

**Decisions of 363<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of SRC-NCTE**

<b>Sr No</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>	<b>Remarks of SRC</b>
<b>1.</b>	Confirmation of Minutes of 362 <sup>nd</sup> Meeting of SRC 21 <sup>st</sup> to 22 <sup>nd</sup> August 2018	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>2.</b>	Action Taken Report (ATR) on of 362 <sup>nd</sup> Meeting of SRC 21 <sup>st</sup> to 22 <sup>nd</sup> August 2018 & 361 <sup>st</sup> Meeting of SRC 21 <sup>st</sup> to 22 <sup>nd</sup> June, 2018	<b>Noted</b>

1.	ASPO7134	B.Ed	Priyadarshini College of Education, Andhra Pradesh	Court Matter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Court has virtually ordered continuation of the programme during 2018-19 even for the first year admissions.</li><li>2. We have to proceed on that basis.</li><li>3. The issues to pursue in particular are:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) Shifting to own premises during 2018-19 itself. Otherwise, recognition will have to be withdrawn and the 2<sup>nd</sup> year students may have to be shifted to some other college. Admissions in 2018-19 will be subject to this understanding.</li><li>(ii) They should immediately submit revalidated FDRs in joint account with a 5-year validity (in original) @ Rs. 7 + 5 lakhs.</li><li>(iii) Latest approved Faculty List must be furnished within 3 months. Recruitments made after 09.06.17 must conform to the amendments made to the qualifications on that date.</li><li>(iv) Principal shall have Ph.D degree.</li><li>(v) Dimensions of classrooms, labs and M.P. Hall shall correspond to the prescribed norms for a 2 year B.Ed. programme with 2 units.</li></ol></li><li>4.1 Collect all documents and prepare for a V.T. Inspection.</li><li>4.2 Obtain full fee for the inspection without fail.</li><li>5. Keep the University informed.</li><li>6. Keep our lawyer informed so that he can duly apprise the court of the correct facts if and when it becomes necessary.</li></ol>
----	----------	------	--	--------------	--

					7. Issue Show Cause Notice to the college accordingly.
2.	APSO0520	B.Ed	Sri Sai College of Education, Telangana	Court Matter	<p>1. The Court has virtually granted permission to run the programme during 2018-19 even for the first year.</p> <p>2. We have to proceed on that basis.</p> <p>3. Right from the start they have been fooling us and the University. They deserve to be dealt with strictly.</p> <p>4. The issues to pursue on particular are:</p> <p>(i) They have to submit all documents especially the latest EC.</p> <p>(ii) They have to submit the title deeds in particular.</p> <p>(iii) We cannot accept their continuance in the school building. They have to have their own premises in Municipally.</p> <p>(iv) They shall submit the latest approved Faculty List for 1 + 15 not just 6. Recruitments made after 09.06.17 shall conform to the amendments made on that date.</p> <p>(v) It has to be stressed that the strength is fixed at 2 units (i.e., 100 students) in the RPRO.</p> <p>(vi) Labs &amp; classes shall have the prescribed minimum dimensions.</p> <p>(vii) They cannot be using furniture borrowed from the school.</p> <p>(viii) They shall shift to own premises during 2018-19 itself. Otherwise, recognition will have to be withdrawn and the 2<sup>nd</sup> year students may have to be adjusted in some other college. The admissions in 2018-19 will be subject to this understanding.</p> <p>5. The Principal is overaged and is, therefore, not qualified.</p>

					<p>6. Collect fees and prepare for causing inspection.</p> <p>6.1 We must advise the VT clearly about the deficiencies festering.</p> <p>7. Collect all relevant documents for scrutiny before VT Inspection.</p> <p>8. Keep the University informed.</p> <p>9. Keep our lawyer informed so that he can duly apprise the court of the correct facts if &amp; when the need arises.</p>
3.	APSO2678	B.Ed	Kattipally Ravindra Reddy College of Education, Andhra Pradesh	Court Matter	<p>1. The Court has virtually granted permission to run the programme during 2018-19 even for the first year.</p> <p>2. We have to proceed on that basis.</p> <p>3. Right from the start they have been fooling us and the University. They deserve to be dealt with strictly.</p> <p>4. This seems to pursue in particular are: (i) They have to submit all documents especially the latest EC. (ii) They shall give the latest EC. (iii) Their in-take strength has already been reduced from 2 units to 1 unit. They shall submit the latest approved Faculty List of 1 + 9. Recruitments made after 09.06.17 shall conform to the amendments made on that date. (iv) They have shifted without permission. This is not acceptable. They shall shift to own premises during 2018-19 itself. Otherwise, recognition will have to be withdrawn and the 2<sup>nd</sup> year students may have to be adjusted in some other college. The admissions in 2018-19 will be subject to this understanding. (v) Class-rooms, labs &amp; MP Hall shall conform to the dimensions prescribed.</p> <p>5.1 Collect fees and prepare to cause inspection.</p>

					<p>5.2 We must examine all the documents and advise the VT clearly about the deficiencies festering.</p> <p>6. Keep the University informed.</p> <p>7. Keep our lawyer informed so that he can duly apprise the court of the correct facts if &amp; when the need arises.</p> <p>8. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly. Collect all documents in one month. Process &amp; put up in November 2018.</p>
4.	APP20163 0157	M.P. Ed	Mother Terasa College of Physical Education, Veerapatti Village, Mettusalai Illuppur Taluk, Veerapatti City, Pudukottai District, Tamilnadu	Court Matter	<p>1. The issue relating to submission of the affiliating body's NOC has been finally settled by the Supreme Court. As directed by the Hon'ble High Court we have to proceed to consider the case on the basis of documents submitted.</p> <p>2. In view of the protracted litigation, going up to the Supreme Court, we have to treat this as a pipeline case. In other words, the time-limit prescribed for issue of FRs can not be applied to this case.</p> <p>3.1 Title deed is only in photo copy; the original is not there; even the photocopy is authenticated only by the Principal and not by the Sub-Registrar. Obtain a proper title deed.</p> <p>3.2 Title of the Trust is shown.</p> <p>3.3 Land area required is 8 acres. They have 26.3 acres.</p> <p>4. LUC is in photocopy. Otherwise it is in order. Obtain the original or a photocopy certified by the Tashildar.</p> <p>5. EC shows 'No encumbrance'. But, it is in photocopy. Obtain the original.</p> <p>6.1 Building Plan is in photocopy. Obtain the original; or; a photocopy attested by the Panchayat.</p> <p>6.2 Built-up area indicated is 3010 sq.mts.</p>

					<p>which is more than the 2500 sq.mts. required.</p> <p>7.1 BCC is in photocopy. Obtain the original; or, a photocopy attested by the Panchayat.</p> <p>7.2 The built-up area shown is 3018 sq.mts. which is much more than the 2500 sq.mts. required which is well within the built-up area permissible under the Building Plan.</p> <p>8.1 FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a five year validity @ Rs.7 + 5 lakhs for each programme.</p> <p>8.2 In this case, they have given photocopies of FDRs for Rs.5 + 3 lakhs only.</p> <p>8.3 Obtain proper FDRs. They should be different from the FDRs given for B.P.Ed.</p> <p>9. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.</p> <p>10. Keep NCTE (HQ) informed of the developments in this case.</p> <p>11. Keep our lawyer informed w.r.t the 'pre-contempt notice' received from the lawyer of the applicant.</p>
5.	APS04056 APS00539	B.Ed /M.Ed	Sampoorna Educational Curriculum Private Lmt, No.3, Vasantha Nagar, Villianur-605110, Pondicherry	Court Matter	<p>1. The Sampoorna Educational Curriculum Private Limited was given recognition for running a B.Ed. programme. After notification of the NCTE Regulations 2014, because of the entries relating to stand-alone courses, they wanted to handover the B.Ed. programme to the Acharya Educational Public Trust who were running D.El.Ed. and M.Ed. programmes.</p> <p>2. Even before that, in the early 2000s, the Pondicherry Government had been asking the applicant to shift educational</p>

					<p>programmes from Private Limited Companies to a Public Trust like the Acharya Educational Public Trust.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. After some protracted correspondence between them and the Pondicherry Government, the Sampoorna Educational Curriculum Private Limited reported that the B.Ed. Programme had been handed over to the Acharya Educational Public Trust who had agreed to take it over.</li><li>4. The NCTE Regulations do not permit change of management. But, historically, 15 years ago, some factual readjustments are reported to have taken place at the ground level in Pondicherry. Notwithstanding the position today in the NCTE Regulations regarding 'mergers', it will be advisable to accept the factual position at the ground level as the given base.</li><li>5. If that is to be so, then, Acharya Educational Public Trust will have D.El.Ed., B.Ed. and M.Ed., and Sampoorna Educational Curriculum Private Limited (SEC Private Limited) will disappear from the NCTE Regulatory radar. Notwithstanding this factual occurrence, the composition seems to have fostered because, objections to the alleged merger apparently persisted.</li><li>6. The Acharya Educational private Trust (A.E. Public Trust) had to file a W.P. to get the confusion resolved. Instead, the situations seems to have worsened. The A.E. Public Trust felt compelled to restore <i>status quo ante</i> and withdrew its</li></ol>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>writ petition. The question about the status of the stand alone B.Ed. course has consequently erupted again. Hence, our involvement with this case.</p> <p>7.1 It will be advisable to get these inferences authenticated by the Pondicherry University and the AE Public Trust.</p> <p>7.2 Based on the correct facts emerging we may have to take further action. There may be no need at all for SEC Private Limited to take any action w.r.t. the 'stand-alone' issue. But, these may be some concern about a Private Limited company running a T.E. Programme. We will have to await further developments and if necessary, take NCTE (HQ) advice.</p> <p>7.3 If SEC Private Limited wants to hand over the programme, the 2014 Regulations will come into play. In that event, the old B.Ed. course will have to be wound up and a new course will have to be applied for by AEP Trust.</p> <p>8. Two other issues will remain for attention:</p> <p>(i) Identification of the VT and Affiliation Team 'Inspectors' for such action as deemed appropriate by the Court.</p> <p>(ii) The general issue about demand-supply coordination and submission of consolidated information/ data to the court. Possibly, this will be taken care of by NCTE (HQ).</p> <p>9. Please process accordingly. Collect specific information, and put up in our</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					December, 2018 meeting. 10. Keep NCTE (HQ), Pondicherry University and our lawyer concerned informed.
6.	SRCAPP 2016 30046	B.P.E d.	DNC Manivannan College of Physical Education, Dharmapuri, Tamilnadu.	Court Matter	<p>1.1 The applicant was given a personal hearing today as directed by the Court. The applicant was represented by Dr. Sabapathy, Secretary of the Trust.</p> <p>1.2 Dr. Sabapathy, in his presentation, had stated that he would give a written-submission of the points made by him in his verbal-presentation. But, after the personal hearing, he left without giving any written-submission.</p> <p>1.3 (i) In his verbal-presentation, Dr. Sabapathy only stressed the point that the college had given all the documents necessary. (ii) He was not aware that NOCs were required separately from the Government and separately from the Affiliating University. He only emphasized that the NOC issued by the Government was at the instance of the University, on the University's recommendation and, based on the inspection conducted by the University. This procedure was inescapable since the applicant-institution fell within the jurisdiction of the Government University for sports. That being so, the NOC issued by the Government should be deemed to be a NOC issued by the University.</p>

					<p>(iii) The applicant-college is located in Dharmapuri District which is a drought-prone area populated by poor people. The proposed B.P.Ed. programme will provide new opportunities for the youngsters of the area to advance in life. This case, therefore, deserved sympathetic consideration.</p> <p>(iv) Since Government procedures were somewhat time-consuming, submission of documents in this case should not be subjected to rigorous time-limits.</p> <p>The college had applied to the University on the same date on which they had submitted the application. If there was delay on the part of the University, that should not be held against the college.</p> <p>2. The relevant facts are as follows:</p> <p>(i) Title deeds are present. Title is clear. Land area available is adequate.</p> <p>(ii) LUC is in order.</p> <p>(iii) EC is in order.</p> <p>(iv) Building Plan is only in photocopy. But, it is duly approved. The built-up area specified is 3010 sq.mts.</p> <p>(v) BCC is in order. Built-up area shown is 3666 sq.mts. This is in excess of what is permissible</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>under Building Plan. But the area required for BPEd. Is only 1500 sq.mts.</p> <p>(vi) FDRs are not given</p> <p>3.1 Even though all the documents have been given, one basic infirmity remains: the applicant has not given any NOC.</p> <p>3.2 According to the Regulations, they should have an NOC from the State Government and another NOC from the affiliating University.</p> <p>3.3 At the time of the personal hearing, it was clarified that the State Government issued the NOC based on the recommendation of the University after an inspection conducted by them. That being so, it should be taken as the NOC of the University.</p> <p>3.4 The last date for giving this NOC was 15.07.2016. It was issued on 17.06.2017 i.e., almost one year later.</p> <p>3.5 Even then, it was given to the Appellate Authority and not to the SRC. The NOC in reference has not been received by the SRC till today.</p> <p>3.6 Even if it is decided to that this NOC, a copy of which was presented at the personal hearing, as an NOC from the University, the fact that it was given almost one year later can not be ignored. The SRC has no authority to relax the time-limit. We have actually rejected a number of applications just on this objection.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Ignoring that and conducting the delay in this case along 4<sup>th</sup> involve gross discrimination.</p> <p>4. The Hon'ble High Court has directed that, after the personal hearing we must "consider the request of the petitioner on merits and in accordance with law. That being so, we have to hold out this infirmity firmly against the applicant.</p> <p>5. In the result, and for the reasons given above, the application is rejected.</p> <p>6. Inform the applicant and the University accordingly.</p>
7.	SRCAPP20 1630004	M.P. Ed	Bharathidasan University, Suriyur Village, NH210, Thiruverambur Mandal & Taluk, Tiruchirapalli District - 620024, Tamilnadu	The Appellate Authority of NCTE	<p>1. Appellate order seen.</p> <p>1.1 Cause Inspection, to confirm removal of the asbestos roofing, as directed.</p> <p>1.2 No fee is required from a State Government University.</p> <p>3.4 Take the new BCC on record.</p> <p>3.5 Give a copy to the VT.</p> <p>4. Put up after receipt of the VT Report.</p>
8.	SRCAPP20 1630129		Government College of Education, Kalinjur Village, Gandhi Nagar, Vellore Taluk, Kalinjur City, Vellore District-632006, Tamil Nadu	The Appellate Authority of NCTE	<p>1. The case is taken up as directed by the Appellate Authority.</p> <p>2. The Faculty list submitted is approved by the Registrar.</p> <p>(i) But, it is not in the approved format, it is only in a photocopy. Original is required.</p> <p>(ii) Essential details like, subjects covered, marks scored, etc, are not given.</p> <p>(iii) There is no mention of the second Professor.</p> <p>(iv) There are no Associate Profs at all</p> <p>3. Issue SCN accordingly.</p>

9.	SRCAPP14 877	B.Ed	Amaravathi College of Education, Plot No-879/1, Idupur Village, Darimadugu Post, Markapur Taluk, Prakasam District-523320 Andhra Pradesh.	The Appellate Authority of NCTE	Noted.
10.	SRCAPP14 844	B.P.Ed	Jonah College of Physical Education, Plot No. 978/A1/2, NH-65, Aitipamula Village & Post, Kattangoor Taluk, Nalgonda District-508205, Telangana	Complaint Cases	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a case of B.P.Ed. (1 unit)</li> <li>2. Based on the observations of the University's Affiliation Team in their inspection, the Telangana School Educational Department has sent a 9-point complaint.</li> <li>3. Send a Show Cause Notice (for withdrawal of recognition), alongwith a copy of the complaint, for appropriate response to the college.</li> <li>4. Keep the University informed.</li> </ol>
11.	SRCAPP14 685	B.Ed	Sri Kethaki Sangameshwara B.Ed College, X Road, Plot No. 74/A, Jharasangam Village & Post, Zaheerabad Town, Jharasangam Taluk, Medak District-502246, Andhra Pradesh.	Complaint Cases	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a B.Ed. (2 units) case.</li> <li>2. With reference to a complaint received from the Telangana School Educational Department the case has been put up again.</li> <li>3. Send a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition, alongwith a copy of the complaint, for appropriate response to the college.</li> <li>4. Keep the University informed.</li> </ol>

12.	SRCAPP14 664	B.Ed	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.	Complain t Cases	<p>1. The Special Secretary of Telangana has raised two issues :</p> <p>(i) The fact that one Asst. Prof. was required to be changed because of 'double-employment' is enough to show that the applicant-institution is not <i>bona fide</i> in its intentions and is not, therefore, worthy of recognition.</p> <p>(ii) The Regulations clearly show that the '3-year experience' is mentioned not only w.r.t. the 'Perspective' group that also w.r.t. the 'Curriculum and Pedagogy' group. Therefore, it should be applied uniformly to all cases.</p> <p>2.1 Both these are good points raised for serious consideration. The SRC is happy to note the careful attention given to teacher education cases of the NCTE by the State Govt. of Telangana.</p> <p>2.2 Whether or not the NCTE / SRC is able to agree with the contentions of the State Govt. should not be seen by the State Govt. as an affront our response, in all cases, will be backed up by specific reasoning.</p> <p>2.3 Responses of the SRC are, in any case, subject to scrutiny by the NCTE / Appellate Authority.</p> <p>3.1 The point about 'double employment' is relevant and serious. The NCTE / SRC does not have any field-formation to inspect and verify all facts. In the matter of faculty-recruitment, therefore, we rely on the Affiliating</p>
-----	-----------------	------	--	---------------------	--

					<p>Body. They participate in the recruitment process and the registrar (for Universities) / Director (for SCERTs) certify the details. In the formulation of the NCTE scheme of things, obviously, this was found to be an adequate safe ground for issue of FRs. That the Affiliating Body's further inspection before granting affiliation is a further level of scrutiny to eliminate deficiencies / infirmities is a double check available.</p> <p>The noteworthy point is, the Affiliating Body does apprise us of violations of norms / standards noticed by them; and, we do take them up with the institutions concerned for appropriate redress through Show Cause Notices.</p> <p>Our information is that this system does eliminate wrong-doings. There may be occasional slip-ups in the operation of this system. Such isolated occurrences of 'omissions' can not be seen to corrupt the whole system.</p> <p>The isolated cases of aberration can, if necessary, be subjected to further check to ascertain how and why the slip-ups occurred.</p> <p>In the cases specifically cited by you, we will surely cause such a further check-up and revert.</p> <p>3.2 The point about the '3-year experience' arises, possibly, because of some</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>confused drafting. That be 3-year experience clause applies only to the 'Perspective Group' becomes clear when we read the entry 5.2, c(ii). The foot-note given about seeing 'B &amp; C together', strictly speaking, was necessary. It would have been sufficient (and, perhaps, simpler) to add the '3-year experience clause to 'B or (ii)'. 4. We trust, which we have stated about will remove your doubts and allay your apprehensions. We thank you for the interest you are taking in our cases.</p>
13.	SRCAPP24 80	B.Ed	Infant Jesus College of Education, Plot No.4-224/1/B, Valankanni Street, Shamshabad Village, Post, Taluk & City, Rangareddi District-501218, Telangana.	Complain t Cases	<p>1. The Special Secretary of Telangana has raised two issues :</p> <p>(i) The fact that one Asst. Prof. was required to be changed because of 'double-employment' is enough to show that the applicant-institution is not <i>bona fide</i> in its intentions and is not, therefore, worthy of recognition.</p> <p>(ii) The Regulations clearly show that the '3-year experience' is mentioned not only w.r.t. the 'Perspective' group that also w.r.t. the 'Curriculum and Pedagogy' group. Therefore, it should be applied uniformly to all cases.</p> <p>2.1 Both these are good points raised for serious consideration. The SRC is happy to note the careful attention given to teacher education cases of the NCTE by the State Govt. of Telangana.</p> <p>2.2 Whether or not the NCTE / SRC is able to agree with the contentions of the</p>



					<p>State Govt. should not be seen by the State Govt. as an affront our response, in all cases, will be backed up by specific reasoning.</p> <p>2.3 Responses of the SRC are, in any case, subject to scrutiny by the NCTE / Appellate Authority.</p> <p>3.1 The point about 'double employment' is relevant and serious. The NCTE / SRC does not have any field-formation to inspect and verify all facts. In the matter of faculty-recruitment, therefore, we rely on the Affiliating Body. They participate in the recruitment process and the registrar (for Universities) / Director (for SCERTs) certify the details. In the formulation of the NCTE scheme of things, obviously, this was found to be an adequate safe ground for issue of FRs. That the Affiliating Body's further inspection before granting affiliation is a further level of scrutiny to eliminate deficiencies / infirmities is a double check available.</p> <p>The noteworthy point is, the Affiliating Body does apprise us of violations of norms / standards noticed by them; and, we do take them up with the institutions concerned for appropriate redress through Show Cause Notices.</p> <p>Our information is that this system does eliminate wrong-doings. There may be occasional slip-ups in the operation of this system. Such isolated occurrences of 'omissions' can not e</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>seen to corrupt the whole system.</p> <p>The isolated cases of aberration can, if necessary, be subjected to further check to ascertain how and why the slip-ups occurred.</p> <p>In the cases specifically cited by you, we will surely cause such a further check-up and revert.</p> <p>3.2 The point about the '3-year experience' arises, possibly, because of some confused drafting. That be 3-year experience clause applies only to the 'Perspective Group' becomes clear when we read the entry 5.2, c(ii). The foot-note given about seeing 'B &amp; C together', strictly speaking, was necessary. It would have been sufficient (and, perhaps, simpler) to add the '3-year experience clause to 'B or (ii)'. 4. We trust, which we have stated about will remove your doubts and allay your apprehensions. We thank you for the interest you are taking in our cases.</p>
14.	APSO8024	B.Ed	Jesus & Mary College of Education, Door No. 45-56-9, Narasimhanagar, Visakhapatnam-530024 Andhra Pradesh.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p>

					<p>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

15.	APSO0303	B.Ed	Gandhi Centenary college of Education, Kakinda Reven Division, Sashikanth Nagar, Engineering College, SPO, East Godavari District- 533003, Andhra Pradesh	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>5.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>5.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup></li> </ol> </li> </ol>
-----	----------	------	---	---	--

					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>6. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
16.	APSO0374	B.Ed	Leyas College of Education, Flat Nol 302, Sai Arcade, 6th Phase, Plot No. 527 and 528, KPHB Colony, Kukatpally, Hyderabad-500072, Andhra Pradesh.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>5.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>5.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will</p>

					<p>have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>5.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>6. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
17.	APS05223	B.Ed	Olive College of Education, Gopalreddi Complex Manneguda Village, Bonglur X Road, Ibraimpatnam Mandal, Rangareddy District-501510, Andhra Pradesh.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> </ol>

					<p>5.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>5.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for derecognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>5.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>6. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
18.	APS06273	M.Ed	Nova College of Education, Vegavaram, Jangareddygudem, West Godavari District-534447	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running M.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not</p>

					<p>adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



19.	APS07001	B.Ed	Pratap College of Education, Ramapuram Village, P apayapalem Post, Vetapalem, Chirala, Prakasam Distirct, Andhra Pradesh.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulatio ns, 2014	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup></li> </ol>
-----	----------	------	--	---	--

					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
20.	APS07195	B.Ed	<p>Prema College of Education, Thimmapuram Village, Madhuravada Post, Visakhapatnam - 531163, Andhra Pradesh.</p>	<p>Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014</p>	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to</p>

					<p>refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
21.	APS07455	B.Ed	Sri. Venkateshwara Blal Kutter College of Education, Chetanapuri, Chowdavaram, Guntur-522019, Andhra Pradesh.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are</p>

					<p>verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
22.	APS07668	B.Ed	Gnana Sraswathi College of Education, No. 1-67/25, Pendekanti Nagar, Banaganapalle, Kurnool District-518124, Andhra Pradesh.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of</p>

					<p>recognition.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li><li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li><li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li><li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li><li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</li><li>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</li></ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--

23.	APS07708	B.Ed	Purandareswari College of Education, S.No.195/5, Bodasingapeta, Crajapathinagaram, Vizianagaram District, Andhra Pradesh.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup></li> </ol>
-----	----------	------	--	--	--

					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
24.	APS08400	B.Ed	Sri TatiparthiVenka Reddy Memorial College of Education No.3-10-1, Fuduri Anjaneyulu Building, Opp. R.T.C Bus Stand, Chimakurthy, Prakasam District, Andhra Pradesh	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not</p>

					<p>fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351st SRC meeting held on 28th &amp; 29th December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
25.	APS08790	B.Ed	Bhashyam College of Education, Mallikharjunapuram Colony, Gorantla Village, Guntur-522034, Andhra Pradesh.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> </ol>



					<p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351st SRC meeting held on 28th &amp; 29th December 2017 when we authorized the RO to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
26.	APS08905	B.Ed	Montessori College of Education, No.1-48-11, Beside APHB Colony, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District-534101, Andhra Pradesh.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue</p>

					<p>a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351st SRC meeting held on 28th &amp; 29th December 2017 when we authorized the RO to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

27.	APS09114	B.Ed	Tribal Welfare college of Education ITDA, Charla Road, Bhadrachalam, Khammam District-507111, Andhra Pradesh	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351st SRC meeting held on 28th &amp; 29th</li> </ol>
-----	----------	------	--	---	---

					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RO to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
28.	SRCAPP15 70	B.Ed	Sadulla Hussain B.Ed College, Khasra No. 522/c, Plot No. 36-9,1/4th Street, Huzur Nagar Village, Guntur Post & Taluk, Guntur District - 522201, Andhra Pradesh	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not</p>

					<p>fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351st SRC meeting held on 28th &amp; 29th December 2017 when we authorized the RO to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
29.	APS03462	B.Ed	Senthil College of Education, Vriddhachalam, Cuddalore, Tamilnadu.	Reply as required after RPRO under NCTE Regulations, 2014	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> </ol>

					<p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351st SRC meeting held on 28th &amp; 29th December 2017 when we authorized the RO to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
30.	APS02086	B.Ed	Mother Teresa College of Education, Jalahalli, Bangalore.	The Shifting Case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is an RPRO Case. The college has responded to the condition listed in the RPRO.</li> <li>2. This college has been functioning in leased premises.</li> <li>3. They had been asked earlier to shift to their own premises.</li> <li>4. The 12-year lease has also expired.</li> <li>5. They have represented that they have no resources to shift to a new location. They want special permission to continue in the same leased premises.</li> <li>6. SRC has no authority to grant such</li> </ol>

					<p>special permission. The Regulations are very clear about the requirement to function from own premises. That being so, the request is rejected.</p> <p>7. Issue Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition. If admissions for 2018-19 have not already been made, ask them not to make new admissions.</p> <p>8. Keep the Affiliating University informed.</p>
31	APS0205 6	B.Ed	Karnataka College of Education, Hyderabad Road, Bidar - 585401, Karnataka	The Shifting Case	<p>1. This is a RPRO case of B.Ed. (1 unit) + D.El.Ed. (1 Unit)</p> <p>2. They have been functioning in their own premises. No shifting is involved. VTI Report confirms this position.</p> <p>3. Building Plan is in order. Build-up area shown is 3179 sq.mts.</p> <p>4. BCC is in order. Built-up area shown is 3179 sq.mts. which is more than the required area of (1500 + 1500) 3000 sq.mts.</p> <p>5.1 FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ Rs.7 + 5 lakhs per programme. The FDRs available on record amount only to Rs.21 lakhs as against the required level of Rs.24 lakhs.</p> <p>5.2 Most of the FDRs validity have expired. They need to be revalidated.</p> <p>6. Faculty lists are given.</p> <p>6.1 The Faculty List for B.Ed. (1 Unit) is in order.</p> <p>6.2 The Faculty List for D.El.Ed. (1 Unit).</p>

32	APS0195 8	B.Ed	H.K.D.E. Trust's College of Education, Kalloor Road, Humnabad, Bidar District -585330, Karnataka.	The Shifting Case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a RPRO shifting case of B.Ed. (2 Units).</li> <li>2. Title deed is there. Title is clear.</li> <li>3. LUC &amp; EC are in order.</li> <li>4. Building Plan is submitted.</li> <li>5.1 BCC is given. The copy given to the VT varies somewhat in detail with the original given. But, the totals tally. The confusion seems to be attributable to different descriptions like cellar, descriptions like cellar, mezzanine, etc., given.</li> <li>5.2 Total built-up area of 2343 sq.mts. is more than the required area of (1500 + 1500) 2000 sq.mts.</li> <li>6. FDRs of Rs.7 + 5 lakhs are in order.</li> <li>7.1 Faculty List is given. It is approved by the Registrar. It is not signed in every page. But, the individual details tally with the consolidated listing given by the Registrar in the covering letter.</li> <li>7.2 One post of Assistant Professor in the Perspective Group is required to be filled up.</li> <li>7.3 There are 9 Assistant Professors against the 8 required in the Pedagogy Group. One of them can be accommodated in the Perspective Group.</li> <li>7.4 In the Pedagogy Group One Assistant Professor (Maths) is required.</li> <li>8. Issue show cause notice accordingly.</li> <li>9. Once the Faculty position is corrected, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations.</li> </ol>
----	--------------	------	--	-------------------------	---



33	APSO7029	B.Ed	Vijay College of Education for Women, Mubarak Nagar, Nizamabad District-503003, Andhra Pradesh	Requesting of Closure	They have requested for permission to close down the B.Ed. programme recognized by us on 12.04.2007. Please report whether they have completed all the formalities like obtaining a Resolution of the sponsoring body, NOC of the affiliating body, No dues certificate from the Faculty and the Staff and, no student left for completing the second year course.
34	SRCAPSO 343	B.Ed	Allen Alfred College of Education, Hyderabad, East Revenue Divn, Rangareddy District-500060	The shifting case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a RPRO shifting case.</li> <li>2.1 We had issued a Show Cause Notice on 26.9.2016.</li> <li>2.2 They have still not replied.</li> <li>3.1 Issue another Show Cause Notice specifically stating that we will withdraw recognition in the absence of a satisfactory reply.</li> <li>3.3 Give time till 20.11.2018 for reply.</li> </ol>
35	SRCAPP3 460	B.Ed	Ahmed College of Education, Khasara No. 117/118, Plot No. 425, Rameshwar Pally Village & Post, Biknoor Taluk & City, Nizamabad District-503101, Telangana.	The shifting case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a shifting case of B.Ed. (2 Units).</li> <li>2. We had issued a Show Cause Notice on 31.05.2018 listing specific deficiencies.</li> <li>3. They have still not replied.</li> <li>4. Issue Show Cause Notice again stating that, in the absence of a satisfactory reply, we will withdraw recognition.</li> <li>5. Give time till 20.11.2018.</li> </ol>
36	SRCAPSO 0381	B.Ed	St. Ann's college of Education, H.No.10-1/13 Prem Vijay Nagar Colony, Mirjalguda, Malkajgiri, Ranga Reddy, Hyderabad-500047 Andhra Pradesh.	The shifting case No reply case agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant in this case has not cared to send a reply or respond to our Show Cause Notice.</li> <li>2. Issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> </ol>

37	APSO593 5	B.Ed	Vijaya Bharathi College of Education, Sri Sai Nagar Phase-2, Opp. Radio Relay Tower, Hayath Nagar, Hyderabad-501505, Andhra Pradesh.	The shifting case No reply case agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant in this case has not cared to send a reply or respond to our Show Cause Notice.</li> <li>2. Issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> </ol>
38	APSO089 57	B.Ed	Rishi College of Education, Bairagiguda Village, Rangareddy District, Andhra Pradesh.	The shifting case No reply case agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant in this case has not cared to send a reply or respond to our Show Cause Notice.</li> <li>2. Issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> </ol>
39	APSO024 7	B.Ed	Dr. Zakir Hussain College of Education, Mulukunduru Village, Ponnur Mandal, Dompalapude(via) Guntur District-522315, Andhra Pradesh.	The shifting Case Part reply case agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 If upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be</li> </ol>

					<p>recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
40	SRCAPSO 0373	B.Ed	Madhu College of Education, Vishakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh.	The shifting Case Part reply case agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the</li> </ol>

					<p>recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

41	APSO037 9	B.Ed	Shams-Ul-Uloom College of Education, Markapur-523316, Prakasam Dt., Andhra Pradesh.	The shifting Case Part reply case agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup></li> </ol>
----	--------------	------	---	--	--

					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
42	APS0350 6/APS03 505		Regional Institution of Education (NCERT), Mysore	Old Case	<p>1. This is an old case of RIE (Mysore).</p> <p>2. They had started one programme each of BA. B.Ed and B.Sc, B.Ed as Innovative Courses. The NCTE has recognized them as Innovative Courses.</p> <p>3. An issue has arisen now about converting the Innovative Courses as Regular Courses and according them formal recognition as 4-year Integrated Courses under the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p>4.1 This will require conversion of the 2 Innovative Courses. As advised by NCTE (HQ) in other similar cases, the RIE must formally apply for the B.A., B.Ed. or B.Sc. B.Ed. Integrated Courses under the 2014 Regulations; and, synchronizing with the recognition of the new courses, wind up the old innovative courses.</p> <p>4.2 This process will take time because they can apply only when NCTE issues a notification inviting applications</p> <p>5.1 In the meanwhile, RIE is facing difficulties in securing affiliation and other services from the Mysore University.</p>

					<p>5.2 To help them to hide over this difficulties , it is certified that the recognition given by NCTE to the 2 old innovative courses will continue on the principle that recognition once given will be deemed to continue until it is specifically withdrawn</p> <p>5.3 That being so, there should be no problem for the Mysore University to continue to affiliate the 2 old innovative courses of B.A. B.Ed and B.Sc B.Ed.</p> <p>6. These courses will be formally converted as regular integrated courses under the NCTE Regulations , 2014 as when NCTE issues the notification inviting applications.</p>
43	APSO880 3	B.Ed.	Thalapathy College of Education, B.N. Sowdappachetty Street, Karimngalam Post, Dharmapuri-63511, Tamilnadu	RPRO Case	<p>1. This is RPRO case.</p> <p>2.1 They had earlier requested for reduction from 2 units to 1 unit.</p> <p>2.2 They were asked to complete certain formalities.</p> <p>2.3 They have now represented that they may be allowed to continue with 2 units. This request is accepted. Our earlier acceptance of the request for reduction is cancelled.</p> <p>3. They have not submitted any documents for verification before issue of RRO in place of the RPRO.</p> <p>Issue SCN calling for documents (especially latest BCC, latest Approved Faculty list and, Latest FDRs). Give time till 20.11.2018 for reply. Clearly state that, in the absence of a satisfactory reply, recognition will be withdrawn.</p>

44	APS0438 5	B.Ed	Sri Muthukumaran College of Education, Chikkarayapuram, Kunrathur Road, Near Mangadu, Chennai District - 600069, Tramli Nadu.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a RPRO Shifting Case of B.Ed. (2 Units).</li> <li>2. Title deed is there. Title is favour of the college is clear. Land area of 1 acre is adequate.</li> <li>3. LUC is in order.</li> <li>4. EC is in order.</li> <li>5. Building Plan is given. But, it is not approved by the Competent Authority.</li> <li>6.1 BCC as such is not there. Only a Building Stability of structure certificate is given.</li> <li>6.2 Earmarking of area for B.Ed. is not done.</li> <li>7. FDRs are given for Rs.13 lakhs. But, they are all in photocopies. And, their validity has expired. We have to obtain proper FDRs.</li> <li>8. Faculty List given is only for B.Ed. (1 Unit). They must give a list of 1 + 15 for B.Ed. (2 Units)</li> <li>9. Issue a Show Cause Notice accordingly indicating withdrawal of recognition if no satisfactory reply is given by 10.11.2018.</li> </ol>
45	SRCAPP2 0163006 7	B.A. B.Ed /B.S c.B.E d	USHA LATCHUMANAN COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, Thirukkanur Village, T.V Malai road Villinaur Taluk & Mandal, Thirukkanur City, Pondicherry - 605501	Court Case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This case has been put up first when the 363<sup>rd</sup> meeting is to be wound up.</li> <li>2. The Court Order wants SRC to re-consider the petitioners representations dt. 21.05.2018 and 13.06.2018 and pass appropriate order, <u>after giving an opportunity to the Petitioner</u>, within a period of 2 weeks". After receipt of this order.</li> <li>3. Call the Petitioner for a personal hearing on 28.09.2018.</li> <li>4. In the meanwhile, check whether they have complied with all the requirements of documents and information.</li> </ol>



46	APSO031 1	B.Ed	SreeKonaseemaBhan ojiRamaras College, Amalapuram, Revenue Division, Amalapuram, East Godavari District- 533201, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup></li> </ol>
----	--------------	------	--	-----------------------	--

					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
47	APSO5174	B.Ed	Krishna Teja College of Education, No. 131, Chadalawada Nagar, Renigunta Road, Tirupathi, Chittoor District-517506, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will</p>

					<p>have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
48	SRCAPSO 5671	B.Ed	St. Mary's College of Education H.No. 8-2-217, Padmavathi Colony, Mahabubnagar, Pin-509002, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> </ol>

					<p>7.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.1 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.2 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
49	APSO706 7	B.Ed	Bethany College of Education, NH.5, Ethakota, Ravulapalem, East Godavari District-533238, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<p>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</p> <p>3. The applicant in this case has not</p>

					<p>adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

50	APSO714 4	B.Ed	K.M.M College of Education, Ramireddipalli, Narasingapuram, Chandragiri Mandal, Tirupathi-517102, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup></li> </ol>
----	--------------	------	--	-----------------------	--

					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
51	APSO720 1	B.Ed	Raja Foundation College of Education, Kona Road, Mylavaram, Kadapa- 516439, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to</li> </ol>

					<p>refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
52	SRCAPSO 7295	B.Ed	Sri Padmavathi College of Education, No. 20/3/131/A, Sivajyothi Nagar, K.T.Bypass Road, Tirupati, Chittoor- 517507, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> </ol> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are</p>



					<p>verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
53	APS0745 3	B.Ed	Thotakura Ramakotai ah College of Education, N.H-5, Near Manjira Hostel, Ganpavaram Post, Chilakaluropet, Guntur-522619, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of</li> </ol>

					<p>recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

54	APSO763 8	M.Ed	Pushpagiri College of Education, Pushpagiri Nagar, Ukkayapalle (PO) Kadapa city, Kadapa (Dist)-516002.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a M.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup></li> </ol>
----	--------------	------	--	-----------------------	--

					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
55	APSO775 7	B.Ed	A.B.R College of Education, Chinairlapadu village, Kanigiri Mandal, Prakasam District- 523234, Andhra Pradesh	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to</li> </ol>

					<p>refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
56	APSO780 7	B.Ed	Vamsadhara college of Education, Kotabommali, Srikakulam District-532195, Andhra Pradesh	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> </ol> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are</p>

					<p>verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
57	APSO789 4	B.Ed	B.M.R.M. Jhansi B.Ed College, Addanki Road, Darsi, Prakasam District - 523247	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of</li> </ol>

					<p>recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

58	APSO800 0	B.Ed	Radiance College of Education, Maulana Azad Colony, Yenugonda Village, Mahaboobnagar District-509001, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup></li> </ol>
----	--------------	------	---	-----------------------	--



					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
59	APSO816 7	B.Ed	<p>Sri Lakshmivenkateswar aCollege of Education,H.No.1-47- 1, Byreddy Nagar, Stantanpuram Village, Kurnool Mandal, Kurnool District-518001, Andhra Pradesh.</p>	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to</li> </ol>

					<p>refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
60	APSO841 3	B.Ed	RJC College of Education, No.1-7-59, Trunk Road, Khammam District, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are</li> </ol>

					<p>verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
61	APSO8450	B.Ed	SIMS College of Education, No.8-24-34, Mangaladas Nagar, Guntur-522001, Andhra Pradesh.	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of</li> </ol>

					<p>recognition.</p> <p>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</p> <p>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</p> <p>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</p> <p>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</p> <p>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

62	APSO883 3	B.Ed	<p>Vyshnavi College of Education, No.8-841, Jayanthi Nagar, Gurazala, Guntur District-522415, Andhra Pradesh.</p>	Part reply case	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant-institution was running a B.Ed. programme.</li> <li>2. After notification of the 2014 Regulations, because of the increase in the course-period from 1 to 2 years, because of increased requirements of facilities (especially of built-up area and faculty), they were given a RPRO and required to furnish documents for verification of satisfaction of the new norms/ standards.</li> <li>3. The applicant in this case has not adequately responded. Therefore, issue a Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition.</li> <li>4. If they do not respond satisfactorily, we can proceed to withdraw the recognition given.</li> <li>5. If they respond satisfactorily, then, we will have to cause a VT Inspection to verify the veracity of the claims made.</li> <li>6.1 It upon inspection, all claims are verified to be valid, we can issue a Regular Recognition Order (RRO) under the 2014 Regulations. It is to be recognized that RPROs cannot continue indefinitely, as they are ipso facto 'provisional'.</li> <li>6.2 If upon inspection, the claims are not fully validated, then, we will have to refer the case to NCTE (HQ) for necessary action under section 13 since, according to the Supreme Court decision, we cannot proceed with action for de-recognition based on inspection under section 17.</li> <li>6.3 We had discussed this issue in detail in 351<sup>st</sup> SRC meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> &amp; 29<sup>th</sup></li> </ol>
----	--------------	------	---	-----------------------	--

					<p>December 2017 when we authorized the RD to proceed with action in RPRO cases since SRC was fully engaged in clearing new application cases before the Supreme Court prescribed dateline for issue of FRs.</p> <p>7. Please put up all such cases together for a common order for similar action.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---