

**Decisions of 364<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SRC-NCTE**

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>	<b>Remarks of SRC</b>
1.	Confirmation of Minutes of 363 <sup>st</sup> Meeting of SRC 17 <sup>th</sup> To 19 <sup>th</sup> September, 2018	Confirmed
2.	Action Taken Report (ATR) on of 363 <sup>st</sup> Meeting of SRC 17 <sup>th</sup> To 19 <sup>th</sup> September, 2018	

**Consideration of Court Cases, SCN reply and Requesting for Closure : (Volume-2)**

1.	SRCAPP20163 0067	B.Ed	USHA LATCHUMANAN COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, Thirukkanur Village, T.V Malai road Villinaur Taluk & Mandal, Thirukkanur City, Pondicherry - 605501	TN	<p>1. The case (no. SRCAPP30067) relating to Usha Latchumanan College of Education was taken up today.</p> <p>2. The Hon'ble High Court of Madras, in W.P. No. 20881/2018, had directed the SRC to consider the petitioner's representation dt. 21.05.2018 and 13.06.2018 and pass on appropriate order, after giving an opportunity to the petitioner.</p> <p>3.1 The basic W.P. (No. 12261/2017), challenging the order of the SRC rejecting the application for a B.A, B.Ed / B.Sc., B.Ed course of the Usha Latchumanan College, is still pending in the Hon'ble High Court.</p> <p>3.2 The present direction of the Hon'ble High Court is, therefore, in the nature of an interim action to resolve the matter if possible.</p> <p>4.1 The (unsigned) petition dt 21.05.2018 of the applicant is to issue of a provisional recognition for B.A., B.Ed (4 years integrated course) w.e.f. 2018-19.</p> <p>4.2 The second petition, signed by the correspondent of the college, is for causing a joint inspection by NCTE and the Pondicherry University for grant of provisional affiliation to their 2 year B.Ed. programme.</p> <p>5.1 The matter relating to the joint inspection has progressed separately. The present direction to SRC is,</p>
----	---------------------	------	---	----	--

					<p>therefore, more addressed to the BA B.Ed. (4 Year i.e.).</p> <p>5.2 Since the SRC had already rejected the case after considering all aspects, and since the concerned W.P. of the applicant institution, is still pending before the Hon'ble High Court, the applicant was invited for a personal hearing in pursuance of the Hon'ble High Court directive about giving an opportunity to the petitioner.</p> <p>6.1 Accordingly, the correspondent (Dr. M.Lathumanan) of the College appeared for the personal hearing. He was unhappy that he had unnecessarily been put to the difficulty of Visiting Delhi when the whole matter could have been settled through correspondence. He would not accept the Committee's contention that since he had sought the opportunity, it would be for him to raise points / issues / clarifications that could not be settled.</p> <p>6.2 He was requested to make his statement and support it, if necessary, with a corresponding written submission. This was not acceptable to him.</p> <p>6.3 He wanted the Committee to dictate the proceedings. When an attempt was made to briefly trace the circumstances leading up to his hearing, he raised an objection about reopening subjudice matters. His insistence was that the hearing should focus only on the two issues arising out of the LOI issued viz., Faculty List and FDRs.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>6.4 Consequently, the proceedings were shifted to focused discussion on the two issues.</p> <p>7.1 As regards FDRs, it was pointed out that as against a requirement of (7+5) Rs. 12 Lakhs, they had given only (5+4) Rs. 9 Lakhs. Even of this, FDRs for Rs. 5 Lakhs had expired in 2013.</p> <p>7.2 Vehemently objecting to the point about underpayment, he empathetically stated that they had actually given FDRs for Rs. 24 Lakhs (i.e. the amount stipulated in the Regulations prior to the amendment). He even gave a statement giving relevant details of the FDRs.</p> <p>7.3 When pointed out that the records did not reflect such a position, he wanted the SRC to check with the bank concerned. On being told that it would not be possible for the SRO to pursue such details in individual cases, he asked for more time to discharge this onus on the applicant.</p> <p>8.1 As regards the faculty list, he was explained the gross violations of the Regulations :</p> <p>(i) The list is in three parts : (a) a list of 9 persons regularly appointed; (b) a list of 10 persons yet to appear before the Selection Committee; and (c) a list of three part-time teachers.</p> <p>(ii) The list of 9 had the following deficiencies :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Shri Thirumavalavan, Asst. Prof. (Comm.), is not eligible since Commerce is not a school</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>subject.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Shri Prasanna (Asst. Prof. – English) is not eligible because he is still awaiting result in M.Ed.</li><li>• There is no Asst. Prof. in Physical Education, Fine Arts and, Performing Arts.</li></ul> <p>(iii) It is pointless including the names of 10 candidates yet to be selected.</p> <p>(iv) There is no information about filling up the three vacant posts.</p> <p>(v) In any case, the list is not approved by the Registrar of the University; only the Principal of the college has authenticated it.</p> <p>8.2 He responded to say that the recruitments were planned for BA B.Ed. (1 Unit) and B.Sc. B.Ed. (1 Unit); but, the SRC changed it to BA B.Ed. (2 Units). It was pointed out to him that the records clearly indicated that the change was at their behest; and, there was plenty of time thereafter for them to plan the recruitments of faculty.</p> <p>9.1 In the face of these factual inaccuracies, he argued that the SRC should issue a conditional FR instead of harassing applicants on technicalities.</p> <p>9.2 It was classified that there was no provision in the Regulations, for a conditional Fr, the SRC, therefore, did not have the authority to issue any conditional FR.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

**364<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SRC**  
**28<sup>th</sup> - 29<sup>th</sup>, September, 2018**

					<p>10. He regretted that the noble intentions of the applicant to serve the poor people in the rural areas of Pondicherry were being thwart by the rigid approach of the SRC. It was classified to him that regulatory bodies are not ordinarily endowed with such discretionary powers. In fact, in this field, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had categorically directed the Regional Committees to rigidly enforce the norms and standards.</p> <p>11.1 In the result, and for the reasons given above, even after the personal hearing today, the SRC finds it difficult to alter its basic stand in the matter.</p> <p>11.2 The Hon'ble High Court has directed the SRC to pass an "appropriate order" after giving the applicant an opportunity. Accordingly, the applicant's prayer for issue of a 'provisional' recognition order, in their petition dt. 21.05.2018 is rejected.</p>
2.	APS03926 APS00542	B.Ed AI	Sree Narayana College of Education, Mahe - 673310, Pondicherry	PO	<p>1.1 Our decision to withdraw recognition for non-submission fo Affidavit was wrong. They had given the Affidavit. The very fact that RPRO had issued itself shows that the Affidavit must have been filed.</p> <p>1.2 We regret the mistake. Fortunately, the order was not communicated.</p>

					<p>1.3 Our decision dt. 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> May, 2018 is, therefore, reviewed and rescinded.</p> <p>1.4 We had issued a SCN on 19.09.2009 for not shifting to own permanent premises. They have not cared to reply.</p> <p>1.5 Issue another SCN. Add the fact that they did not care to respond to our earlier SCN.</p>
3.	SRCAPP2940	B.Ed	Raacharla College of Education, Plot No. 384, Gollapally Village & Post, Sircilla Taluk, Karimnagar District – 50535, Andhra Pradesh	AP	<p>1. We have to consider 4 points raised by the Telengana Government.</p> <p>2.1 The issue about giving direction (supported by reasons) in each case was settled long ago by NCTE (Hq.) in its letter to them. We can-not reopen that issue.</p> <p>2.2 The Teleangana Govt. have given specific information about inadequacy of built-up area and other deficiencies. Issue a SCN on that basis. Reproduce the State Govt’s objections.</p> <p>2.3 The point about the ‘3 year experience’ was clarified by us on 23-24 May in our 360<sup>th</sup> meeting. May be it did not reach them. Send a copy.</p>