

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COMMITTEE
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
BANGALORE

Minutes of the 353rd Meeting of SRC held at the Conference Hall of
NCTE, Bangalore on 10th – 11th January, 2018.

The following persons attended the Meeting:-

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Sri. S. Sathyam | - | Chairman |
| 2. Dr. J. Prasad | - | Member (attended on 10.01.2018) |
| 3. Ms. Angelin Golda
Regional Director (l/c) | - | Convenor |

The following members did not attend the Meeting:

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

Consideration of Court case & Show Cause notice reply : (Volume-1)

1.	APS03149 D.T.Ed 1Unit St. Joseph Teacher Training Institute for Women, Salem, Tamil Nadu	St. Joseph Teacher Training Institute for women, Pagalpatty, Omalur Taluk, Salem-636304, Tamil Nadu. In terms of section 15(1) of the NCTE Act 1993, recognition order was issued to St. Joseph Teacher Training Institute for women, Pagalpatty, Omalur Taluk, Salem-636304, Tamil Nadu for Elementary course of two years from the academic session 2004-2005 with an additional intake of 20 students on 16.03.2005. On 27.11.2017, a court order dated 16.11.2017 in W.P No.28050 of 2017 and WMP No.30121 of 2017 in the Hon'ble High Court of Madras was received by this office which states as under:- <i>“These petitions coming on for orders upon perusing the petitions and the respective affidavits filed in support thereof and upon hearing the argument of M/S.A.ARUL MARY, Advocate for the petitioner and of MR.P.R. GOPINATH STANDING COUNSEL TAKING NOTICE on behalf of the Respondents in both the petitions the court made the following order:-</i> Mr.P.R. Gopinath, learned standing Counsel, takes notice on behalf of the respondents. 2. Transfer Petitions are filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court to transfer the cases like the present one pending before different High Courts to Delhi High Court and the said petitions are pending before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Earlier, in similar situation, this court passed the following order on 12.09.2017 in W.P.No.19839/2017 and batch and paragraph 3 of the said order is extracted as follows: “3. It is admitted by both sides that as on today, the Transfer petitions are not ordered and the same are still pending before Hon'ble Supreme Court granted an interim order not to take coercive action and the said interim order was subsequently clarified on 08.09.2017 that the same was passed in respect of the subject matter of the Transfer petitions is concerned. This court, in fact, while entertaining these writ petitions had directed the respondent not to precipitate the matter as an interim measure. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that same order shall have to be continued to operate until further orders insofar as these writ petitions are concerned, however, subject to the outcome of the order to be passed in the Transfer petitions pending before the Honorable Supreme Court. Accordingly, this respondents are directed not to take any coercive steps until further orders, however, subject to the outcome of the order to be passed in the Transfer petitions. Post these matter after four weeks.”
----	---	--

		<p>4. In View of the above, the respondents are directed not to take any coercive steps until further orders, however, subject to the outcome of the orders passed in transfer petitions.</p> <p>5. Post the matter along with batch after the disposal of the transfer petitions before the Hon'ble Court".</p> <p>The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The High Court order is noted. 2. No coercive action is contemplated. 3. Send a copy of this High Court order to NCTE (HQ)
2	A letter received from the Special Chief Secretary to Government (I/c).	<p>A letter received from the Special Chief Secretary to Government (I/C), School Education Department addressed to Director, NCTE, New Delhi copy marked as the The Director, Bangalore received on 08.01.2018, vide Letter No. 19740/Prog II/A1/2014 dated 28.12.2017 regarding not to accord permission to Teacher Education Institutions and stating as under;</p> <p><i>".....I am to invite your attention to the reference 4th cited and to inform that NCTE has recognized 15 Teacher Education Programmes as per the NCTE 2014 norms. At present 767 D.El.Ed Colleges, more than 600 B.Ed Colleges, 25 M.Ed Colleges and more number of B.P.Ed., and M.P.Ed., Colleges are functioning in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The new colleges are of no need for under mentioned courses in the State of Andhra Pradesh for the academic year 2018-19 and 2019-20 onwards and hence, not to grant recognition to new Colleges/Educational Societies for the under motioned courses and also not to grant additional intake for the existing colleges.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elementary Teacher Education Programme leading to Diploma in Elementary Education (D.El.Ed) 2. Bachelor of Elementary Education Programme leading to Bachelor of Elementary Education (B.El.Ed) 3. Bachelor of Education Programme leading to Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) 4. Master of Education Programme leading to Master of Education (M.Ed) 5. Bachelor of Physical Education Programme leading to Bachelor of Physical Education (B.P.Ed) 6. Master of Physical Education Programme leading to Master of Physical Education (M.P.Ed) 7. Diploma in Elementary Teacher Education Programme through Open and Distance Learning System leading to Diploma in Elementary Education (D.El.Ed) 8. Bachelor of Education Programme through Open and Distance Learning System leading to Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) degree

		<p>9. Bachelor of Education (Part time) leading to Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) 10. B.Ed. M.Ed (3 years integrated) Programme leading to B.Ed. M.Ed (Integrated)</p> <p>2. I am further to inform you that there are no Pre-Primary Teacher Education Institutions and Colleges awarding Diploma in Physical Education (D.P.Ed) Diploma in Arts (Visual Arts, Performing Arts) are not established in Government and Private Sectors in Andhra Pradesh. Hence, in regard to the Teacher Education development in Andhra Pradesh State, the following Programmes recognized by NCTE may be considered for opening of Teacher Training Institutions for the Academic Session 2019-20.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diploma in Early Childhood Education Programme leading to Diploma in Pre-School Education (DPSE) 2. Diploma in Physical Education Programme leading to Diploma in Physical Education (D.P.Ed) 3. Diploma in Arts Education (Visual Arts) Programme leading to Diploma in Arts Education (Visual Arts) 4. Diploma in Arts Education (Performing Arts) Programme leading to Diploma in Arts Education (Performing Arts) 5. 4-year integrated programme leading to BA.B.Ed/BSc.B.Ed <p>3. I therefore, request you to take further action accordingly and convey your consent on the request of the Government of Andhra Pradesh.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The letter is addressed to the NCTE (HQ). Only a copy has been endorsed to us for information. 2. SRC is not competent to impose ‘ban’ orders. Only the Council can. 3.1. 2018-19 in any case is a ‘Zero Year’. 3.2. The NCTE (HQ) will take appropriate action on the letter in respect of 2019-20. 4. Send a copy, by way of abundant Caution, to the NCTE (HQ).
3	<p>SRCAPP1468 3 B.Ed 1Unit Chenna Keshava College of Education, Rangareddy, Telangana</p>	<p>Chenna Keshava College of Education, Plot/Khasara No. 43/A/1, Burugupally Village, Vikarabad Post Office and Taluk, Vikarabad City, Rangareddi District-501101, Telangana</p> <p>Sri ChennaKeshava Educational Society, Plot No.4-5-25, Alibagh Road, Vikarabad Village and Post Office, Vikarabad Taluk and City, Rangareddy District-501101, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Chenna Keshava College of Education, Plot/Khasara No. 43/A/1, Burugupally Village, Vikarabad Post Office and Taluk, Vikarabad City, Rangareddi District-501101, Telangana for offering B.Ed course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act,</p>

	<p>1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30/06/2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 14/07/2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 23/07/2015, followed by Reminder I on 08/10/2015 and Reminder II on 08/12/2015.</p> <p>The Sub clause (7) of clause 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 296th held on 15th-16th Dec, 2015 has considered the documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Encumbrance Certificate to be submitted2) Original Fixed Deposit Receipts to be submitted3) Ask VT to obtain relevant Land and Building documents4) Cause Composite inspection <p>Accordingly, inspection of the institution was fixed between 10th-30th January, 2016 the same was intimated to the institution, and VT members on 16.01.2016.</p> <p>As per the direction of SRC, the inspection of the institution was conducted on 29.01.2016 and the VT Report along with documents received on 03.02.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 301st meeting held on 05th & 06th February, 2016 considered the VT report and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Issue LOI for B.Ed (1 Unit)2. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished.3. Only if these are given on or before 7.3.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, LOI was sent on 11.02.2016. The institution submitted its reply along with faculty list and other documents on 03.03.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 306th meeting held on 01st – 04th March, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:</p>
--	--

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

Deficiency was pointed out by the SRC is as under:

- One Asst. Professor in Sociology & Philosophy is to be appointed.

As per decision of SRC deficiency letter was sent on 12.04.2016. The institution submitted its reply on 26.05.2016.

Accordingly, Formal Recognition Order was issued on 12.04.2016.

The institution submitted its written representation through e-mail on 12.02.2017 request for withdrawal of recognition.

The SRC in its 330th meeting held on 12th & 13th February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. The applicant has expressed inability to run the B.Ed and B.P.Ed courses because of the State Govt.'s Policy that does not suit their convenience.
2. FR for B.Ed(1unit) has already been issued. They have requested for withdrawal of this recognition. Their request is accepted. Withdraw recognition for the B.Ed (1 unit) course (SRCAPP14683) w.e.f 2016-17 after completion of all formalities.
3. In the B.P.Ed(1 unit) case (SRCAPP14726) we had ordered VT Inspection. In view of their request, the VT inspection is cancelled. The request for withdrawal of application is accepted. The application is rejected as withdrawn
4. Return the FDRs.
5. Close the 2 files.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC withdrawal order was sent to B.P.Ed (SRCAPP14726) course and letter was sent to B.Ed (SRCAPP14683) course on 23.02.2017.

The institution submitted reply for B.Ed course on 10.10.2017.

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

1. They have completed all the formalities.
2. Request for permission to close down is accepted. Issue a formal order, for closure w.e.f. 2018-19 incorporating the usual Faculty reduction conditions.
3. Students in the 2nd year shall be allowed to complete their course in 2019-20.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Inform the University concerned. 5. Withdraw recognition. 6. Return FDRs, if any. 7. Close the file. <p>NOTE: The action taken by SRO in Point. 2 of the decision of 347th meeting of SRC, “incorporating the usual Faculty reduction conditions” was removed while issuing the withdrawal order. It is submitted for ratification please.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their B.P.Ed application was withdrawn even before FR. 2.1. The B.Ed case did result in issue of FR w.e.f. 2016-17. But, apparently, they did not make any admissions to start the programme. 2.2. The No Dues certificate from the Faculty indicates that all of them left the college by 31.01.2017 2.3. In other words there were no students ; and, there were no new admissions in 2017-18. 3.1. That being so, there is no need to talk of phased reduction of Faculty. 3.2. The mistake committed by SRO is condoned. 3.3. There is no need to issue any corrections
4	<p>SRCAPP2448 B.Ed 1Unit Sri Shiva Sai College of Education, Mahabubnagar, Telangana</p>	<p>Sri Shiva Sai College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.Sy.No.1112/A2, Bharathnag Street, leeja Village & Post, leeja Taluk & City, Mahbubnagar District – 509127, Telangana</p> <p>SV Educational Society, Sy.No.1112/A2, Bharath Nagar, leeja Village & Post, Leeja Taluk & City, Mahbubnagar District – 509127, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Sri Shiva Sai College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.S y.No.1112/A2, Bharathnag Street, Leeja Village & Post, Leeja Taluk & City, Mahbubnagar District – 509127, Telangana for offering B.Ed course for two years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 27.05.2015. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A copy of application was sent to State Government for recommendation on 21.07.2015.</p> <p>Sub section 2 of section 7 of the Regulations 2014 read as under:-</p> <p>2(a). Failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the NCTE</p>

		<p style="text-align: center;">Rules on or before the date of submission of online application.</p> <p>2(b). Failure to submit printout of the applications made online along with Land documents as required under sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 within 15 days of the submission of online application</p> <p>The SRC considered the matter in its 291st meeting held on 20th & 21st August 2015, and on careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other related documents, the Regional Committee decided to summarily reject the application as per Regulations 7 2(a)/2(b) on the following ground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Institution has not submitted hard copy of application within 15 days from the date of online submission of application. <p>As per the decision of SRC a rejection order was issued to the institution on 20.10.2015.</p> <p>NCTE-Hqrs letter dated 14.01.2016 received on 19.01.2016 stating as follows;</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“...the directions of chairperson NCTE, as conveyed, in this office vide above mentioned letter dated 15.07.2014, extending the date of acceptance of the hardcopy of the applications for 2016-17, up to 15.07.2015 is reiterated for compliance.”</i></p> <p>The institution has submitted NOC from SCERT dated 29.05.2015.</p> <p>As directed the application was processed and placed before SRC in its 304th meeting held on 19th – 20th February, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This is a reopened ‘delayed submission’ case.2. They want B.El.Ed (units not given.) and B.Ed (units not given).3. BCC is not furnished.4. Built up area given in BP is adequate only for one unit of B.Ed and one unit of B.El.Ed5. Cause composite inspection6. Ask Vt to collect all relevant documents esp 304th Meeting of SRC 19th & 20th February 2016 8 Members: Prof. Sandeep Ponnala, Prof. M.S. Lalithamma. Prof. Rajya Lakshmi, Dr. K.S. Mani (TN) (S. Sathyam) Chairman BCC; and, also check on contiguity of location of the two programmes. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent on 16.03.2016. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.03.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 28.03.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 308th meeting held on 28th – 30th March, 2016 considered the matter and</p>
--	--	--

	<p>decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Issue LOI for B.Ed (1 Unit)2. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished3. Only if these are given on or before 02.05.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Issue LOI for B.El.Ed (2 Units)2. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished3. Only if these are given on or before 02.05.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC LOI was sent on 31.03.2016. The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 02.05.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 313th meeting held on 02nd & 03rd May, 2016 considered the matter and decided to <i>“Issue Formal Recognition for B.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2016-17.”</i></p> <p>Accordingly, as directed by SRC Formal Recognition order was issued on 02.06.2016 with an annual intake 50 students.</p> <p>A letter received from Smt. Ranjeev R. Acharya, I.A.S, Special Chief Secretary to Govt., Education Department, Government of Telangana vide D.O. Letter No. 4890/SE.Trg/A2/2016-2, dated 12.10.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 308th meeting held on 28th – 30th March, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. The Telangana Govts communication is noted.<ol style="list-style-type: none">1.1 Out of the deficiencies alleged, only one is of relevance to our granting recognition.1.2 The material issue is about duplication of one Faculty member viz., Asst. Prof (Telugu)-Anjaneyalu.3. Issue SCN accordingly <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 02.11.2017, and Letter was sent to Smt.Ranjeev R. Acharya Special Chief Secretary to Govt, Education Department Government of Telangana on 03.11.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted reply to the show cause notice on 28.11.2017 and stating as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“We are in receipt of the show cause notice referred above, which was issued by your kind authority on the basis of the letter received from the Education Department of Government of Telangana, Hyderabad. Having read the contents of the said show</i></p>
--	--

cause notice, we have understood the allegations made by the Government of Telangana against us. The Government of Telangana had sought to raise two deficiencies viz., (i) Teachers do not have 3-years teaching experience; and (ii) One Faculty Member i.e., Assistant Professor (Telugu) is employed in another college, by name Venkata Sai Diploma in Elementary Education.

As against the said allegations, your kind authority had issued a notice to us with respect to the issue of duplication of the Faculty Member i.e., Assistant Professor (Telugu). As far as the allegation that Faculty Member i.e., Assistant Professor (Telugu), as identified and appointed by us, being employed in another College, namely Venkata Sai Diploma in Elementary Education is concerned, the Department of Education of the Government of Telangana has tried to misdirect your kind authority. The said Mr. Anjaneyulu has been employed in Venkata Sai Diploma in Elementary Education, which is a College that has been running for some time. When we were making the application for a new College, we gave a Notification inviting all the interested candidates to appear for the selection process and interview to be our Faculty Member. Mr. Anjaneyulu had also appeared in the selection process and was selected as an Assistant Professor (Telugu) at our college. We offered him the job at our college and he accepted the same. His teaching at our college would only start after our college receives the State Government permission through a G.O. After getting the formal recognition from your kind authority on 02.05.2016, we made an application to the Government of Telangana to issue a G.O. granting permission to commence the admissions and teaching at our College. The aforesaid application was received by the Government of Telangana on 09.06.2016.

However, ignoring the law on the subject as declared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that once formal recognition is granted by NCTE, the State Government must give approval and issue G.O. the Government of Telangana did not issue the G.O. in favour of our college for the Academic Year 2016-17. We have continuously represented that we have formal recognition from NCTE and the State Government must issue the G.O., despite this, the G.O. was not issued by the State Government for the Academic year 2016-17. Naturally, as the State Government has prevented our college from making admissions and to function from the Academic year 2016-17 starting to function from the Academy year 2016-17, albeit contrary to law, the said Mr. Anjaneyulu did not discontinue teaching at his previous college and continued there. If the State Government had acted legally and allowed us to make admission and commence classes Mr. Anjaneyulu would have started teaching at our college as accepted by him.

Having not given permission for the academic Year 2016-17, the State Government cannot use its own wrong doing to say that now there is same deficiency. Mr. Anjaneyulu would start teaching at our college once our college is allowed to make admissions by issuance of the Go by the State Government as agreed by him. Therefore, there is absolutely no duplication. Any new teacher sought to be recruited by any new college would be teaching at some college or the other prior to commencement

of teaching at a new college.

Hence we were constrained to file W.P.No. 1677 of 2017 as the GO was not issued, at least to secure the GO for academic year 2017-18. We succeeded in the said W.P.No. 1677 of 2017 order and by order dated 19.09.2017, the Hon'ble High Court had directed the State Government to issue permission and G.O and directed the University to grant affiliation for the Academic Year 2017-18. Instead of complying with this order of the High Court, for oblique motives this baseless complaint has been made by the State Government. It is after the aforesaid order of the Hon'ble High Court that the complaint of the Government of Telangana has been issued to your kind authority only to avoid implementation of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court.

It may be noted that the said Professor – Mr. Anjaneyulu cannot continue to be in our employment and discontinue teaching at his previous college, if the State Government does not accord permission and prevent us from starting the college. Having illegally prevented us from starting the college for the academic year 2016-17 and now also for academic Year 2017-18, the State Government cannot state that the said Professor – Mr. Anjaneyulu is currently teaching in the College of Venkata Sai Diploma in Elementary Education and that the same amounts to duplication.

Any recruitment of Teachers would be from the teachers working at different colleges. Therefore, the allegation that the duplication of Assistant Professor (Telugu) – Mr. Anjaneyulu is an incorrect allegation as against us. If one were to say that two new colleges have made applications for opening the college by using the same person's name as a Professor, it can be said that there is duplication. However, a Faculty Member teaching in an existing college being identified, approved and staffed for starting a new college cannot be said to be duplication, as such a person would not discontinue teaching at his previous college if the new college where he has accepted to teach is not allowed to commence and make admission.

In view of the above, we respectfully submit that the allegation that there is duplication of one faculty Member is completely false and misconceived. Moreover, these allegations have been made by the State Government only to avoid implementation of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court. In view of the above, we request that the above show cause notice may be withdrawn and these proceedings be closed in our favor."

The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:

- 1. This is a complicated case involving many legal issues.**
- 2. On the face of it, this case involves only one issue about one Asst Prof serving at 2 places at the same time. But, there are more important issues attached.**

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>3.1. The Regulation requires applicant-institutions to “appoint” Faculty, get the Faculty list authenticated by the Registrar, and report accordingly to the Regional Committee, so that the case can be processed for issue of FR.</p> <p>3.2. In practice, however this does not happen. The applicant selects the Faculty, issues appointment letters and, the affiliating body authenticates. But, the Faculty does not actually “join”.</p> <p>3.3. This is because, even after issue of FR by the NCTE, the affiliating body grants affiliation only after receipt of a G.O from the State Government conveying their approval. This process may take even a whole year in some cases ! The applicant institutions do not ask the ‘selected and appointed’ Faculty to join so that they do not have to start paying salary in fructuously.</p> <p>4.1. This fractured process of faculty recruitment leads to several anomalies / irregularities / illegalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) The applicant institution is required to play a charade of showing ‘Faculty in position’.(ii). The individual faculty Members concerned file false affidavits stating that they have been “appointed”.(iii). The affiliating body authenticates the list in a non-committal way even while refusing to give affiliation for want of State Government approval. <p>4.2. All these aberrations are made to happen because the State Government and the affiliating University ignore the legal position (under the NCTE Act) that an affiliating body SHALL grant affiliation once a Regional Committee of the NCTE grants recognition. There is no scope for any State Government intervention at this stage.</p> <p>4.3. it is only to avoid this eventuality that the Regulations require the applicants to obtain NOCs from State Governments right at the start. If a State Government does not utilise that opportunity, then, it loses its right to halt the case at a later stage.</p> <p>4.4 In this case, the State Government of Telangana has been doing just that. The procedure for issue of a G.O. after issue of FR by the NCTE is at initio void.</p> <p>5. It will be necessary for the NCTE (HQ) to take up these issues with the State Governments, sensitise them about the legal niceties involved and make them follow the prescribed legal procedures.</p> <p>6. The aberrations / irregularities / illegalities committed by the others are all so done under procedural duress illegally imposed by the indefensible ‘G.O. procedure’ prescribed by the State Governments. (the state Government of Telangana in this case.)</p> |
|--|--|---|

		<p>7.1. In the result, and for the reasons given above, the explanation given by the ‘Sri Shiva Sai College of Education’ about Asst Prof Anjaneyalu’s appointment is accepted.</p> <p>7.2. The State Government of Telangana may be informed accordingly.</p> <p>8. SRO is directed to make a comprehensive formal reference accordingly to the NCTE (HQ) for examining the issues’ listed above for removal of the procedural anomalies. Even the NCTE Regulations will require to be amended appropriately.</p>
5	<p>SRCAPP2016 30183 BSc.B.Ed/ BA.B.Ed (2 Units) Sri Gowthami Integrated B.Ed College, Prakasam, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Sri Gowthami Integrated B.Ed College, Padmati Nayudupalem Village & Road, Chimakurthy Taluk, Padamati Nayudupalem City, Prakasam District-523226, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Kanumarla Rural Development and Educational Society, Sy.No 67/3, Padmat Naidupalem Taluk, Chimakurthy Taluk & City, Prakasam District-523226, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Sri Gowthami Integrated B.Ed College, Padmat Nayudupalem Village & Road, Chimakurthy Taluk, Padamati Nayudupalem City, Prakasam District-523226, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.Sc.B.Ed.B.A.B.Ed integrated course for four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2016. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 14.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 08.09.2016 followed by Reminder I on 26.10.2016 and Reminder II on 23.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Government, the period of 90 days as per Regulations is over, hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.Sc.B.Ed.B.A.B.Ed course in the State of Andhra Pradesh.</p> <p>The application was processed and place before the SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th – 05th January, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NOC is given. 2. Title is in order. 3. LUC/EC ... not given. 4. BP is not approved. 5. BCC – not given. 6. FDRs - not given. 7. Fee paid in full. 8. Cause inspection. 9. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents. <p>Accordingly, inspection was scheduled through online mode between 20.02.2017 to</p>

12.03.2017.

Now, the institution has sent an e-mail dated 15.02.2017 along with a letter requesting postponement of Inspection. The letter stated as under:

“With reference to the above said subject, we had applied for 4 year integrated B.Ed Course to SRI GOWTHAMI INTEGRATED B.Ed COLLEGE at Chimakuthy, Prakasam District, Andhra Pradesh for the academic year 2017-2018 and also submitted all relevant documents as per norms. It is pertinent to submit here that due to labor and other problems the construction of the building is under progress and also in Govt. of Andhra Pradesh couldn't give the admissions for Integrated B.Ed colleges for the academic year 2016-17. Because we postponed the VT Inspection for the academic year 2018-19.

Hence I request you sir please postpone the VT Inspection for Sri Gowthami Integrated B.Ed College, Chimakurthy, Prakasam District, Andhra Pradesh till we communicate. We shall be grateful to your authority for the above act of consideration.”

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

1. Request for postponement of inspection is accepted subject to the clear understanding that they will miss the opportunity for the 2017-18 academic year because of the Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3.3.2017.
2. Give time till 30.9.2017.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 07.04.2017 and the inspection of institution was cancelled on 03.09.2017.

The institution has not submitted any reply till date.

The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:

- 1.They have not given any reply to our letter dated 07.04.2017.**
- 2.But, their intention to persist with the application is clear from their statement, “Because we postponed the VT Inspection for the academic year 2018-19”, in their e-mail dated 15.02.2017.**
- 3.1. Order VT again.**
- 3.2. Alert them about the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit of 03.03.2018 and advise them to respond quickly so that this case can be considered for 2018-19 at least.**
- 3.3. Ask VT to collect LUC, latest EC, duly approved BP, duly approved BCC and FDRs.**
- 4. Put up in the first meeting in Feb 2018.**

6	SRCAPP2016 30143 B.Ed 2Units Muthukkaruppan Memorial Educational Trust, Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu	<p>Muthukkaruppan Memorial Educational Trust, Sillangulam Village, M.K.N Nagar, Ottapidaram Taluk & City, Tuticorin District-628718, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Muthukkaruppan Memorial Educational Trust, Sillankulam Village, M.K.N. Nagar, Ottapidaram Taluk & City, Tuticorin District-628718, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Muthukkaruppan Memorial Educational Trust, Sillangulam Village, M.K.N Nagar, Ottapidaram Taluk & City, Tuticorin District-628718, Tamil Nadu for offering B.Ed course of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 21.06.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 05.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.08.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.10.2016 and Reminder II on 11.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations was over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.Ed course in the State of Tamilnadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application of the institution was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and documents and the same was placed before SRC in its placed before SRC in its 327th meeting held on 19th to 20th January, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. NOC is given.2. Title is in order. Land area is adequate.3. LUC is in order. Plot area details not given.4. EC is not in original. It shows 'lease'.5. BP is approved. Built-up area shown is 4063.01 sq.mts.6. BCC – not given.7. FDRs – not given.8. Cause inspection. <p>As per the decision of SRC, inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode during 01.02.2017 to 21.02.2017.</p> <p>Inspection of the institution was conducted on 21.02.2017 and VT report was received by this office through e-mail on 22.02.2017 and in hard copy on 27.02.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February to 3rd March, 2017 the committee considered the VT Report and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Sy.No. 399/12B is not relevant to this case.2. EC covers only 398/1; it does not cover 39/12A.
---	---	---

3. They are not offering any other course. The proposed B.Ed. (2 units) will, therefore, be hit by the 'stand alone' clause.
4. Issue SCN for rejection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The institution has submitted Original FDRs on 12.05.2017.

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

The SRC-NCTE is in receipt of Office Memorandum F.No.89-551/E-10781 Appeal/57290 dated 26.08.2017 was received by SRC on 11.09.2017.

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

“..... the Committee noted that the appellant has submitted the letter of the

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

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

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

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

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

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

As per the decision of the SRC, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 03.01.2018. Based on website information, the institution has submitted LOI notice reply on 04.01.2018.

The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:

- 1. Their reply dated 04.01.2018 is seen.**
- 2. They have made 3 new appointments to rectify the deficiencies.**
- 3.1. Appointment of a History Asst Prof, strictly speaking, cannot be said to meet the requirement of an Assistant Professor in Sociology.**
- 3.2. They will have to recruit a duly qualified Assistant Professor in Sociology / Philosophy.**
- 4. Issue SCN accordingly.**

07	SRCAPP2016 30219 M.Ed 1Unit Sathyasai B.Ed College, Thiruvallur, Tamil Nadu	<p>Sathyasai B.Ed College, Paruthipet Village, Avadi Town, No.7, Rajaji Street, Poonamallee Taluk, Paruthipet city, Thiruvallur District-600071, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Dr. Rajalakshmi Sundarajan Educational Society, Avadi Village, No.7, Rajaji Street, Kamarajar Nagar, Poonamalli Taluk, Avadi City, Thiruvallur District-600071, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Sathyasai B.Ed College, Paruthipet Village, Avadi Town, No.7, Rajaji Street, Poonamallee Taluk, Paruthipet city, Thiruvallur District-600071, Tamil Nadu for offering M.Ed course of two years duration for the academic session 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee.</p> <p>The institution submitted application online 28.06.2016 and hard copy received on 05.07.2016 without application code. The application code mentioned on their covering letter is other college of Pondicherry. Another application submitted on 28.06.2017 and hard copy on 25.07.2016 (submitted late).</p> <p>NCTE vide public notice invited applications for different Teacher Education Programmes for the academic session 2017-18.</p> <p>The applications received for the academic session 2017-18 are to be processed online.</p> <p>On Clause 7 (2) of NCTE Regulations, 2014, provides as under:-</p> <p>“(2) the application shall be summarily rejected under one or more of the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) <i>Failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the National council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 on or before the date of submission of online application.</i>b) <i>Failure to submit print out of the applications made online along with the land documents as required under sub-Regulation (4) of Regulation 5 within fifteen days of the submission of the online application”.</i> <p>NCTE vide letter no F.49-4/2014/NCTE/N&S dated 22.08.2016 has clarified that hard copy of application received up to 15th July, 2016 shall be acceptable irrespective of the date of online submission of application.</p> <p>The SRC in its 322nd meeting held on 20th to 21st October, 2016 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All the 5 cases in which hard-copies were received after the last date are summarily rejected. <p>Accordingly, Rejection order was issued to the institution through online on 21.10.2016.</p>
----	--	--

The Memorandum F.No.89-836/2016 Appeal/50523 dated 27.02.2017 received by this office on 04.03.2017 in respect of Sathyasai B.Ed college, Thiruvallur Dist., Tamil Nadu for M.Ed course with the request to sent the original file along with comments of the institution.

A letter was addressed to the section officer Shri.R.C Chopra, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi along with original file on 10.03.2017.

Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE-Hqrs and the Appellate Authority in its order No. F.No.89-836/2016 Appeal/6th Meeting-2017 dated: 18.04.2017 received by this office on 24.04.2017, remanded the case to SRC, as under:-

“.....remand back the case to SRC for further processing of the application. On perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents on record and oral argument advance during the hearing, appeal committee concluded to remand back to the case to SRC for further processing of the application.

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

The matter was placed before SRC in its 337th meeting held on 25th & 26th April, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided to “Process the application.”

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

1. This is an appeal remand case.
2. Processing this case further at this stage will cross the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit of 2 May 17 for grant of FR w.e.f. 2017-18.
- 3.1 If this case goes into 2017-18, then, it can be considered only prospectively.
- 3.2 There will be two hurdles to be cleared:
 - (i) Can the NOC issued by the affiliating body for 2017-18 hold good for starting the course in a later academic year.
 - (ii) Will even pipe-line cases be hit by the ‘zero year’ Notification for being considered for FR w.e.f. 2018-19.
4. Refer to NCTE (HQ) for advice.
5. Depending upon the advice received, a decision can be taken about causing VT inspection.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the NCTE-Hqrs on 09.05.2017.

The institution submitted its written representation on 26.07.2017, 04.08.2017, 10.08.2017 and 16.08.2017 and stating as under:-

We got to application numbers (SRCAPP201630138 & SRCAPP201630219) in our same application ID: 10955 and also we brought it to your kind notice. But our application is not processed still 08.03.2017. So, we requested the NCTE-Director to process our application of our M.Ed. course during 2017-18.

We received a letter from the member Secretary NCTE (dt.08.03.2017) & directed us to appear before the appeal committee on 25.03.2017. We explained everything before the committee. On 18.04.2017, we received an order from the member secretary directing Regional Director (SRC) to process our application. Even after that the Regional Director was not processed our application still now i.e. 11.08.2017).

We went personally to SRC-NCTE (Southern Zone) three times and requested the Regional Director to process our application. Even now we do not know the status of our application. We invested huge amount to provide all the necessary things for this programme, we deposited F.D. Rupee 12 lakhs. We made advertisement many times in Hindu daily newspaper on Sundays for staff recruitment and we are paying salary regularly still now to the staff.

We request you to give a permission to appear before the SRC 344th meeting dt: 17.08.2017 & explain our grievances before the committee members.

Now, a letter dated 12.10.2017 from NCTE – Hqrs received by this office on 19.10.2017 along with Opinion (Ex-parte) from Additional Solicitor-General of India and stating as under:-

“I am directed to refer to your F.No.SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP201630219/M.Ed/TN/2017-18/93181 dated 09.05.2017 and to say that the Appellate Authority of the NCTE has remanded back the case to the Southern Regional Committee, Bangalore for reconsiderations of the case of Sathyasai B.Ed College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu against the impugned order of SRC dated 21.10.2016 refusing recognition for conducting M.Ed. course on the grounds on ““Non-submission of hard copy on time””.

The Appeal Committee after considering the same had decided to remand back the matter to SRC for further processing of the application as per observations contained in the appellate order dt 18.04.2017, which is self explanatory.

In this connection the opinion of the ASG is enclosed for reference of the Southern Regional Committee. On the basis of the same it has been decided the following:-

- (i) In case there is any inaccuracy of fact or a misreading of law then a rectification application or an MA can be preferred before the Appeal Committee;*

(ii) *In all other cases the opinion of ASG regarding the binding nature of Appellate orders needs to be reiterated.*

You are, therefore, requested to reconsider the case as per the direction of the Appellate Authority.”

The same was placed before SRC in its 346th meeting held on 24th to 25th October, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. The HQ advice is seen.
2. It is not a question of any RC treating an ‘appellate’ order as “acceptable” or unacceptable”. The difficulty arises only when an appellate order tends to contravene a Regulation. What should a RC do in such a case?.
3. In the reference to the ASG this issue was not posed at all.
- 4.1 With reference to the NOC problem, the issue is non-submission of NOC as prescribed in the Regulations. If an appellate-order requires a RC to recognise NOC submitted after expiry of the date line prescribed, what should the RC do.
- 4.2 It is not a question of judicial –indiscipline. The RC has also to take care of Regulation-discipline. What is more sacro sanct a Regulation or an appellate-order?.
5. Refer again to NCTE (HQ) for advice

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the Member’s Secretary, NCTE-Hqrs, New Delhi on 31.10.2017.

The institution submitted letter dated 22.11.2017 received by this office on 24.11.2017 along with relevant documents and stating as under:-

“We had applied for the Recognition of M.Ed course for the Academic year 2017-18 and our application was not accepted for the reason that the SRC had incorrectly observed that we had not paid the requisite fees was duly paid and our application was filed with all the necessary details along with Payment of processing fee of Rs. 1.50.011.50/- on 28.06.2016 net banking. Later, the same was acknowledged through SMS alert on the day, 28th June 2016. We also made of fixed deposit of Rs. 7 lakhs towards endowment fund and Rs. 5 lakhs as reserve fund to be operated jointly on 30.01.2017 and we are maintaining the same till date. But the SRC had mistaken that we had not paid the processing fees and hence not considered our application which is incorrect.

We had taken all efforts and pain in elaborating our stand and submission made in our earlier letters filed on 04.05.2017, 09.06.2017, and 27.07.2017. But it is very surprising to know that the Southern Regional Committee (SRC) at Bangalore did not either respond to any of our submission nor follow the directions of the NCTE.

In fact we had complied with all the formalities for the purpose of our recognition of M.Ed course for academic year 2017-18.

We appealed to NCTE Delhi for rectifying the wrong decision of NCTE-SRC, we went to Delhi (HQ) and explained in details before the appeal committee on 25.03.2017 and the NCTE Delhi passed an "Appeal order bearing No. F.No.89-836/2016 Appeal/ 6th meeting 2017/52934 dt. 18.04.2017", directing NCTE SRC to remand back the case to SRC for further processing of the Application.

In spite of the direction given by NCTE Delhi to process the Application, the SRC has not taken any action with this regard in all the seven SRC meeting held so far from May 2017-Nov 2017.

Because of Such a huge delay by SRC we had suffered a huge loss in terms of our reputations, and Finance. More so ever the students also suffered a lot who join M.Ed from B.Ed and their one year of academics was lost because of the delay in granting recognition.

Based on our letter to your office dated 27.07.2017, the SRC held its 346th meeting on 24th to 25th October 2017 (copy enclosed). Therein also they do not give any concrete solutions to our appeal but only kept the issue in abeyance and for advice from NCTE. When the entire facts and issues are already in the file of SRC they should have acted accordingly but just for the mistake of SRC we have become the victim of circumstances and an under huge mental agony at the age of 79 years. In spite of my several visits to SRC and NCTE there is absolutely no development in my case.

We had called SRC and explained about our status and they had assured us that in 347th meeting they will consider our application and will surely give us relief for the request we made in our email dated 02.11.2017 (copy enclosed). But again our appeal was not considered in the 347th meeting held on 16th 17th Nov. 2017.

Thus it is humbly requested to your goodself to kindly look into plea in details as submitted earlier and at least grant us recognition for academic year 2018-19 so that the students will not loose their another year of waiting or so.

Therefore we invite your intervention in above subject and direct the SRC to grant us recognition for year 2018-19 and thus render justice.

We had received an SMS alert from NCTE mobile desk Mr. Sanjay Gupta that our application letter NO.2862/2017/DS(OSD)-HQ has been forwarded to O/o US-SRC on 09.05.2017. We have so far not received any communication from SRC-Bangalore.

We would like to bring to your kind notice about the agenda of 347th SRC meeting

held 16th to 17th NOV, 2017 Wherein the following cases were discussed.

Item no. 1- page 4, Serial No.3

Item no. 2- page 5, Serial No. 6

In both the above cases discussed, the concerned college have approached the court for their remedy, but we have been co-operating with your office with utmost due care and belief that our submission will be addressed with due regards. In case of further negligence regarding our issue, we may also be forced to take legal actions in further.

Thus it is humbly requesting to your goodself to kindly consider our application based on the facts and give appropriate directions to NCTE-SRC Southern Zone to address our grievances and to do the needful, Enabling us to get recognition for the academic year 2018-19. We Trust your goodself and committee to consider my above submission on merits and thus render justice”.

The institution submitted a letter through e-mail on 28.11.2017 and stating as under:-

“As we didn’t receive our recognition for M.Ed programme 2016-17, we have been repeatedly, reporting to your head office regarding this matter and this came to appeal on 25.03.2017 and we dot the appeal report on 18.04.2017, “Appeal order bearing No. F.No.89-836/2016 Appeal/6th Meeting-2017/52934 dt.18.04.2017”, directing NCTE SRC to remand back the case to SRC for further processing of the Application”. But in spite of all these, SRC has been throwing the blame on NCTE (HQ) asking NCTE to give further advice.

To find a solution we made a call to NCTE (HQ) this morning at 11.15 a.m (27.11.2017) asking about the status of our M.Ed application for which they replied as “we dispatched the Appeal report earlier, in this regard and SRC had asked for some clarification which was also sent to them. So it’s the duty of SRC to look into matter and take appropriate decision”. This was told by Shri. R. C. Chopra (NCTE Appeal Department).

We make a humble request to SRC-NCTE to kindly explain the reason for not rendering the recognition for our M.Ed programme for the coming year 2018-2019.

We have suffered a deep mental trauma because of this delay and have also faced a huge financial loss. The future of candidates applying for M.Ed is at stake. Hence kindly look into this issue with deep concern and help us in getting the recognition. We submit our request humbleness for your kind perusal”.

As directed, a reminder sent through e-mail to NCTE-Hqrs regarding the decision of 346th meeting of SRC on 24th to 25th October, 2017 in respect of Sathyasai B.Ed college, thiruvallur District-600071, Tamil Nadu on 06.12.2017.

NCTE Hqrs letter dated 08.12.2017 received by this office on 08.12.2017 and 11.12.2017 along with Opinion (Ex-parte) from Additional Solicitor-General of India, from Dr. Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Under Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi and stating as under:-

"I am directed to refer to your letter dated 31.10.2017 sent by e-mail letter dated 05.12.2017 on the subject noted above and to reiterate the opinion of the additional Solicitor General of India dated 09.03.2017 (copy enclosed) for immediate action in the matter.

A perusal of the legal opinion will reveal that the order of the Appeal Committee is binding on the RC. Accordingly the RC members must be respectfully reminded again of this position".

The matter was placed before SRC in its 349th meeting held on 15th to 16th December, 2017 and the Committee considered the clarification received from NCTE-Hqrs and decided as under:-

1. Which reference to the latest clarification/advice received from NCTE (HQ), please process the case further.

The SRC in its 351st meeting held on 28th to 29th December, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. As per the Appellate order, we may ignore the one day's delay in submission of hard copies and, process the case further.
2. In the Office records, Vol-I of this case is not readily traceable. Without examining the documents therein, we can not consider the case too V.T. Inspection.
3. Request the college to give us copies of the documents to help us rebuild the file. Express regret for the inconvenience caused.
4. After receipt of the documents from the college, rebuild the file, process and, resubmit.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 03.01.2018.

The institution submitted reply on 03.01.2018 along with documents and stating as under:-

"With reference to your SRC 351st meeting held on 28th to 29th December 2017, herewith we are submitted the relevant documents for M.Ed programme (our Application No. SRCAPP30219 & ID No. 10955) is being sent for your kind perusal and favorable order".

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

		<p>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have B.Ed (2 units) & BSc.B.Ed (2 units). 2. Title is clear. Land area for B.Ed (2 units), M.Ed (1 unit) and BSc.Bed (2 units) is adequate for the programmes in reference. The requirement is 4500 sqmts ; availability is 4775 sq mts. 3. EC is in order. 4. BP is in order. Built up area shown is 4056.27 sq mts. 5. BCC-there are 2 BCCs. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The names of Engineer given in the 2 BCCs are different from each other although both have been approved on the same date. (ii) One bears the seal of the Avadi Municipality ; the other bears the seal of the college !. (iii) The total built-up area shown is (4670.35 + 4047.48) 8717.83 sq mts. This is more than double of what is permissible under the BP. They should explain this discrepancy. 6. FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7 +5 lakhs per programme. 7. NOC is submitted correctly. 8. NAAC certificate is there. Validity expired on 04.01.2018. But, they can not approach NAAC again because of the QCI litigation. 9. Cause VT Inspection-Composite-for B.Ed (2 units), BSc.B.Ed (2 units) and M.Ed (1 unit).
08	SRCAPP2016 30099 BA.BEd BSc.Bed Pope John Paul II College of Education, Pondicherry	<p>Pope John Paul II College of Education, Reddiarpalayam Village, Villianur Main Road, Reddiarpalayam City, Pondicherry District-605010, Pondicherry</p> <p>Le Conseil D Administration De L Archdiocese De Pondicherry, Villianur Main Road, Reddiarpalayam Taluk, Pondicherry City & District-605010, Pondicherry had applied for grant of recognition to Pope John Paul II College of Education, Reddiarpalayam Village, Villianur Main Road, Reddiarpalayam City, Pondicherry District-605010, Pondicherry for offering BA.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed-AI integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 06.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016, followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Govt. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for BA.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed-AI course in</p>

the State of Pondicherry.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- This item is withdrawn from agenda.

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

A letter dated 04.02.2017 received on 09.02.2017 from Mr. S.P Veerappan, Former state Vice- president Bharathiyar janatha Party regarding requesting for probing irregularities in giving Affiliation- on Pondicherry University has complaint alleging irregularities in grant of affiliation for 4 year integrated courses in Pope John Paul-II College of Education.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The B.Sc.B.Ed/B.A.B.ED 4 years integrated course was introduced only in the Regulations, 2014.

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

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

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

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

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

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

An email dated 06.05.2017 and Hard copy received by this office on 08.05.2017 from Pope John Paul II College of Education.

353rd Meeting of SRC
10th & 11th, January, 2018

The institution has submitted representation on 11.05.2017 and stating as under:-
On 04.05.017 we sent letter to your good self requesting for Revised Regulation order as per 2014 norms. That letter also gives some points for clarification of the observations made in 334th meeting of SRC-30th to 31st march, 201.7
 May we request your good self to accept the correction as follows:

<p>If such courses had been sanctioned in the past, they will have to be reckoned with as 'innovative courses'. They will have to be regularized into regular courses following a procedure prescribed by NCTE(HQ); or, they will have to be converted into courses now recognized by the 2014 Regulations.</p>	<p>We leave it to the discretion of the SRC to decided in favour of our institution.</p>
---	--

An email was received by this office on 11.05.2017 and Hard copy received on 12.05.2017 regarding second clarification for the SCN issued on 21.12.2016 to Pope John Paul II College of Education, Pondicherry.
 A letter dated 10.05.2017 received by this office on 15.05.2017 from Shri.Dr. Kiran Bedi Lieutenant Governor Raj Nivas, Puducherry and stating as under:-
" In continuation of the telephonic conversation had with you on 08.05.2017 evening regarding recognition of the four-year integrated course (BSc., B.Ed) offered by Pope John Paul II College of Education, I Understand that the college principal has given additional particulars for considering their application for grant of recognition. Copy of the letter is enclosed.
The process of examining the explanation submitted by the college may kindly be expedited in the interest of the students, whose future is at stake".
 An email was received on 16.05.2017 and a letter dated 16.05.2017 received by this office on 19.05.2017 from Shri. Mukesh Kumar, under secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi and stating as under:-
I am directed to invite your kind attention to your letter No. letter No.SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP201630099/PU/2017/91630 dated 07.02.2017 and the NCTE Hq. letter No.49-03/2016/NCTE/N&S/51537 dated 20.03.2017. Reply of which is still awaited.
In this connection it is to further inform you that the institution vide letter dated 9th May, 2017 has represented that the college has the NCTE recognition from 2000-2001. It also submitted self-affidavit to come under NCTE new Regulation 2014. But it received a show cause notice NCTE, SRC for which clarification was given (copy enclosed). It was discussed in 334 SRC Meeting for which also an explanation was submitted copy enclosed. Due to the want of recognition the University withheld the result and not allowed the students to sit for examinations due in May, 2017 (a copy of the letter dated 09.05.2017 received from the institution is enclosed).
The matter has been further examined in the NCTE Hq. and it has been observed that as per provisions under NCTE Act, 1993, the recognition of the institution continues till NCTE withdraws it under section 147 of the NCTE Act. Moreover, the then

Regional Director, SRC-Sh. M.Vasudev had filed an Affidavit in W.P.o.15488 and 15489 of 2003 (clause 9(b) stating that the SRC in its 62nd meeting held on 18.07.2003 has approved an intake of 150 students from the year 2003-04. The institution had also enclosed the copies of earlier conditional recognition orders issued by SRC.

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

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

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

Reply sent through e-office on 17.05.2017.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NCTE Hqrs letter received by this office on 14.06.2017 and 19.06.2017, from Dr. Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Under Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi and stating as under:-

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

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

- 2. However, this action of SRC is seen to be clearly against the directions contained in the NCTE Hqtrs. Letter file no.3-6/PS/CP/NCTE/2000/1995 dated 14.06.2000 issued by the then Chairperson of the NCTE (which was also issued to SRC) stating inter alia that as per the Chapter 4 of the NCTE Act, an institution can either be recognised or conditionally recognised or refused recognition. There is not provision of grant of recognition on year-to year basis in the NCTE Act.*
- 3. And whereas as per the above said direction/instruction from the Chairperson NCTE, the conditional recognition on year to year basis granted to the institution as stated above in para-1 is against the direction of the NCTE Hqrs. The action of the SRC of giving year on year recognition is illegal in the light of the instructions of NCTE Hqrs. Since this letter was issued in the year 2000 all subsequent acts of the SRC in violation of such orders would be illegal, not only in the light of such directions but also in the light of a plain reading of the extant provisions of the NCTE Act.*
- 4. And whereas looking at the records provided by SRC and the institution concerned it is observed that RD SRC has filed an affidavit to the Hon'ble High Court of Madras with reference of W.P No. 15488 of 2003 and 15489 of 2003 in which it is stated that the petitioner institution has got the approval from the year 2003-04 and therefore, the student shall be permitted to take examination from the year 2003-04 and not before the date of recognition.*
- 5. And whereas SRC NCTE may be clarified that the act of the SRC after 2000 of issuing year to – year recognition was not in conformity with the direction of the NCTE Hqrs and therefore it may be treated illegal. Moreover as per the guidelines issued by the NCTE Hqrs. Dated 26.05.2000 it is stated that recognition in respect of those institution which fail to meet/comply with the norms for the concerned teacher education course within the given time frame may be withdrawn by invoking Section 17 of the NCTE Act.*
- 6. Considering the totality of facts & circumstances, and the letter of the NCTE Act, the NCTE Regulation, letter of the then Chairperson NCTE dated 14.06.2000 and 26.05.2000, and also affidavit filed by RD SRC to the Hon'ble High Court of Madras with reference to W.P No.15488 of 2003 and 15489 of 2003 in which it is stated that the petition institution has got the approval from the year 2003-2004 and therefore*

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

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

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

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

	<p>An email was received from the institution on 16.06.2017 and hard copy received on 21.06.2017 regarding requesting for issuing the order.</p> <p>A letter was received from Pondicherry University on 22.06.2017.</p> <p>] A letter was received from the institution regarding grant of permission for additional intake in B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed on 28.06.2017. Again a letter received from the institution on 04.07.2017 along with PAR .</p> <p>NCTE Hqrs letter received by this office through e-mail on 12.07.2017, from Dr. Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Under Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>I am directed to refer to the Minutes of 341st meeting held from 15 to 16 June 2017 and the clarification issued to SRC by the NCTE Hqtrs. Letter dated 14.06.2017 regarding Pope John Paul II College of Education Pondicherry. The said minutes have been carefully perused.</i></p> <p><i>2. Taking the above decision of SRC and the factual position obtained from RD, SRC and the institution concerned, the following points are noteworthy:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><i>i. The recognition granted to the institution by SRC was conditional for the year 2004-2005 and the last date of submitted PAR by the institution to SRC was 31.03.2005. As per information furnished by SRC, the institution did not submit PAR to SRC office whereas the institution asserts that they have submitted PAR to SRC and SRC did not take any cognizance of it.</i><i>ii. The then RD SRC had filed an affidavit before the High Court Madras in the case of W .P. No. 15488 of 2003 and 15489 of 2003 in which it was stated that the petitioner institution has got the approval from the year 2003-2004 and therefore, the students shall be permitted to take examination from the year 2003-2004.</i><i>iii. It appears to be correct in the light of the direction of NCTE Hqtrs. issued to all Regional Committees vide letter file no. 3-6/Panchayath Secretary/CP/NCTE/2000/1995 dated 14.06.2000 by the then Chairperson of the NCTE stating that an institution can either be recognition or conditionally recognized or refused recognition. There is no provision of grant of recognition on year-to-year basis in the NCTE Act.</i><i>iv. The Chairperson NCTE's letter dated 26.05.2000 (guidelines issued to all Regional Committee) states that recognition in respect of those institution which fail to meet/comply with the norms for the concerned teacher education course within the given time frame may be withdrawn by invoking Section 17 of the NCTE Act.</i><i>v. It is also stated that as per Section 17 (i) of the NCTE Act where the Regional Committee, on its own motion or on representation received from ant person,</i>
--	---

is satisfied that a recognized institution has contravened any of the provisions of this Act, or the rules, regulations, orders made or issued thereunder, or any condition subject to which recognition under sub-section (3) of section 14 or permission under sub-section (3) of section 15 was granted, it may withdraw recognition of such recognized institution, for reasons to be recorded in writing: provided that no such order against the recognized institution shall be passed unless a reasonable opportunity of making representation against the proposed order has been given to such recognized institution.

- vi. The above facts including the RD SRC's letter file no. NCTE-Reg1022/1/2017-Regulation Section-SRC/93301 dated 17.05.2017 show that the Regional Committee did not withdraw the recognition of the institution. The regional Committee is seen to not have proceeded formally for withdrawing recognition through issue of any show cause notice to the institution and thereby not taking any action against the institution for discontinuing the programme. It appears that the guidelines of the NCTE HQtrs. Issued to the Regional Committee vide letter dated 26.03.2000 have been disobeyed. Moreover it is observed that the spirit of the NCTE Act 1993 as mentioned in section 17(1) has been not taken into cognizance by SRC NCTE.*
- vii. The conditional recognition granted for 2004-05 academic session is illegal as per the affidavit already filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras stating that the institution is recognized from 2003-2004. The Regional Committee could have reviewed this matter under section 17(1) of the NCTE Act in case any infraction of law or extent regulations were brought to its notice.*
- viii. A per para 2 (ii) above it is obvious that the institution is recognized from 2003-2004 onwards as per affidavit filed by the then RD SRC before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras and the RD SRC's letter dated 17.05.2017 makes is clear that the recognition has not been withdrawn specifically.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“The learned counsel appearing for the National Council of Teacher Education, seeks further time to file counter. However, based on instruction, he submitted that the petitioner is not entitled to admit the students in B.A.B.Ed., and B.Sc.B.Ed, course by specifically stating the subjects in which those integrated courses are

taught for. Therefore, he submitted that the petitioner can admit the students for B.A. B.Ed., and B.Sc., B.Ed., without reference to the subjects for the existing intake as permitted by the NCTE already.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 1. The Court has accepted our contentions and, directed the college to abide by the SRC orders about dropping the subject wise nomenclatures.**
- 2. Noted.**

09	APS04085 D.T.Ed 1Unit Bharathi Teacher Training Institute, Villupuram, Tamil Nadu	<p>Bharathy Teacher Training Instittue, C. Meyyur Post, thirukoilur Taluk, Villupuram-605803, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Bharathy Educational Trust, Villupuram District, Tamil Nadu submitted an application for grant of recognition to Bharathy Teacher Training Instittue, C. Meyyur Post, Thirukoilur Taluk, Villupuram-605803, Tamil Nadu for (D.T.Ed) Elementary course of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students on 31.12.2004.</p> <p>The application was processed and inspection of the institution was carried out on 23.2.2004. The VT report was placed before SRC in its 117th meeting held on 13-19th September 2006 and the Committee decided to cause re-inspection to ascertain the exclusive facilities created for D.T.Ed courses as the management is also running other colleges. Accordingly, re-inspection of the institution was conducted on 25.11.2006. The VT report was considered by SRC in its 27-28 December 2006 and SRC decided to defer the matter.</p> <p>The matter was taken up by SRC in its 126th meeting held on 20th-23rd February 2007 and committee decided to accord recognition for starting D.T.Ed course to the institution with an intake of 50. Accordingly recognition to the institution was granted on 27.03.2007.</p> <p>A complaint was received against the institution from State Government of Tamilnadu vide letter no. 6811/C5/2008 dated 20.6.2008. The complaint was considered by SRC in its 161st meeting held on 6-7 August 2008 and decided to issue notice under section 17 of NCTE Act and to call for written representation with documentary proof for the following deficiencies:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Total built up area available is only 7489sq.ft . It is not enough as per the NCTE norms.• Ground Floor has asbestos sheet roof building.• Facilities for Physical education/Games, Special Coaching, Audio Visual Education, Co-curricular activities are not available.• Teaching and non-teaching staff are not yet appointed.• Approved building plan is not enclosed. <p>Accordingly, a notice was issued on 24.10.2008. The institution submitted its reply on 01.12.2008. The reply was considered by SRC in its 168th meeting held on 15th December 2008 and SRC decided to withdraw recognition to the D.T.Ed course for the following reasons: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As per the regulations dated 10.12.2007 the total built up area should be 1000 sq.mts. whereas the total built up area available is 7489 sq ft. or 696 sq.mts, which is less than the prescribed area as per NCTE norms.• As per para 8(10) of regulations dated 10.12.2007, no temporary structure / asbestos roofing shall be allowed, whereas, the institution has asbestos roof sheets for housing the institution.
----	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• As per Regulations, Norms and Standards published in the Gazette notification with effect from 10.12.2007 para 8(13) reads as follows:- “Whenever there are changes in the norms and standards for the course or training in teacher education, the institution shall comply with the requirements laid down in the revised norms and standards immediately but not later than the date of commencement of the next academic session, subject to conditions prescribed in the revised norms.” <p>Accordingly, recognition to the institution was withdrawn on 05.01.2009.</p> <p>The institution preferred an appeal under section 18 of NCTE Act. The Appellate Authority vide order dated 14.07.2009 remanded back the case to SRC, NCTE for necessary action.</p> <p>The committee considered the matter in its 181st meeting held on 20th-21st August 2009 and decided to cause inspection after payment of Rs.40000/- fees and submission of filled in Questionnaire. Accordingly a letter was issued to the institution on 04.09.2009. The institution submitted its reply on 02.02.2010. Inspection of the institution was conducted between 28th to 29th May 2010.</p> <p>The SRC in its meeting 193rd meeting held on 21st & 22nd June 2010 and the Committee considered the VT report of the institution, CD and other related documents and decided to continue the recognition of the institution for the D.T.Ed course.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a restoration of recognition was issued to institution on 27.07.2010.</p> <p>A court order dated 19.09.2017 in W.P.No.10857 of 2009 in the Hon'ble High Court of Madras filed by the institution received on 05.01.2018 and stating as under:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the prayer for this writ petition has become infructuous. He has also made an endorsement to that effect.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>2. In view of the submission and endorsement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this writ petitioner, this writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. No costs”.</i></p> <p>The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In this case, we had withdrawn recognition in 2009.2. Consequent upon remand of the case by the Appellate authority, we processed the case further, caused VT Inspection and restored recognition in 2010.3. The Court has now rejected their Writ Petition as infructuous.4. No action is pending.
--	--	---

		<p>5. Court order is noted. 6. Close the file.</p>
--	--	--

10	APS09060 B.Ed Sri Parasakthi College of Education for Women, Madurai, Tamil Nadu	<p>Sri Parasakthi College of Education for Women, No. 10 Vandiyur, East Anna Nagar, Madurai North, Madurai-625020, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>NCTE granted recognition to Sri Parasakthi College of Education for Women, Muthuramasamy Andal Educational and Social Trust, No. 10 Vandiyur, East Anna Nagar, Madurai North, Madurai-625020, Tamil Nadu for offering B.Ed course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students on 07.05.2009.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014, letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations, 2014 and seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted its willingness affidavit on 25.05.2015.</p> <p>Accordingly revised order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed course of two years duration, on 29.05.2015, with an intake of two units of 50 students each, with condition that the institution has not shifted to its own premises as stipulated in its formal recognition order dated 07.05.2009.</p> <p>The Institution submitted shifting proposal along with shifting fees of Rs. 1,50,000/- on 05/07/2016.</p> <p>The documents submitted by the institution were processed and placed before SRC in its 317th meeting held on 28th to 30th July 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Title to land is there. Land area is adequate.2. LUC/EC not given.3. BP is in order. It shows, built-up area is adequate.4. BCC is not given.5. Original FDRs not given.6. Faculty list-not given.7. Fee-paid in full.8. Cause Inspection9. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.10. Ask VT to Check in particular adequacy of facilities for B.Ed(2 units) <p>As per the decision of SRC, inspection intimation was sent to the institution through on-line VT module, VT Members Names were generated through On-line VT module.</p> <p>A letter dated 30.08.2016 received by this office on 31.08.2016 regarding Requesting for postponement of inspection.</p> <p>The SRC in its 324th meeting held on 07th to 08th December, 2016 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <p>Request for postponement is accepted. Cause Inspection by end of December-16.</p>
----	---	--

	<p>Process VT Inspection Report and put up. Visiting Team report was received on 23.01.2017. A letter dated 01.03.2017 received by this office on 01.03.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Our college Sri. Parasakthi College of Education for women is functioning at 10, East Annanagar, Madurai. We have applied for shifting the college from temporary premises at Madurai to premises at Madurai to permanent premises at S.Kottaipatti, Madurai District</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“A Team of two members inspection committee visited our college on 16.01.2017 and 17.01.2017. as per the instructions given by the Team, we have submitted the following original documents for your kind perusal.</p> <p>FDRs for 5 Lakhs, 3 Lakhs and 4 Lakhs (Original) Approved Building Plan (Original) Building Completion Certificate(Original) Building License by Thasildar (Original) Land Encumbrance Certificate (Original) Staff Approval of remaining six teen faculties(Original)”.</p> <p>A letter dated 05.08.2017 from Advocate, Sh. P. R. Gopinathan, received on 10.08.2017 reg Madras High Court Cases- W.P.No.10784 of 2004- filed by Prasakthi College of Education states as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“...I am to state that the case mentioned in the subject above had come up for Further Hearing on 01.08.2017. This case is a old one pertaining to the year 2004, wherein the petitioner Institution had prayed to process it's Application for Recognition dated 31.12.2003, under the Deeming Clause for insistence of NOC, as directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for Academic Year 2004-2005.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>I had submitted before the Hon'ble Court that nothing survives in this Writ Petition, since much water has flow pertaining to the change of Regulations, regarding Establishment/Recognition of Teacher Training Institutions and that NCTE Regulation,2014, which has been gazette on 01.12.2014 had come into effect and as of now had occupied the field. The Hon'ble Court, after hearing the either sides was pleased to record my above submissions and had further disposed off the above Writ Petition. I request the SRC to take cognizance of the Developments in the above matter. I have applied for a Certified copy of the above Order and the same would be dispatched to you, as and when I receive the same”.</i></p> <p>A Court order dated 01.08.2017 Writ Petition No.10784 of 2004 and WP.MP.No.12638 of 2004 and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“When the matter was listed before this court on 31.07.2017,there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner and hence, the matter was directed to be</i></p>
--	---

		<p><i>listed under the caption "For Dismissal" on 01.08.2017. When the matter is listed today, again there is also no representation for the petitioner either in person or through the learned .counsel on record. Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed for non- prosecution. No costs. Consequently, Connected miscellaneous petition is closed".</i></p> <p>The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The agenda note is not at all clear. 2.1. We do not know who filed W.P when and, for what purpose. 2.2. Be that as it may, the Court has dismissed the W.P. for non-prosecution. 3.1. Meanwhile, the case has progressed at our end. We had ordered VT Inspection. The Inspection was done. The VTI report has come. 3.2. The VT has also collected and submitted originals of the relevant documents. 4. Process and put up this RPRO (shifting) case.
11	<p>SRCAPP2016 30046 B.P.Ed 1Unit DNC Manivannan College of Physical Education, Dharmapuri, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>DNC Manivannan College of Physical Education, Elagiri Village, Nallampalli Taluk, Elagiri City, Dharmapuri District-636807,Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Sri Vijay Vidyalaya Educational Institutions, Elagiri Village, Nallampalli Taluk, Elagiri City, Dharmapuri District-636807,Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to DNC Manivannan College of Physical Education, Elagiri Village, Nallampalli Taluk, Elagiri City, Dharmapuri District-636807,Tamil Nadu for offering B.P.Ed course of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 27.05.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 02.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 04.07.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations was over. Hence, the application was processed. As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for B.P.Ed course in the State of Tamilnadu.</p> <p>The application was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and the same was placed before SRC in its 325th meeting held on 19th to 20th December, 2016 and the Committee decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title deed is there. 2. Land area is adequate; in 2 blocks of 2.86 acres each. This will cover the requirements of BPED (5 acres). 3. BP is not approved. Total built – up area is not shown. 4. BCC is approved. Built-up area is adequate.

5. LUC is in order.
6. EC is in order.
7. FDRs not paid.
8. Cause Inspection for BPED (1 unit).
9. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.

As per the decision of SRC, inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode during 08.02.2017 to 28.02.2017.

Inspection of the institution was conducted on 24.02.2017 and VT report (hard copy) was received by this office on 28.02.2017.

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

1. They have not given a duly approved Building plan.
2. They have also not given the NOC from the affiliating University. The Visiting Team Inspection report says 'It is under process'. But, the last date for its submission is long over.
3. Issue SCN accordingly.

Before issuance of Show Cause Notice, based on the website information of the SRC decision the institution has submitted a reply on 02.03.2017 and 13.03.2017 (hard copy).

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

1. The BP is not approved by competent authority.
2. NOC is not given within the prescribed time-limit. We have no authority to relax the time-limit.
3. Reject the application.
4. Return FDRs, if any.
5. Close the file.

As per the decision of SRC, a Rejection order was issued to the institution on 12.04.2017.

An office Memorandum received from NCTE Hq vide F.No.91-13th Mtg./2017-Appeal dated 19.06.2017 with a request to send the original file of DNC Manivannan College of Physical Education, Elagiri Village, Nallampalli Taluk, Elagiri City, Dharmapuri District-636807, Tamil Nadu.

On 21.06.2017, a letter was addressed to the Section Officer, Shri.R.C Chopra, NCTE, New Delhi. Forwarding (Original file) of records relating to DNC Manivannan College of

	<p>Physical Education, Dharmapuri District Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>The Appellate Authority vide No. F.No.89-316/E-2568/2017 Appeal/15th Meeting-2017 dated: 16.10.2017 received by this office on 23.10.2017 and 31.10.2017 the <i>Appeal Committee concluded to confirm the impugned refusal/rejection order dated 12.04.2017 issued by S.R.C., Bangalore.</i></p> <p>The appellate authority order was placed before SRC in its 347th meeting held on 16th to 17th November, 2017 and the Committee considered and decided to “noted the matter”.</p> <p>The institution submitted letter regarding requesting a copy of rejection order of the institution received by this office on 07.12.2017. The reply was sent to the institution along with a copy of rejection order on 15.12.2017.</p> <p>Now, a letter dated 07.01.2018 from Advocate, Shri P.R. Gopinathan has submitted the opinion through e-mail received by this office on 08.01.2018 and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“I am to state that the Counsel on record for the above mentioned Writ petition, had, on the directions of the Hon’ble Court, served with the copies of Affidavit and typed set of Papers, a copy of which I am enclosing with this letter for the Counsel’s Reference, Records and Due instructions.</p> <p>The above matter pertains to the prayer of the Petitioner to quash the impugned order passed by the RD/SRC/NCTE in SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP201630046/B.P.Ed/TN/2017-18/92805 dated 12.04.2017, which was confirmed in the appeal preferred by the petitioner by the NCTE, Head Quarters in F.No.89-316/E-2568/2017/Appeal/15th Meeting 2017 dated 16.10.2017 and further to direct the respondent to grant recognition to the petitioner college for the 2 year B.P.Ed. Degree course for the academic year 2018-19 by taking into account the building plan and the NOC from the state Government dated 17.05.2017.</p> <p>When the matter came up for Hearing on 5.1.2018, the Hon’ble Court had directed me to take notice and to get the necessary instructions/remarks as to the stand of the NCTE in granting Recognition for B.P.Ed. course for the Academic Year 2018-19, as the petitioner are already having the necessary documents, i.e. the Approved Building Plan and the NOC from the State Government.</p> <p>I have entered appearance on behalf of NCTE and pleaded before the Court to grant me 4 week time to get the necessary instruction. But the Hon’ble Court considering the circumstances mentioned above was pleased to grant a week time to get necessary instruction and to file either the form of Memo on instructions or a Counter Affidavit.</p> <p>After the perusal of the entire records, I am of the considered opinion that the</p>
--	--

		<p>NCTE can process the application of the petitioner for the grant of recognition for B.P.Ed., Course for the Academic Year 2018-19, as the petitioner had fulfilled in rectifying the two defects mentioned by the SRC and thereafter by the NCTE Head Quarters, subject to fulfilment of any other factors/grounds deemed necessary by the NCTE.</p> <p>I request the Council to take cognizance of the developments in the above matter and to forward me the required instructions and remarks, so that either a Memo of Instructions or a Draft Counter Affidavit can be prepared by me and thereafter forwarded to you for your necessary Approval, which can be submitted before the Hon'ble Court. The above matter is posted for orders 17.01.2018”.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The note from the Panel lawyer is seen. He has not sent a copy of the petition. 2.1. We had rejected this application mainly on the ground of non-submission of NOC within the prescribed time-limit. 2.2. The Appellate Authority has also confirmed our order. 3.1. The Panel lawyer now advises that we should accept the petition, process it and, grant FR w.e.f. 2018-19. 3.2. We do not agree with him. His advise is not acceptable. 3.3. In another similar case of Tamil Nadu, we had decided to go to the Supreme Court against the High Court order. Our lawyer (Shri. Harikrishnan) had also advised similar action. We accepted his advice. 4. Let us take a similar stand in this case. Oppose the petition on the same grounds.
12	<p>SRCAPP2016 30083 BA.B.Ed BSc.B.Ed 2Units Vallalar College of Education, Vellore, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>Vallalar College of Education, Karthikeyapuram Village, Melpatti Road, Gudiyattam Taluk, Karthikeyapuram City, Vellore District-635806, Tamilnadu</p> <p>Sri Meenachi Margabanthu Trust, Kamatchiamman pet , Pavala Street, Gudiyattam Taluk & City, Vellore District-632602,Tamilnadu applied for grant of recognition to Vallalar College of Education, Karthikeyapuram Village, Melpatti Road, Gudiyattam Taluk, Karthikeyapuram City, Vellore District-635806,Tamilnadu for offering B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 14.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed course in the</p>

State of Tamilnadu.

As per the direction, the application was scrutinized online along with hard copy and placed before SRC in its 326th Meeting held during 4th and 5th January, 2017. The Committee decided as under :-

- 1.A. NOC is given.
- 1.B. They have D.El.Ed.(1 unit) & B.Ed.(2 units). They want B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. (2 units).
2. They should clarify whether they want B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit) + B.Sc. B.Ed.(1 unit) or B.A.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Sc. B.Ed.(2 units).
3. Land document is in order.
4. LUC is in order.
5. EC is in order.
6. BP is in order.
7. BCC is in order. Built-up area available (2640 sq.mts.) is inadequate w.r.t. requirement(4500 sq.mts).
8. NOC is given.
9. Cause composite inspection for D.El.Ed.(1 unit), B.Ed.(2 units) and B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed.(2 units).
10. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.

As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations, 2014, the decision of the Committee to cause composite inspection was communicated to the V.T. Members through on-line mode on 12.01.2017.

The V.T. Members have given their acceptance for inspection of institution during 23.01.2017 to 12.02.2017.

On 19.01.2017, an e-mail has been received from Shri.M.Ramalingam,Chairman, Vallalar College of Education, Gudiyattam, Vellore District, Tamilnadu requesting for postponement of inspection as under :-

“ I submit that as per the decision of the Trust, we request the honorable Regional Director to postpone the visit of the visiting team to our institution as we have yet to fulfill the instructional and facilities and due to same unavoidable circumstance . Kindly cooperate and do the needful.”

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

1. The request for postponement is accepted. But, since VT inspection has already been ordered, if the vT has moved, the institution must bear the vcost of another VT inspection.
2. It should also be noted that, by this postponement, the institution runs the risk

		<p style="text-align: center;">of losing the opportunity for getting an FR w.e.f. 2017-18.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 07.12.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 07.12.2017.</p> <p>Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request. The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 07.02.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection. 2. Issue SCN. <p>The SRC in its 353rd meeting decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the 352nd meeting, it was decided to issue SCN to the institution for not taking any action to get the inspection conducted. 2. The case is taken up for reconsideration suo motu by the Committee today. In view of the (Supreme Court prescribed) 3rd March dateline for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19, there is a need to save time. 3. The applicant institution has paid the fee in full. This is proof enough of their intent to go through with the Inspection. 4. The problem was only with reference to the timing. They have had enough time to prepare for the inspection. 5. In supersession of the earlier decision to issue SCN, therefore, it is now decided to cause inspection. Please take action accordingly.
13	<p>SRCAPP2016 30078 M.Ed 1 Unit Annai Madha College of Education, Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>Annai Madha College of Education, Edaicheruvai Village, Trichy Main Road, Thittagudi Taluk, Edaicheruvai City, Cuddalore District-606106, Tamil Nadu</p> <p>Christhuva Madhakalvi Kalacharam Samuga Niruvanam, Thittagudi Village, No.50 West Street, Thittagudi Taluk & City, Cuddalore District-606106, Tamil Nadu had applied for grant of recognition to Annai Madha College of Education, Edaicheruvai Village, Trichy Main Road, Thittagudi Taluk, Edaicheruvai City, Cuddalore District-606106, Tamil Nadu for offering M.Ed course of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 15.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed. As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for M.Ed course in the State of</p>

Tamilnadu.

As per the direction, the application has been scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and documents. The matter was placed before SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th to 06th January, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. They have B.Ed.(2 units). They want M.Ed.(1 unit).
2. NAAC certificate not given.
3. NOC is given.
4. Land document – one page is missing. Sy.Nos. are same as for B.Ed. Land area is 0.60 acre.
5. LUC is given.
6. EC – latest EC required.
7. BP is in order.
8. BCC in original is required. Built-up area is adequate for B.Ed. (2 units) and M.Ed. (1 unit).
9. Cause composite inspection for B.Ed.(2 units) and M.Ed.(1 unit).
10. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.

As per the decision of SRC, and as per Regulations, 2014 inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode. VT Members names were generated through online VT module for inspection during the period on 08.02.2017 to 28.02.2017.

On 27, 28.02.2017 and 03.03.2017 an e-mail was received from the VT members Mr. Dr. Devinder Pratap Asija & Dr. Brijesh Kumar Pandey and stating as under:

“I, Dr. Brijesh Kumar Pandey VT ID. 409132 and Devinder Pratap Asija VT ID. 409043 have been appointed as the Visiting Team Member for Annai Madha College of Education, Edaicheruvai-Tehsil-Tamil Nadu ID:SRCAPP201630078. But I would like to your notice that since the day I received this below email i.e. 31st Jan, 2017. We have been constantly trying to contact the concerned person Mob: 94434339586. The mobile is either switched off or out of coverage area or the concerned person does not pick up the phone. Thus the phone goes unanswered. When the phone got connected he did not fix up the date of inspection on the pretext that he is not feeling well and is in the Hospital. In view of the above it is very humbly requested that NCTE may very kindly co-ordinate and fix up the date of inspection”.

As per directed an email sent to the institution on 15.03.2017 and stating as under:

Para 7(7) of the notification of NCTE, 2014 specifically mentions that inspection shall not be subject to the consent of the institution, rather the decision of the SRC to cause inspection shall be communication to the institute with the direction that the inspection shall be caused within stipulated time.

		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>In view of the above you are requested to co-operate with the VT member to Cause inspection within the stipulated time else it will be viewed seriously.</i></p> <p>The institution submitted reply through email on 22.03.2017. The SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th & 31st March, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“The request for extension of time for VT inspection is accepted subject to the clear understanding that they will lose the opportunity of being considered for FR w.e.f. 2017-18 because of the 2nd May (extended) time – limit prescribed by the Supreme Court.”</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 05.04.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 05.04.2017.</p> <p>Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 05.04.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection. 2. Issue SCN. <p>The SRC in its 353rd meeting decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the 352nd meeting, it was decided to issue SCN to the institution for not taking any action to get the inspection conducted. 2. The case is taken up for reconsideration suo motu by the Committee today. In view of the (Supreme Court prescribed) 3rd March dateline for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19, there is a need to save time. 3. The applicant institution has paid the fee in full. This is proof enough of their intent to go through with the Inspection. 4. The problem was only with reference to the timing. They have had enough time to prepare for the inspection. 5. In supersession of the earlier decision to issue SCN, therefore, it is now decided to cause inspection. Please take action accordingly.
14	SRCAPP2016 30127 BA.B.Ed BSc.B.Ed GET Integrated	<p>G E T Integrated College of Education, Plot No.30/1 & 30/2, V S Puram Village, Paradarami P.O, Vellore City & District-632603,Tamilnadu</p> <p>Guruvappa Naidu Educational Trust, V S Puram Village, Paradarami P.O, Vellore City & District-632603,Tamilnadu had applied for grant of recognition to G E T Integrated College of Education, Plot No.30/1 & 30/2, V S Puram Village, Paradarami P.O, Vellore</p>

College of Education, Vellore, Tamil Nadu	<p>City & District-632603,Tamilnadu for offering B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 14.06.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 14.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations was over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Tamilnadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and the same was placed before the Committee.</p> <p>The SRC in its 326th meeting held during 4th to 5th January, 2017 considered the scrutiny of the application and decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Title is in order.2. LUC is in order.3. EC refers to other Sy.Nos. also. There is a reference to 5 year lease which has been replaced by Gift Deed.4. BP is in order.5.1. BCC is in order. Built-up area is adequate for B.Ed.(2 units), M.Ed.(1 unit) and B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. (2 units)5.2. They should clarify whether they want B.A. B.Ed. (1 unit) + B.Sc. B.Ed.(1 unit) or B.A. B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Sc. B.Ed.(2 units)6. Fee paid.7. Cause composite inspection. <p>As per the decision of 326th meeting of SRC and as per Regulations, 2014, the decision of the Committee to cause composite inspection of the institution was communicated to the V.T. Members through on-line mode on 13.01.2017.</p> <p>On 15.01.2017, one of the VT Members has given acceptance for the visit of the institution. The visit schedule was during 24.01.2017 to 13.02.2017.</p> <p>On 22.01.2017, the other VT Member has rejected the visit of the institution.</p> <p>On 23.01.2017, a letter dated 20.01.2017 was received by this office from G.E.T. College of Education seeking postponement of inspection which is as under :-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“ We request the honorable Regional Director to kindly postpone the visit of the visiting team to our institution as we have yet to fulfill the instructional and infrastructural facilities due to some unavoidable circumstances. Kindly</i></p>
---	---

		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>cooperate and do the needful.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 328th meeting held on 321st January, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The request for postponement is accepted. But, since VT inspection has already been ordered, if the VT has moved, the institution must bear the cost of another VT inspection. 2. It should also be noted that, by this postponement, the institution runs the risk of losing the opportunity for getting an FR w.e.f. 2017-18. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 07.12.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 07.12.2017.</p> <p>Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 07.02.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection. 2. Issue SCN. <p>The SRC in its 353rd meeting decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the 352nd meeting, it was decided to issue SCN to the institution for not taking any action to get the inspection conducted. 2. The case is taken up for reconsideration suo motu by the Committee today. In view of the (Supreme Court prescribed) 3rd March dateline for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19, there is a need to save time. 3. The applicant institution has paid the fee in full. This is proof enough of their intent to go through with the Inspection. 4. The problem was only with reference to the timing. They have had enough time to prepare for the inspection. 5. In supersession of the earlier decision to issue SCN, therefore, it is now decided to cause inspection. Please take action accordingly.
15	SRCAPP2016 30198 BA.B.Ed 1Unit BSc.B.Ed 1Unit Arasu College	<p>Arasu College of Education for Women, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu</p> <p>Dr. P. N. Educational and Charitable Trust, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Arasu College of Education for Women, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006,</p>

of Education for Women, Karur, Tamil Nadu	<p>Tamil Nadu for offering B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.08.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.10.2016 and Reminder II on 11.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations was over. Hence, the application was processed. As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and the same was placed before the Committee.</p> <p>The SRC in its 327th Meeting held during 19th & 20th January, 2017 considered the scrutiny of the application and decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. NOC received2. Title is there. Land area is adequate.3. They have to clarify whether they want B.A.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Sc. B.Ed.(2 units) or B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit) + B.Sc. B.Ed.(1 unit).4. LUC is there.5. EC is not in original. Shows land is mortgaged.6. BP is approved. Built-up area shown 2543.19 sq.mts.7. BCC is approved. Built-up area shown is 2017.02 sq.mts. It is not clear whether the building is common for the existing B.Ed.(2 units)-APS08517 and this application for B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed.(SRCAPP2016). If it is the same, then, the built-up area is inadequate. They must clarify the position.8. FDRs – not given.9. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Accordingly, a Show Cause Notice was sent to the institution through online mode on 20.01.2017.</p> <p>The institution submitted reply to the Show Cause Notice along with relevant documents in hard copy on 27.01.2017 and in online on 30.01.2017.</p> <p>SRC in its 329th meeting held during 6th to 7th February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In this case, a lot of work remains to be completed.2. This case is not at all likely to materialize for consideration or issue of FR before 3.3.2017.3. The agenda note is also incomplete. Their reply to our SCN is also not
---	--

		<p style="text-align: center;">complete.</p> <p>4. Put up with a complete agenda note in April.</p> <p>The institution has submitted additional documents as Show Cause Notice Reply in hard copy on 07.02.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 330th meeting held on 12th & 13th February, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. These two cases have many things in common, same location, same Sy. No.s, same type of building, the 2 units linked in a L-shaped structure, same existing courses (i.e B.Ed , 2 units), same proposed courses (i.e B.A.B.Ed 1 unit + B.Sc.B.Ed – 1 unit).2. But, EC (dt 24.1.17) is differently shown. For one the no is 104 and for the other it is 105. Why should there be two different ECs for the same Sy.No.s, it is not clear.3. There is one EC covering Sy.No. 867 for which there are no documents. The relevance of this EC needs to be explained.4. The built-up area required in each case is 5000 sq.mtrs (2000 sq.mtrs for B.Ed 2 units + 1500 sq.mtrs for B.A.B.Ed – 1 unit + 1500 sq.mtrs for B.Sc.B.Ed – 1 unit)5. The built-up area shown to be available for Arasu College is only 2543.19 sq.mtrs which is very inadequate. They cannot make up by additional construction because the Building Plan permits only 2543.19 sq.mtrs of built-up area.6. The built-up-area shown to be available for the Ponkalamman case is 4560.21 sq. mtrs (2543.19 +2017.02 sq. mtrs). This is inadequate against the requirement of 5000 sq. mtrs . But, it is not clear wherefrom the extra 2017.02 sq. mtrs come since both the building units are shown to be of the same size and shape. In this case also, they cannot make up for the deficit through addl. construction because the Building Plan permits only 2543.19 sq. mtrs of built up area.7. According to NCTE(HQ), we cannot give more than 2 units of B.Ed to a TEI since that is the stipulation in the Regulations. Both these TEIs already have 2 units of B.Ed. Whether the 2 units of B.Ed in the 2 integrated courses proposed will add to the already existing 2 units or not is not clear. We may have to seek clarification form NCTE(HQ).8. All in all, these two cases are too complex. Various legal and documentary issues need to be resolved. We will have to get a composite inspection organized with a detailed list of points for verification by VT.9. Cause such a composite inspection.
--	--	---

10. Since the computer programme reportedly is not amenable for issuing such guidelines to VT members, RD is advised to write separate letter to the VT members giving guidelines strictly according to the minute of the SRC.

As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations 2014 inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode. VT Members names were generated through On-line VT module for inspection during the period on 12.03.2017 to 01.04.2017, as per the decision of SRC 330th meeting decision was informed to the VT members through on-line on 02.03.2017.

Now, the institution has submitted a letter through on-line on 27.03.2017, stated as under:-

“...With reference cited above the subject we would like to submit the following grounds.

1. Our institution is granted to conduct the examination center of Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamilnadu and also Tamil University, Thanjavur, Tamilnadu.

2. The academic Examination work for theory as well as practical is going on in our center (College).

We request you to kindly postpone the inspection formalities until the examination is over, May 2017.”

The SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th & 31st March, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

- “The request for extension of time for VT inspection is accepted subject to the clear understanding that they will lose the opportunity of being considered for FR w.e.f. 2017-18 because of the 2nd May (extended) time – limit prescribed by the Supreme Court.”

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 05.04.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 05.04.2017.

Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request.

The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:

1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 05.04.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection.
2. Issue SCN.

		<p>The SRC in its 353rd meeting decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the 352nd meeting, it was decided to issue SCN to the institution for not taking any action to get the inspection conducted.2. The case is taken up for reconsideration suo motu by the Committee today. In view of the (Supreme Court prescribed) 3rd March dateline for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19, there is a need to save time.3. The applicant institution has paid the fee in full. This is proof enough of their intent to go through with the Inspection.4. The problem was only with reference to the timing. They have had enough time to prepare for the inspection.5. In supersession of the earlier decision to issue SCN, therefore, it is now decided to cause inspection. Please take action accordingly.
--	--	---

16	SRCAPP2016 30201 BA.B.Ed 1Unit BSc.B.Ed 1Unit Ponkalias n College of Education, Karur, Tamil Nadu	<p>Ponkaliasman College of Education, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Dr. P. N. Educational and Charitable Trust, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Ponkaliasman College of Education, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu for offering B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.08.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.10.2016 and Reminder II on 11.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Tami Nadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application of the institution along with the hard copy was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and placed before SRC in its 327th meeting held on 19th to 20th January, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. NOC is given.2. Title is there.3. They have to clarify whether they want B.A.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit)+B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit).4. LUC is there.5. EC is not in original. Shows land is mortgaged.6. BP is approved. Built-up area shown is 2543.13 sq.mts.7. BCC is approved. Built-up area shown in 2017.02 sq.mts. It is not clear whether the building is common for the existing B.Ed.(2 units) –APS08517- and this case(SRCAPP30201). If it is the same, then, the built-up area is inadequate. They must clarify the position.8. FDRs not given.9. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.10. They have 4 cases –APS08517, APS08321, SRCAPP30198 and SRCAPP30201. We must see all together. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution through online mode on 20.01.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted a reply in online mode and in hard copy on 10.02.2017. The institution has not uploaded supporting documents in online.</p>
----	---	---

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

1. *These two cases have many things in common, same location, same Sy. No.s, same type of building, the 2 units linked in a L-shaped structure, same existing courses (i.e B.Ed, 2 units), same proposed courses (i.e B.A.B.Ed 1 unit + B.Sc.B.Ed – 1 unit).*
- 2.1 *But, EC (dt 24.1.17) is differently shown. For one the no is 104 and for the other it is 105. Why should there be two different ECs for the same Sy.No.s, it is not clear.*
- 2.2. *There is one EC covering Sy.No. 867 for which there are no documents . The relevance of this EC needs to be explained.*
3. *The built-up area required in each case is 5000 sq.mtrs (2000 sq.mtrs for B.Ed 2 units + 1500 sq.mtrs for B.A.B.Ed – 1 unit + 1500 sq.mtrs for B.Sc.B.Ed – 1 unit)*
- 4.1 *The built-up area shown to be available for Arasu College is only 2543.19 sq.mtrs which is very inadequate. They cannot make up by additional construction because the Building Plan permits only 2543.19 sq.mtrs of built-up area.*
- 4.2 *The built-up-area shown to be available for the Ponkalamman case is 4560.21 sq. mtrs (2543.19 +2017.02 sq. mtrs). This is inadequate against the requirement of 5000 sq. mtrs. But, it is not clear wherefrom the extra 2017.02 sq. mtrs come since both the building units are shown to be of the same size and shape. In this case also, they cannot make up for the deficit through addl. construction because the Building Plan permits only 2543.19 sq. mtrs of built up area.*
5. *According to NCTE(HQ), we cannot give more than 2 units of B.Ed to a TEI since that is the stipulation in the Regulations. Both these TEIs already have 2 units of B.Ed. Whether the 2 units of B.Ed in the 2 integrated courses proposed will add to the already existing 2 units or not is not clear. We may have to seek clarification form NCTE(HQ).*
- 6.1 *All in all, these two cases are too complex. Various legal and documentary issues need to be resolved. We will have to get a composite inspection organized with a detailed list of points for verification by VT.*
- 6.2 *Cause such a composite inspection.*
7. *Since the computer programme reportedly is not amenable for issuing such guidelines to VT members, RD is advised to write separate letter to the VT members giving guidelines strictly according to the minute of the SRC*

As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations 2014 inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode. VT Members names were generated through On-line VT module for inspection during the period on 12.03.2017 to 01.04.2017, as per the decision of SRC 330th meeting decision was informed to the VT members through on-line on 02.03.2017.

A letter dated 27.03.2017, an email was received by this office on 27.03.2017 from P.K. College of Education and stating as under:-

“With reference cited above the subject we would like to submit the following grounds.

1. *Our institution is granted to conduct the examination centre of Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu and also Tamil University, Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu.*
2. *The academic examination work for theory as well as practical is going on in our center (college).*
3. *We request you to kindly postpone the inspection formalities until the examination is over, may 2017”.*

The institution request was placed before the SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th to 31st March, 2017. The committee observed the matter and decided as under:-

- The request for extension of time for VT inspection is accepted subject to the clear understanding that they will lose the opportunity of being considered for FR w.e.f. 2017-18 because of the 2nd May (extended) time –limit prescribed by the Supreme Court.

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 05.04.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 05.04.2017.

Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request.

The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:

1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 05.04.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection.
2. Issue SCN.

The SRC in its 353rd meeting decided as under:

- 1. In the 352nd meeting, it was decided to issue SCN to the institution for not taking any action to get the inspection conducted.**
- 2. The case is taken up for reconsideration suo motu by the Committee today. In view of the (Supreme Court prescribed) 3rd March dateline for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19, there is a need to save time.**
- 3. The applicant institution has paid the fee in full. This is proof enough of their intent to go through with the Inspection.**
- 4. The problem was only with reference to the timing. They have had**

		<p>enough time to prepare for the inspection.</p> <p>5. In supersession of the earlier decision to issue SCN, therefore, it is now decided to cause inspection. Please take action accordingly.</p>
--	--	---