004-05), it is in their own premises. The institution enclosed a sale deed dated 24.1.2003 stating that the institution is functioning in a site measuring 3600 sq.ft. at Site No. 512/B, Bangalore North Taluk, Hebbal village, Bangalore. It also enclosed the lease agreement for 30 years at Site No.10, HRBR II Block, Kalyan Nagar, Bangalore measuring 3064 sq.mtrs.</p> <p><i>On perusal of records, it was found that a lease for 30 years from Bangalore Development Authority is executed w.e.f. 24<sup>th</sup> April, 1998 at Site No.10, HRBR II Block, Kalyan Nagar, Bangalore measuring 3064 sq.mtrs. It is in individual name and not in the name of the Trust/Society. As seen from the Bangalore University correspondence letter dated 30.12.2011, the institution is at No.1, Lakshmi Nilaya, 4<sup>th</sup> Cross, Papanna Block, Anandanagar, Ganganagar, Bangalore-560032. From the seal of the institution, it was observed that a college "Vidyavahini College" is in the same campus where the College is located. As per NCTE norms, there should be a separate building for offering teacher education courses.</i></p> <p><i>From the above, it was observed that the institution is functioning in the address which is different from the lease agreement address that is submitted to this office.</i></p> <p>The Southern Regional Committee in its 231<sup>st</sup> Meeting held during 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> August , 2012 considered the reply of the institution vide letter dt. 10.05.2012 and all the relevant documentary evidences and decided to serve Show cause Notice under NCTE Act, for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>The land is on lease basis for 30 years from Bangalore Development Authority executed on 24<sup>th</sup> April, 1998, but it is in individual name, which is not permissible as per NCTE norms.</i></li><li>• <i>As seen from the Bangalore University Correspondence letter dt. 30.12.2012, the institution is at No.1, Lakshmi Nilaya, 4<sup>th</sup> Cross, Papanna Block, Anandanagar, Ganganagar, Bangalore-5600032. From the seal of the institution it is observed that a college "Vidyavahini College" is in the same campus where the college is located. As per NCTE norms, there should be a separate building for offering teacher education purpose.</i></li></ul> <p>As per the decision of SRC , a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 21.09.2012. The institution did not submit reply within the stipulated time.SRC in its</p>
-------------------------	---

268<sup>th</sup> Meeting held during 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under :-

*“Show Cause Notice issued dated 21.09.2012 was wrongly worded and should be issued again for withdrawal of recognition.”*

A Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 07.08.2014.

On 25.03.2015, the institution submitted an affidavit affirming adherence to Regulations, 2014. A revised order was issued to the institution on 20.05.2015 (2 units).

On 22.12.2015 , the institution submitted a written representation as under :-

*“ With reference to the above subject , we hereby kindly request you to permit us to run the B.Ed course at Vidyavahini College Campus ,academic year.i.e 2015-16.As the building at Chikkaballapura is nearing to the completion it will be take shift theB.Ed Course to Chikkaballapura therefore the B.Ed course will be permanently shifted to Chikkaballapura from the academic year 2016-17. Kindly do the needful.*

*Please give the permission for 2015-16 in Vidyavahini College Campus, thereafter we will permanently shift to Chikkaballapura campus from the next academic year Do the needful and oblige.”*

The Southern Regional Committee in its 298<sup>th</sup> Meeting held during 8<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> January, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:

*“1.BDA lease is as good as Govt. lease. Remove the shifting condition.  
2. Whenever later they want to shift to Chikballapur, they can make a fresh application.”*

As per the decision of SRC , a corrigendum removing the shifting condition in the revised order was issued to the institution on 18.01.2016.

On 18.11.2015, the institution submitted a written representation as under :-

*“We hereby kindly request you to permit us to do the B.Ed admissions for the academic years 2015-16. Meanwhile, we also request you to give permission to shift our college Vidyavahini First Grade College , Anandanagar ,Bangalore - 24 to KIADB Industrial Area, Near Railway Gate, Chikkaballapura .We have the required infrastructure & required no.of faculty to run the B.Ed course .Kindly give permission to do the admission as earliest .”*

On 23.11.2015, the institution submitted another representation as under :-

*“We hereby kindly request you to permit us to run the B.Ed course at Vidyavahini*

*College Campus for 2 academic years i.e 2015-16 & 2016-17. As the building at Chikkaballapura is nearing to the completion it will take 2 more years to shift the B.Ed course to Chikkaballapura therefore the B.Ed course will be permanently shifted to Chikkaballapura from the academic year 2017-18. Kindly do the needful.*

*We are also submitting the copies of sale deed and the building plan of both Vidyavahini Campus and Chikkaballapura Campus for your kind attention Kindly do the needful”*

*We also hereby submitting the copies of the sale deed and the building plan of both Vidyavahini campus &Chikkaballapura Campus for your kind attention. Kindly do the needful.”*

On 29.11.2015, the institution submitted another representation stating as under :-

*“ OurHuliyappaMalammaB.Ed College which is run at Vidyavahini College Campus, till 2014-15. Now we are willing to run this institution from the academic year 2015-16 onwards at No. 40-C, Chikkaballapura Industrial Area, Near Railway Gate, Chikkaballapura. This land also been in the name of RevannaSiddeshwara Education Trust. We enclosed copy of the land document & copy of the building plan of the new campus. Kindly consider the same. Kindly do the needful.”*

SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 considered the matter of institutions which have been recognition for offering with an intake of 100 students and decided as under :-

*“For cases of B.Ed( 2 units) in the existing institution , where RPRO had been issued ,*

*We have to cause inspection to check adherence to the 2014 Regulations .This action will have to be completed by July 2016 so that revised Formal Recognition can be issued w.e.f 2016-17 to enable them to make admissions in time.*

*Action to check the documents in these cases( about 1885 in number) will take time. Instead of waiting for that action to be completed for placing them before the SRC, to save time, VT inspections can straight away be ordered. VT inspection reports can be considered along with examination of the documents.*

*Regional Director is authorized to initiate action accordingly. The institutions concerned may be alerted about such action so that they will be prepared to receive the shifting teams . They may also be advised to keep in readiness latest approved faculty lists for submission to VTs.”*

As per the decision of 314<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SRC, an inspection letter was sent to the

	<p>institution on 14.06.2016.</p> <p>On 28.06.2016, the institution has submitted a request letter to run the B.Ed programme with a single unit with an annual intake of 50 students.</p> <p>The SRC in its 329<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 06<sup>th</sup> – 07<sup>th</sup> February, 2017 considered the request of the institution for one unit and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. "This is a case of shifting and adjustment of intake strength.</li><li>2. They have to submit all the documents to enable us to process the case.</li><li>3. Ask them to do so."</li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 13.02.2017.</p> <p>On 23.01.2018, a letter received by this office from the advocate along with copy of the writ petition No. 54843/2017 and court order dated 12.12.2017 which is as under:-</p> <p>"The above Writ petition was heard and disposed of vide order dated 12.12.2017. On the directions of the Hon'ble I have taken notice and appeared for respondent 2. The Hon'ble High Court disposed of the writ petition directing the 4<sup>th</sup> Respondent-University to consider the representation dated 31.10.2017 in accordance with law and to pass a speaking order thereon within a period of one month from the date of receipt of copy of the order.</p> <p>I am herewith forwarding the following for your information for your information and needful</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) Certified copy of the order dated 12.12.2017;</li><li>ii) Writ petition with annexures'</li><li>iii) Bill towards fees and expenses;</li><li>iv) Cause list for 12.12.2017."</li></ol> <p>The court order stated as under:-</p> <p>"Though this writ petition is listed for Preliminary Hearing, with the consent of learned Counsel on both sides, it is heard finally.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. Petitioner is stated to be an Educational Institution imparting education in B.Ed Degree Courses for the purpose of training Teachers.</li><li>3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No. 4-University ought to have renewed affiliation for the academic year 2017-2018. The same not having been done, representation was made on 31.10.2017 (Annexure 'G').</li><li>4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the said representation was</li></ol>
--	--

		<p>submitted on 02.11.2017, but till date, the same has not been considered and no order has been passed on the grant of affiliation for the current academic year.</p> <p>5. In the circumstances, petitioner’s Counsel request to this Court is to issue direction to the fourth respondent-University.</p> <p>6. Learned Counsel for respondent No. 4 submits that if a direction is to be issued by this Court, the same would be considered in accordance with law.</p> <p>7. In the circumstances, the fourth respondent-University is directed to consider the representation dated 31.10.2017 which has been submitted on 02.11.2017 to the fourth respondent-University in accordance with law and to pass a speaking order thereon in expeditious manner and within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.”</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <p><b>1.1. The Court order is to the affiliating University</b></p> <p><b>1.2. There is no direction to us.</b></p> <p><b>2. We have to deal with the shifting issue. We has asked them to submit all relevant documents. They have not sent yet. Remind them.</b></p> <p><b>3. Put up after 3.3.18.</b></p>
20	<p>SRCAPP 14664 B.Ed Jai Durga Bhavani B.Ed College, Rangareddy, Telangana</p>	<p><b>Jai Durga Bhavani B.Ed College, Khasara No. 216, 231, Plot No. 6-105, Chilkoor Village, Kanakamamedi Post, Moinabad Taluk, Chilkoor City, Rangareddi District-501504, Telangana.</b></p> <p>Vidya Jyothi Shiksha Samithi, No. 6-105, Moinabad Police Station Road, Chilkoor Village, Kanakamamedi Post, Moinabad Taluk, Chilkoor City, Rangareddi District-501504, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Jai Durga Bhavani B.Ed College, Khasara No. 216, 231, Plot No. 6-105, Chilkoor Village, Kanakamamedi Post, Moinabad Taluk, Chilkoor City, Rangareddi District-501504, Telangana for offering B.Ed course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 29.06/2015. The institution has submitted hard copy of the application on 13/07/2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 21.07.2015 followed by Reminder-I on 14.09.2015 and Reminder II on 10.12.2015.</p> <p>A letter address to the institution regarding composite character as per regulation 2014 was sent on 14.09.2015. The institution has not submitted reply.</p>

The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:

*“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.*

The SRC in its 296<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> December, 2015 considered the matter, documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:

1. Original Fixed Deposit Receipts to be submitted.
2. Ask VT to obtain relevant land and building documents.
3. Cause composite inspection.

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was fixed between 10<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup> January, 2016. The same was intimated to the institution on 16.01.2016. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 26.01.2016. The VT report along with documents and CD received on 27.01.2016.

The SRC in its 300<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> – 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Issue LOI for B.Ed (2 units)
2. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished.
3. Only if these are given on or before 3.3.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f. 2016-17 academic year be possible.

As directed by SRC, a LOI was issued to the institution on 02.02.2016. The institution submitted its reply on 03.03.2016.

The SRC in its 306<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> – 04<sup>th</sup> March, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided to “Issue Formal Recognition for B.Ed (2 units) w.e.f. 2016-17.”

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC Formal Recognition Order was issued to the institution on 12.04.2016 with an annual intake of 100 students from the academic session 2016-2017.

Now, a letter received from Smt. Ranjeev R. Acharya, I.A.S, Special Chief Secretary to Govt., Education Department, Government of Telangana vide D.O. Letter No. 4851/SE.Trg/A2/2016-2, dated 26.10.2017 received on 31.10.17 reads as under;



“.....the National Council for Teacher Education (Southern Regional Committee), Bangalore, granted recognition to Jai Durgabhavani B.Ed College, Khasara No. 216, 213, Plot No. 6-105, Chilkoor Village, Kanakammedi Post, Moinabad Taluk, Chilkoor City, Rangareddy District, Telangana for conducting B.Ed Programme of (2) years duration, with an annual intake of 100 students (2 unis) from the academic session of 2016-2017, subject to the fulfillment of certain conditions.

2) Further, the recognition was subject to fulfillment of all such other requirements as may be prescribed by other regulatory bodies like UGC, affiliating University/Body, the State Government etc., as applicable.

3) In the Memo No. 4851/SE-Trg/A2/2016-17 dated 13.06.2016, while enclosing the copy of the NCTE order received vide reference 1<sup>st</sup> cited, the Director of School Education, Telangana, Hyderabad was requested to furnish the inspection report along with his remarks, as per the new NCTE Norms and Regulations of 2014, to the Government immediately.

4) It is also to inform that the NCTE (Southern Regional Committee) Bangalore granted recognition to certain B.Ed/ B.P.Ed/ M.P.Ed Colleges for conducting B.Ed course of 2 years duration from the A.Y.2016-2017. While these colleges were being inspected before issue of permission by the State Govt. for starting these new colleges in the state, 12 colleges approached the Hon'ble High Court to direct the State Government to grant permission to them expeditiously. On the Hon'ble High Court Common Order dt 16.09.2016 in W.P.Nos.26870 and batch cases, wherein the Hon'ble Court directed to give permission to these 12 Colleges, the State Government has filed Writ Appeals; No.1047/2017 and batch as the State Government found that these Colleges had deficiencies in the staff appointments because they did not have the experience as required under the NCTE norms. Moreover, the Director of School Education in his letter dt: 27.07.2016 and Spl.CS(E) in D.O. letter dt: 21.09.2016 addressed to the Regional Director, NCTE, Southern Regional Committee, Nagarabhavi, Jnana Bharathi Campus, Bangalore had already informed the NCTE that the State of Telangana does not require any more new B.Ed Colleges because already the State has (223) Colleges with 22,450 intake and the demand for B.Ed Teachers in only about 5,000 in Government Secondary Schools and that more than 2.5 lakh qualified candidates are already available in the State, for whom sufficient placements are not forthcoming and any new Colleges/intake will make the existing Colleges also unviable.

5) On the Common Orders of the Hon'ble High Court, dt: 06.01.2017 in W.A.No. 1047/2016 and batch which was in favour of the 12 Colleges, the Government of Telangana filed Special Leave Petitions in the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 3708-3716/2017 on 30.01.2017.

6) The Hon'ble Supreme Court on 04.08.2017 while disposing the SLP No. 3708-

3716/2017, has passed the following order;-

- “We are not inclined to interfere with the judgment of the High Court. Needless to say, if at any point of time the NCTE feels that the regulations have been violated, it can take appropriate steps against the College. The NCTE may also take note of assertions made by the State Government relating to any deficiency, but that will not effect the ‘No Objection Certificate’ issued by the State Government and the recommendation granted by the NCTE. The purpose of stating the same is only for future.
- Mr. Talukdar, learned counsel appearing for the N.C.T.E., has assured the Court that the N.C.T.E shall carry out its function in accordance with the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 and the regulations framed there under and also see that the institutions that have been granted recommendation are properly functional. Our so saying would not mean that the judgment of the High Court shall not be given effect to. When we say that the High Court order shall be given effect to, all the parties to the litigation shall give effect to the judgment of the High Court and act with quite promptitude.”

7) Jai Durgabhavani B.Ed College as mentioned at para (1) above, has filed W.P.No.32813/2017 on 22.09.2017 to expedite the permission of the State Government. This College kept quiet for nearly one and a half years so far, after receiving NCTE recognition. In the reference 5<sup>th</sup> cited, the Commissioner and Director of School Education, Telangana, Hyderabad, has given a report in respect of Jai Durga Bhavani B.Ed College, Khasara No. 216, 231, Plot No. 6-105, Chilkoor Village, Kanakamamedi Post, Moinabad Taluk, Chilkoor City, Rangareddi District that two Faculty Member are already indicated in other colleges. They are (1) Sri Ravindar.S, Lecturer in Perspectives in Education is Lecturer in Education at St.Thomas Institute of Elementary Education, Achanpally, Bodhan, Nizamabad district and (2) Sri Rafi Mohd., Lecturer in English is Lecturer in English at Vaagdevi College of D.Ed.Programme, Parkal, Warangal District. Moreover, no 3 years teaching experience faculty members are provided in the institution. The Management has provided only 3060 Sq.Mtrs of Built up area for D.Ed course and B.Ed with (100) intake of students in the same premises which is not sufficient as per the NCTE norms as it should have been 3500 Sq.Mtrs.

8) Thus, Jai Durgabhavani B.Ed College has not fulfilled the NCTE norms. In the recognition order of the NCTE received vide reference 1<sup>st</sup> cited, it is mentioned that “If the institution Contravenes any of the above conditions or the provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules, Regulations and orders made of issued thereunder, the

*institution will render itself vulnerable to adverse action including withdrawal of recognition by the regional committee under the provisions of Section 17(1) of the NCTE Act.”*

*9) It is also to mention that in the orders of the Hon'ble Court in the W.A.No.1047/2016 (mentioned at para (5) of this letter) at Para 45(iv) the Hon'ble Court observed as follows:-*

*“Even if the State intends to express any grievance as to non-compliance of any of the conditions required under the Norms, the State ought to have brought the same to the notice of the NCTE and ought to have sought appropriate action against the society/college, which the State has not resorted to.”*

*10) Even in the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court (mentioned at para 6 of this letter) the Hon'ble Court has observed as follows:-*

*“Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length, we are not inclined to interfere with the judgment of the High Court. Needless to say, if at any point of time, the NCTE feels that the regulations have been violated, it can take appropriate steps against the Colleges. The NCTE may also take note of assertions made by the State Government relating to any deficiency.”*

*11) Therefore, based on these observations of the Hon'ble Courts and the NCTE norms, it is felt appropriate that before implementing the orders of the Hon'ble Court in the W.P.No.32813/2017, dated 22.09.2017 regarding Jai Durgabhavani B.Ed College, the State Government must address NCTE indicating the deficiencies as mentioned at para (7) of this letter, for their necessary action, as mentioned at para (8) of this letter.*

*12) Therefore, considering all the above facts, it is requested to kindly withdraw the Recognition given to Jai Durgabhavani B.Ed College of Education, Ranga Reddy District for conducting B.Ed programme of (2) years.”*

The SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. The basic direction of the court is to the State Govt (to grant permission u/s 20 of the APed. Act) and to the Affiliating Body ( to give affiliation).
2. As regards the references to deficiencies the court has asked SRC to examine and decide accordingly to the 2014 Regulations.
- 3.1 The State Govt has listed specific deficiencies in this case. Issue SCN to the college for reply.

		<p>3.2 Give 2-months time to reply. 4. Put up in end- Jan 18.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was issued to the institution on 28.11.2017 and letter to the Education Department was sent on 08.12.2017.</p> <p><b>The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 30.01.2018.</b></p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>1. We are busy dealing with the new application cases because of the Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3.3.18.</b> <b>2. This ‘enquiry’ case can wait.</b> <b>3. Put up after 3.3.18</b></p>
21	<p>SRCAPP2883 B.Ed Sree Raghavendra Vidyalayam, Nizamabad, Telangana</p>	<p><b>Sree Raghavendra Vidyalayam, Khasara No. 500, 506, 507, 508, Plot No. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, Near Darga Street, Perkit Village, Armour Post, Taluk &amp; City, Nizamabad District-503224, Telangana</b></p> <p>Sree Narayana Educational Society No. 1-12-14&amp; 15 Chota Bazar Road Armour Village, Post, Taluk &amp; City Nizamabad Distrist-503224 Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Sree Raghavendra Vidyalayam, Khasara No. 500, 506, 507, 508, Plot No. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, Near Darga Street, Perkit Village, Armour Post, Taluk &amp; City, Nizamabad District-503224, Telangana for offering B.Ed course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee , NCTE through online on 29.05.2015. The institution has submitted hard copy of the application on 30.05.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 10.06.15 Followed by recommendation 05.10.2015 and reminder II on 09.11.2015.</p> <p>The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</p> <p>The SRC in its 297<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> December, 2015 considered the matter, documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:</p>

1. The two programmes-B.Ed & B.P.Ed are supposed to provide composite character to each other.
2. But, the lands shown are far apart. In fact, even the villages shown are different!
3. There is, therefore, no physical contiguity. Composite character cannot, therefore, develop.
4. Issue SCN for rejection of the applications.

Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the B.P.Ed course on 04.02.2016 and B.Ed on 19.02.2016. The institution has submitted its reply on 26.02.2016 along with relevant documents.

The SRC in its 306<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> – 04<sup>th</sup> March 2016, the committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. Land shown for B.Ed is mortgaged.
2. Land remaining is inadequate for B.P.Ed.
3. Issue SCN for rejection of both applications.

Before issuance of Show Cause Notice as per website information the institution has submitted its written representation on 11.04.2016.

The SCN reply was placed before SRC, in its 309<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Cause Composite Inspection
2. According to the time-limit extended by the Supreme Court, 2 May 2016 is the last date for issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f. 2016-17. All concerned should be advised of this position so that they can take advantage of the extended time-limit even if necessary by foregoing normal 'notice periods'.

As per the decision of SRC, inspection intimation letter was issued to the institution on 14.04.2016. VT Members names were generated through On-line and VT report was received on 26.04.2016 along with documents.

VT report was placed before SRC in its 312<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided to issue show cause notice on the following grounds:

1. Issue LOI for B.Ed ( 2 units).
2. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished.
3. Only if these are given on or before 02.05.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible.

As per the decision of SRC, a Letter of Intent (LOI) was issued to the institution on 29.04.2016. The institution submitted reply on 02.05.2016.

The LOI reply was placed before SRC, in its 313<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 02<sup>st</sup> & 03<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

- Issue Formal Recognition for B.Ed (2 units) w.e.f. 2016-17.

As per the decision of SRC, a formal recognition letter was issued to the institution on 02.05.2016.

The letter received from Smt. Ranjeev R. Acharya, I.A.S, Special Chief Secretary to Govt., Education Department, Government of Telangana vide D.O. Letter No. 4240/SE.Trig/A2/2016-2, dated 01.11.2017 received on 07.11.2017.

The matter was placed before SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2017 the Committee considered the matter and decided as under;

1. The basic direction of the court is to the State Govt (to grant permission u/s 20 of the APed. Act) and to the Affiliating Body (to give affiliation).
2. As regards the references to deficiencies the court has asked SRC to examine and decide accordingly to the 2014 Regulations.
- 3.1 The State Govt has listed specific deficiencies in this case *“No faculty member is having 3 years of teaching experience in the institution, as per the NCTE norms. Moreover, the Management has provided built up area of 1600 Sq.Mtrs only for B.Ed with an intake of 100 students, which is not sufficient to run the B.Ed course a it should have been 2000 Sq.Mtrs.”*

Issue SCN to the college for reply.

- 3.2 Give 2-months time to reply.
4. Put up in end- Jan 18.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was issued to the institution on 28.11.2017 and letter to the Education Department was sent on 08.12.2017.

The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 30.01.2018.

**The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:**

- 1. We are busy dealing with the new application cases because of the Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3.3.18.**
- 2. This ‘enquiry’ case can wait.**
- 3. Put up after 3.3.18**

22	SRCAPP2480 B.Ed Infant Jesus College of Education, Rangareddy, Telangana	<p><b>Infant Jesus College of Education, Plot No. 4-224/1/B, Valankanni Street, Shamshabad Village, Post, Taluk &amp; City, Rangareddi District-501218, Telangana.</b></p> <p>Hyderabad Archdiocese Educational Society, Plot.No. 4-224/1/B, Velankanni Nagar Road, Shamshabad Village, Post, Taluk &amp; City, Rangareddi District-501218, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Infant Jesus College of Education, Plot No. 4-224/1/B, Valankanni Street, Shamshabad Village, Post, Taluk &amp; City, Rangareddi District-501218, Telangana for B.Ed course for two year duration under section 15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE online on 27.05.2015. The institution has submitted hard copy of the application on 29.05.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition norms and Procedures) Regulations 2014 notified by NCTE on 28.11.2014.</p> <p>A letter was sent to the State Government for recommendation on 09.06.2015.</p> <p>Sub section 3 of section 5 of the Regulations 2014 read as under:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body”.</i></p> <p>The SRC considered the matter in its 292<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> &amp; 30<sup>th</sup> September 2015, and on careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other related documents, the Regional Committee decided to <i>issue Show Cause Notice</i>.</p> <p>Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 21.10.2015. The institution has not submitted reply to the SCN even after the stipulated period of 21 days. (Till date)</p> <p>The SRC in its 298<sup>th</sup> meeting of SRC held on 08<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> January 2015 the committee considered the matter and decided as under.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rejected for non-submission of reply to SCN issued for non-submission of NOC.</li></ul> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a rejection order was issued to the institution on 15.02.2016.</p> <p>The SRC minuetts dated 31.01.2016 decided as follows;</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“...keeping in mind the over-all public interest, the committee revised its earlier stand to reject all cases of non-submission or delayed submission of NOCs, and decided to reopen and process all such rejected cases by accepting NOCs even now irrespective of their dates of issue.”</i></p>
----	--	---

The institution has submitted NOC from Osmania University dated 16.04.2016 on 18.04.2016.

As per the direction of SRC the application was processed and placed before SRC in its 310<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Cause Inspection
2. BCC ,EC and LUC not given
3. BP not approved
4. Ask VT to collect all documents

According to the time-limit extended by the Supreme Court, 2 May 2016 is the last date for issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f. 2016-17. All concerned should be advised of this position so that they can take advantage of the extended time-limit even if necessary by foregoing normal 'notice periods'.

The inspection of the institution was fixed between 18<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> April, 2016. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 24.04.2016. The VT Report received on 26.04.2016.

SRC in its 312<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 considered the VT report and all relevant documents and decided as under;

- *Issue LOI for B.Ed 2 units.*

Accordingly Letter of intent was issued to the institution on 28.04.2016.

The institution has submitted Letter of intent reply on 02.05.2016. SRC in its 313<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 02<sup>nd</sup> & 03<sup>rd</sup> May 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. *FDRs are received.*
2. *No other reply to the LOI-including especially the Faculty list – is received.*
3. *Keep pending till 30 June, 2016.*

The institution has submitted another reply on 02.05.2016. SRC considered the matter and decided as under;

1. *Faculty list is not approved by the Registrar.*
2. *Issue SCN accordingly.*

Before issuance of SCN as per the website information the institution has submitted written representation on 27.05.2016.

The SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> May 2016; considered the matter and decided as under:



- Issue Formal Recognition for B.Ed (2 units) w.e.f. 2017-18.

As per the decision of SRC, a Formal recognition order was issued to the institution on 01.06.2016.

A letter received from Smt. Ranjeev R. Acharya, I.A.S, Special Chief Secretary to Govt., Education Department, Government of Telangana vide D.O. Letter No. 6171/SE.Trig/A2/2016-2, dated 21.10.2017 received on 26.10.2017.

The SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. The basic direction of the court is to the State Govt (to grant permission u/s 20 of the APed. Act) and to the Affiliating Body (to give affiliation).
2. As regards the references to deficiencies the court has asked SRC to examine and decided accordingly to the 2014 Regulations.
- 3.1 The State Govt has listed specific deficiencies in this case. Issue SCN to the college for reply (*One Faculty Member namely Sri P.Buchaiah, Lecturer in Education is already shown as lecturer in Social Studies at BMR College of Education, Gajwel, Medak District. Moreover, no teacher of Infant Jesus College of Education has the teaching experience of 3 years in a Secondary School and also the management has not provided Psychology Lab, as per the NCTE norms. It is not a Composite College*)
- 3.2 Give 2-months time to reply.
4. Put up in end- Jan 18.

Accordingly, as directed by SRC show cause notice was issued to the institution on 28.11.2017 and letter to the Education Department was sent on 08.12.2017.

The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 19.01.2018 and stating as under;

*".....we thank you for giving us formal Recognition for B.Ed (2 units) for the academic year 2017-18. Whereas the Telangana State Government has not issued us any orders for the starting of B.Ed College for 2017-18 academic year. All the department of State Government i.e. say D.E.O, R.J.D have inspected our college. But there was delay in giving permission to our college from the academic year 2017-18. We have waited till the last day of Counselling for the orders of the government.*

*We have approached the Hon'ble High Court at Hyderabad for permission and filed a writ petition to give us permission and court direction as follows. "Petition under section 151 of C.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in W.P., the High Court may be pleased to direct*

Respondent Nos. 2 & 4 to include the 2<sup>nd</sup> Petitioner college in the web-counseling session for allotment of seats in B.Ed course for the academic year 2017-18 pending disposal of W.P. No. 33968 of 2017 on the file of the High Court.

The court while directing issue of notice to the Respondents herein to show cause as to why this application should not be complied with, made the following order. (The receipt of this order will be deemed to be the receipt of notice in the case). Copy enclosed.

The admission process for 2017-18 is closed and we received a show cause notice on 05.12.2017 stating about 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup> November letter was dated on 28.11.2017 to respond to the SCN within 2 months from the date of receiving the SCN.

1. The basic direction of the Court is to the State Govt (to grant permission u/s 20 of the APED.Act) and to the Affiliating Body (to give affiliation).
2. One faculty by name Sri. P. Buchaiah Lecturer in Education. He was working B M R College of Education, but he has resigned and gave affidavit stating presently that he is no more working with BMR College of Education Gajwel.
3. All the faculty members were interviewed by the dean faculty of education for the teaching staff for our college as the same was approved by the registrar of Osmania University and the same was communicated at your office." And whereas, the SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting issue Formal Recognition for B.Ed (2 units) w.e.f 2017-18.
4. There was no intimation to us from State Government that there is a deficiency in Psychology Lab. We came to know only after received SCN notice and we have updated the Psychology Lab.

This is to inform to the August body in education that is NCTE (The government of Telangana has not issued to any college its orders for granting permission for B.Ed colleges for academic year 2017-18). We request NCTE SRC kindly help us and do the needful and intervene in the matters of Teacher Education and instruct the government to give us permission to start the B.Ed College."

**The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:**

1. We are busy dealing with the new application cases because of the Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3.3.18.
2. This 'enquiry' case can wait.
3. Put up after 3.3.18

23	SRCAPP1468 5 B.Ed Sri Kethaki Sangameshwara B.Ed College, Medak, Telangana	<p><b>Sri Kethaki Sangameshwara B.Ed College, X Road, Plot No. 74/A, Jharasangam Village &amp; Post, Zaheerabad Town, Jharasangam Taluk, Medak District-502246, Andhra Pradesh.</b></p> <p>Gnana Saraswathi Educational Society, Plot. No. 74/A, Boppanpally X Road, Jharasangam Village &amp; Post, Zaheerabad Town, Jharasangam Taluk, Medak District-502246, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Sri Kethaki Sangameshwara B.Ed College, X Road, Plot No. 74/A, Jharasangam Village &amp; Post, Zaheerabad Town, Jharasangam Taluk, Medak District-502246, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.Ed course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2015. The institution has submitted hard copy of the application on 14.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 21.07.2015 Followed by recommendation 06.10.2015 and reminder II on 30.11.2015.</p> <p>The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 295<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> -30<sup>th</sup> November &amp; 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2015 considered the documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and it has decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. LUC by competent authority is to be submitted.</li><li>2. Built up area not adequate.</li><li>3. FDRs should be given later.</li><li>4. Cause Composite Inspection.</li><li>5. Ask VT to particularly check on the deficiencies and collect all documents.</li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, inspection of the institution was fixed between 10<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup> January, 2016 and the same was intimated to the institution on 16.01.2016. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 26.01.2016 and VT Report along with documents and CD received on 31.01.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 301<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 05<sup>th</sup> &amp; 06<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 considered the matter and decided to <i>“issue SCN for Asbestos structures.”</i></p> <p>Before issuance of show cause notice based on the website information institution</p>
----	--	--

	<p>submitted its reply along with documents on 15.02.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 303<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Asbestos structure removed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Issue LOI for B.Ed (2 units)</li><li>2. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished.</li><li>3. Only if these are given on or before 3.3.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year possible.</li></ol> <p>As directed by SRC LOI was issued on 16.02.2016. The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 03.03.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 306<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> – 04<sup>th</sup> March, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. In the light of the internal discussion with the Committee about the common issue underlying all such cases, this case is take up for reconsideration.</li><li>2. Issue Formal Recognition for B.Ed (2 units) w.e.f. 2016-17.</li></ol> <p>As per summary the deficiencies pointed out by SRC is as under;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Website is functioning but B.Ed Staff list is not uploaded.</li><li>• One Asst. Professor in Maths is to be appointed.</li></ul> <p>As per decision of SRC, information letter and Formal Recognition Order was issued with an annual intake of 100 students from the academic session 2016-17 on 12.04.2016.</p> <p>The institution submitted its reply along one Maths Asst. Professor appointed faculty list and B.Ed faculty list is uploaded in the website received on 02.05.2016.</p> <p>a letter received from Smt. Ranjeev R. Acharya, I.A.S, Special Chief Secretary to Govt., Education Department, Government of Telangana vide D.O. Letter No. 5055/SE.Trig/A2/2016-2, dated 24.10.2017 received on 31.10.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> &amp; 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The basic direction of the court is to the State Govt (to grant permission u/s 20 of the APed. Act) and to the Affiliating Body ( to give affiliation).</li><li>2. As regards the references to deficiencies the court has asked SRC to examine</li></ol>
--	---

		<p>and decide accordingly to the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p><b>3.1</b> The State Govt has listed specific deficiencies in this case. “No faculty member is having 3 years of teaching experience in the institution as per the NCTE norms.</p> <p>Issue SCN to the college for reply.</p> <p><b>3.2</b> Give 2-months time to reply.</p> <p><b>4.</b> Put up in end- Jan 18</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 28.11.2017 and a letter also sent to the Special Chief Secretary to Government on 08.12.2017.</p> <p>The institution submitted its reply on 30.01.2018.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. We are busy dealing with the new application cases because of the Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3.3.18.</b></li> <li><b>2. This ‘enquiry’ case can wait.</b></li> <li><b>3. Put up after 3.3.18</b></li> </ol>
24	<p>SRCAPP 14218 B.Ed B.S. Bugudi B.Ed College, Rangareddy, Telangana</p>	<p><b>B.S. Bugudi B.Ed College, Plot/Khasara No.1, Tandur Village &amp; Post, Tandur Taluk &amp; City, Rangareddi District – 501141, Telangana.</b></p> <p>B.S Bugudi Educational Society, Plot No.1, Chengeshpur Road, Tandur Village &amp; Post, Tandur Taluk &amp; City, Rangareddi District – 501141, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to B.S. Bugudi B.Ed College, Plot/Khasara No.1, Tandur Village &amp; Post, Tandur Taluk &amp; City, Rangareddi District – 501141, Telangana for offering B.Ed course for two years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 28.06.2015. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 11.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE(Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations,2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A letter was sent to State Government for recommendation on 20.07.2015 followed by Reminder-I on 06.10.2015 and the Reminder-II on 10.11.2015.</p> <p>Sub-section (3) of section 5 of Regulations, 2014 under manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the</i></p>

*processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application*

On careful perusal of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution is deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-

- Application is not signed by the applicant on all pages of application as per Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014.

A letter was sent to the institution regarding furnishing of information in support of 'Composite' character as per Regulations, 2014 on 07.10.2015.

The institution submitted reply to our letter on 20.10.2015.

The application was processed and placed before SRC in its 297<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> December, 2015 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. They have D.El.Ed.
2. BCC is not approved by competent authority.
3. Built-up area is not adequate for 2 units of B.Ed and 1 unit of D.El.Ed.
4. Cause composite inspection for D.El.Ed and B.Ed.

As per the decision of SRC, inspection intimation letter was issued to the institution on 16.01.2016. VT Members names were generated through On-line and VT report was received on 03.02.2016 along with documents.

VT report was placed before SRC in its 302<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 09<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided to issue show cause notice on the following grounds:

1. BCC is not issued by competent authority.
2. CD is OK
3. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.

Before issuance of Show Cause Notice, based on the website information of the SRC decision, the institution submitted a reply on 15.02.2016.

The matter was placed before SRC, in its 303<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under;

1. BCC submitted OK.

- 2.1. Issue LOI for B.Ed (1 unit).
- 2.2. FDR's in joint account should be furnished.
3. Only if these are given on or before 3.3.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible.

As per the decision of SRC, a Letter of Intent (LOI) was issued to the institution on 18.02.2016. The institution submitted reply on 03.03.2016.

The LOI reply was placed before SRC, in its 306<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> to 04<sup>th</sup> March, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. In the light of the internal discussion within the Committee about the Common issue underlying all such cases, this case is taken up for reconsideration.
2. Issue Formal Recognition for B.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2016-17.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter and formal recognition was issued to the institution on 12.04.2014.

A letter received from Smt. Ranjeev R. Acharya, I.A.S, Special Chief Secretary to Govt., Education Department, Government of Telangana vide D.O. Letter No. 3743/SE.Trig/A2/2016-2, dated 27.10.2017 received on 02.11.2017.

The SRC in its 347<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> November 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. The basic direction of the court is to the State Govt (to grant permission u/s 20 of the APed. Act) and to the Affiliating Body ( to give affiliation).
2. As regards the references to deficiencies the court has asked SRC to examine and decide accordingly to the 2014 Regulations.
- 3.1 The State Govt has listed specific deficiencies in this case, "One faculty member namely Sri. Gudimalla Damodar, Lecturer in Mathematics is duplicated as Lecturer in Mathematics at Sri Aurobindo's D.Ed College, Gaddipally (V), Garidepally (M), Nalgonda District. No faculty member is having 3 years of teaching experience in the institution as per the NCTE norms."

Issue SCN to the college for reply.

- 3.2 Give 2-months time to reply.
- 4 Put up in end- Jan 18

As per the decision of SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 28.11.2017 and a letter also send to the Special Chief Secretary to Government on 08.12.2017 .

		<p>The institution submitted its reply on 11.01.2018.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</b></p> <p><b>1.We are busy dealing with the new application cases because of the Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3.3.18.</b>  <b>2.This ‘enquiry’ case can wait.</b>  <b>3.Put up after 3.3.18</b></p>					
25	<p>APS02786  APS00232  D.Ed 1 Unit  B.Ed  2 Units  Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College &amp; Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Adilabad, Telangana</p>	<p><b>Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College &amp; Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Asifabad Revenue Division, # 12-130, Shivakeshava Mandir Street, Asifabad, Adilabad District-517124, Telangana</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>APS00232/B.Ed (2 units)</th> <th>APS02786/D.Ed (1 unit)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College, Asifabad Revenue Division, # 12-130, Shivakeshava Mandir Street, Asifabad, Adilabad District-517124, Telangana was granted recognition on 08.04.2003 for Secondary (B.Ed) course with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in a rented premises).</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification new Regulations 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revise norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted willingness affidavit on 20.01.2015 for compliance of Regulations 2014.</p> <p>Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 06.05.2015 for two units with condition that the institution has not maintained/revalidated the Fixed Deposit Receipts towards Endowment and Reserve Funds.</p> </td> <td> <p>Mother Theresa Educational Society’s, Rajampet, Asifabad District, Adilabad District 504293, Telangana had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana for D.El.Ed course of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students and was granted recognition on 26.08.2005.</p> <p>On 08.02.2016, a letter was received from the Director of School Education, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad vide No.Rc.No99/A/TE/TSCERT/2014 dated 06.02.2016 regarding the observations of the Affiliation Committee in respect of private D.El.Ed / B.Ed colleges in the State of Telangana and decided to forward the list of 76 colleges including Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana to SRC, NCTE for taking further necessary action under section 17 of the Act.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		APS00232/B.Ed (2 units)	APS02786/D.Ed (1 unit)	<p>Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College, Asifabad Revenue Division, # 12-130, Shivakeshava Mandir Street, Asifabad, Adilabad District-517124, Telangana was granted recognition on 08.04.2003 for Secondary (B.Ed) course with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in a rented premises).</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification new Regulations 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revise norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted willingness affidavit on 20.01.2015 for compliance of Regulations 2014.</p> <p>Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 06.05.2015 for two units with condition that the institution has not maintained/revalidated the Fixed Deposit Receipts towards Endowment and Reserve Funds.</p>	<p>Mother Theresa Educational Society’s, Rajampet, Asifabad District, Adilabad District 504293, Telangana had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana for D.El.Ed course of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students and was granted recognition on 26.08.2005.</p> <p>On 08.02.2016, a letter was received from the Director of School Education, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad vide No.Rc.No99/A/TE/TSCERT/2014 dated 06.02.2016 regarding the observations of the Affiliation Committee in respect of private D.El.Ed / B.Ed colleges in the State of Telangana and decided to forward the list of 76 colleges including Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana to SRC, NCTE for taking further necessary action under section 17 of the Act.</p>
APS00232/B.Ed (2 units)	APS02786/D.Ed (1 unit)						
<p>Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College, Asifabad Revenue Division, # 12-130, Shivakeshava Mandir Street, Asifabad, Adilabad District-517124, Telangana was granted recognition on 08.04.2003 for Secondary (B.Ed) course with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in a rented premises).</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification new Regulations 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revise norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted willingness affidavit on 20.01.2015 for compliance of Regulations 2014.</p> <p>Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 06.05.2015 for two units with condition that the institution has not maintained/revalidated the Fixed Deposit Receipts towards Endowment and Reserve Funds.</p>	<p>Mother Theresa Educational Society’s, Rajampet, Asifabad District, Adilabad District 504293, Telangana had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana for D.El.Ed course of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students and was granted recognition on 26.08.2005.</p> <p>On 08.02.2016, a letter was received from the Director of School Education, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad vide No.Rc.No99/A/TE/TSCERT/2014 dated 06.02.2016 regarding the observations of the Affiliation Committee in respect of private D.El.Ed / B.Ed colleges in the State of Telangana and decided to forward the list of 76 colleges including Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana to SRC, NCTE for taking further necessary action under section 17 of the Act.</p>						



<p>On 30.06.2015 the institution submitted FDRs in joint a/c of Rs.7 &amp; 5 Lakhs towards Endowment and Reserve Fund for a period of 03 years. After verification of FDR's, a letter along with original FDRs was sent to the institution on 30.06.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted its representation on 28.10.2015 along with the relevant documents and DD. Rs. 1,50,000/- regarding shifting of premises for Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute D.El.Ed Asifabad and Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College Asifabad.</p> <p>Another letter was received from the institution on 28.10.2015 for causing inspection for shifting and stating as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“SRC NCTE has granted recognition DR Rajendra Prasad B.Ed college to run B.Ed Programme for 2002-2003 year at Asifabad and for our Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute to run D.Ed Programme for 2005-06 year at Asifabad. Both these are our Mother Theresa Educational Society's own properties. The Built up Area for these building were sufficient as per the norms prevailing at the time of granting recognition.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Subsequently we have constructed another building for our B.Ed and D.Ed programme together. Together we have constructed a common building at Buruguda Asifabad in S.No 104/C/2,105/E/2 and 45 and applied for shifting of premises to SRC NCTE, Bangalore.</i></p>		Deficiencies Observed	Number of colleges
	1	Submitted Fake and Fabricated documents	35 (Existing) (Annexure 1A) 02 (New) (Annexure 1B)
	2	Functioning in leased premises even after stipulated period	04 (Annexure II)
	3	Shifting of College Premises without the permission of SRC NCTE	16 (Annexure III)
	4	Submission of fake NOCs	15 (Annexure IV)
	5	Not possessing land in the name of the society/Institution	04 (Annexure V)
		<p>The matter was placed before SRC in its 302<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 09<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> February, 2016. The Committee considered the letter from the Director School Education Department, Telangana State and decided that <i>“What with the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 16 time-limit pressure on us, it is not possible to go into these complaints at this time.</i></p>	

		<p><i>Now the Director of School Education Telangana, Hyderabad is insisting on shifting permission order at the new address.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore we request you to kindly send the letter to the Director of School Education Telangana Hyderabad to grant us affiliation and admission for the year 2015-2016 as our application for shifting is pending with SRC NCTE Bangalore.</i></p> <p><i>We also request you to cause shifting inspection at an earliest and give us shifting orders”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 293<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup>-31<sup>st</sup> October, 2015 considered the written representation from the institution vide letter dated 28.10.2015 and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process for causing shifting inspection.</li> <li>• In the meanwhile request the 2 Affiliating Bodies to renew affiliation.</li> </ul> <p>As per the decision of SRC, the documents submitted by the institution on 01.06.2016 were processed and placed before SRC in its 318<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p>	<p><i>Process and put up after March 16”.</i></p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, the matter was placed before SRC in its 309<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter in respect of (76 colleges) regarding not fulfilling the deficiencies and decided to issue show cause notice for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shifting of college premises without the permission of SRC NCTE.</li> </ul> <p>As per the decision of SRC, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 13.05.2016. The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 28.07.2016.</p>
		<p>The SRC in its 318<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> &amp; 09<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 considered both B.Ed (APS00232) &amp; D.Ed (APS02786) shifting case and show cause notice reply and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The complaint was that they have been continuing on leased premises even beyond the time given. They have replied to show that they have been pursuing action. Now, of course, they have even shifted without permission.</li> <li>2. We have already sent a VT to inspect the new premises. Put up when the VT Inspection report is received.</li> </ol>	

3. Inform Director School Education.
4. Inform Director SCERT.

As per decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the Director, SCERT on 01.09.2016.

VT assigned through online procedure. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 29.08.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 06.09.2016.

The SRC in its 322<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup> October, 2016 considered the VT report and decided to issue show cause notice for the following grounds:

1. Title is in order.
2. LUC and EC – not given.
3. BP & BCC are in order. Built up area shown in BCC is adequate. But, BCC shows larger area than what is approved in the Building Plan. Ask them to get the Building Plan amended and approved.
4. Faculty list is not in original; and; not approved ;
5. FDRs- not given.
6. Fee paid in full.

Accordingly, show cause notice was sent on 18.11.2016. The institution submitted reply along with documents, received on 17.11.2016, 29.11.2016, 06.12.2016, 27.12.2016 and 30.01.2017.

The SRC in its 343<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> & 02<sup>nd</sup> August, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Their reply is not wholly satisfactory.
  2. The BP is not approved by competent authority.
  3. The EC does not specify whether the ref. to the Bank Loan is for mortgaging or is for redemption. This must be clarified.
  4. The faculty lists are approved. But only photocopies are given. Originals are required.
- 4.1 Faculty list for B.Ed.(2 units):
- (i) 1+15 Members are there.
  - (ii) Principal does not have Ph.D. His Service experience is inadequate.
  - (iii) Two Asst. Profs. more are required in the Perspective Group. One Asst. Prof.(Soc.) from the Pedagogy Group is available for shift to the Persp. Group.
  - (iv) In the Pedagogy Group an Asst. Prof.(Zoology) is teaching Physical Science. This needs to be corrected.
- 4.2 Faculty list for D.El.Ed.(1 unit):
- (i) Only 1+7 are there against a requirement of 1+8.

- (ii) One Asst. Prof.(Persp.) is required.
- (iii) Asst. Prof.(Sc.), Asst. Prof.(Maths), Asst. Prof.(Eng.) and, Telugu Pandit do not have M.Ed.
- 5. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 16.08.2017.

Before issuance of show cause notice the institution submitted its reply along with documents on 14.08.2017.

The SRC in its 346<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> & 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

- 1. The BP now given is in order.
- 2. The clarification given about the 'mortgage' does not remove the infirmity. The purpose of mortgage is not so material as the fact of 'mortgage' is they do not have clear title to the property.
- 3. Faculty list is approved.
- 3.1 It has the following deficiencies;
  - (i) Only a colour - photocopy is given, not original.
  - (ii) Principal (in B.Ed) does not have Ph.D.
  - (iii) 2 more Asst. Profs in Persp. Groups are required.
  - (iv) In D.El.Ed, we accept their contention to go by the SCERT norm of 1+7 and not 1+8.
  - (v) Their contention that M.Ed or (MA (Ed) + B.Ed) is not required is accepted subject the understanding that they were all recruited after 2009.
  - (vi) Collect the dates of appointment to check whether their cases will be governed by the 2007 Regulations & not 2009 Regulations.
- 4. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as directed by SRC show cause notice was sent for both B.Ed and D.El.Ed courses on 02.11.2017.

The SRC in its 348<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 05<sup>th</sup> & 06<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

- 1. They had sent a reply on 09.11.2017.
- 2. The agenda note does not refer to it at all.
- 3. Put up in the next meeting.

The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 14.11.2017.

The SRC in its 349<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Admittedly, the land in ref is mortgaged. In the absence of a clear title, their shifting to the mortgaged new land can not be permitted.
2. The request for shifting is rejected.
- 3.1 Both the courses are even now operating on own premises as claimed by them. Why then do they want to shift ? Ask them to clarify.
- 3.2 How do they propose to acquire clear title to the new land.
- 4 Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, show cause notice was sent to the institution on 27.12.2017.

Now, the institution submitted its reply along with documents on 11.01.2018 and stating as under;

*“.....I am to submit that Mother Teresa Educational Society, Asifabad is running (1) Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College, Asifabad (2) Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Asifabad, since last more than a Decade. In view of the changing demands and also to provide better amenities, the management decided to construct a new building for both the institutions with all the required facilities. After the completion of the construction, we requested the Southern Regional Committee NCTE for shifting, as per NCTE regulations.*

*SRC NCTE caused inspection and served a notice. The management fulfilled all the conditions. Further I am to state that the management borrowed loan from SBI Asifabad mortgaging the Society Land and our other properties. The Loan amount is utilized only for the completion of the building.*

*However, SRC, NCTE objected to the mortgage of the Society's Land, and served the show cause notice cited above. In response to the show cause notice the management pooled up its resources and cleared the bank loan, accordingly the land documents got released from the custody of the Bank.*

*Further, a certificate from the Manager, SBI, Asifabad is also enclosed. Even the Encumbrance Certificate is obtained from the competent authority to the extent that there is no mortgage of the society Land.*

*In view of the above, and also considering the Affidavit submitted by the management to the extent, permission may be accorded to Mother Theresa Educational Society (MTES) to run its two institutions in the new building.”*

**The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:**

		<p><b>1.We are dealing on priority with the new application cases in view of the Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3.3.18 for issue of FRs w.e.f. 18-19.</b></p> <p><b>2.This ‘Shifting’ Case can wait.</b></p> <p><b>3.Put up after 3.3.18.</b></p>
26	<p>APS03034 B.Ed 2 Units Roseline College of Education, Sivagangai, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p><b>Roseline College of Education, Victoria Nagar, Sivagangai, District – 630561, Tamil Nadu</b></p> <p>Roseline College of Education, Victoria Nagar, Sivagangai, District – 630561, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Roseline College of Education, Victoria Nagar, Sivagangai, District – 630561, Tamil Nadu for offering Secondary (B.Ed) course of One year duration for the academic year 2005-06 with an annual intake of 100 students, under section 14 (1) of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee. The recognition order was issued to the institution on 25.11.2005.</p> <p>The inspection of the institution was conducted on 02.06.2011 and the VT report along with documents was received on 08.06.2011.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014, letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The institution has submitted willingness affidavit as per regulations 2014 on 27.01.2015. Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 08.05.2015.</p> <p>The institution compliance for RPRO case on 31.01.2015. The SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> May 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <p><i>“For cases of B.Ed (2 Units) in the existing institution, where RPRO, has been issued, we have to cause inspection to check adherence to the 2014 Regulations. This action will have to be completed by July 2016 so that revised Formal Recognition can be issued w.e.f. 2016-17 to enable them to make admission in time.</i></p> <p><i>Action to check the documents in these cases (about 1885 in number) will take time. Instead of Waiting for that action to be completed for placing them before the SRC, to save time, VT Inspections can straightaway be ordered. VT Inspection Report can be considered along with examination of the documents. Regional Director is authorized to initiate action accordingly. The institution concerned may be alerted about such action so that they will be prepared to receive the Visiting Teams. They may also be advised to keep in readiness latest approved Faculty Lists for Submission to the VTs.”</i></p> <p>Accordingly, the inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 13.06.2016. VT</p>

member's names have been generated through online VT module.

The institution submitted a letter along with inspection fee of Rs. 150000. The inspection was conducted to the institution on 20.11.2016 & 21.11.2016, received VT report along with documents on 24.11.2016.

The VT report was placed before SRC in its 348<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 05<sup>th</sup> to 06<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. Land area is only 1393 Sq mts as against 3000 Sqmts required.
2. Built-up area is only 2675 Sq mts as against a requirement of 3500 Sq mts.
3. LUC- not given.
4. Title is clear.
5. EC is given.
6. FDRs are required for Rs.7+5 lakhs. They have given only for Rs.8 lakhs.
7. Faculty list is examined:
  - (i) A total of 1+15 is required. They have given a list of 1+16.
  - (ii) Principal (Dr. Suthanthira Kannan) has only 52% in M.Ed.
  - (iii) Service Certificate of Principal not given.
  - (iv) Asst. Prof English (Sh.KP Krishnamoorthy) has only 54.2% in PG.
  - (v) Two Asst. Profs have M.com. One Asst. Prof has MSc (I.T) which is not a school subject. They are not eligible.
  - (vi) Asst. Prof Performing Arts and Fine Arts are there. There is no Asst Prof (Phy.Ed)
  - (vii) Faculty list is only in photocopy. Original is required.
8. Issue SCN

As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 12.12.2017. The institution submitted SCN reply received on 17.01.2018.

**The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:**

- 1. We are dealing on priority with the new application cases in view of the Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3.3.18 for issue of FRs w.e.f. 18-19.**
- 2. This RPRO case can wait.**
- 3. Put up after 3.3.18**