

24	SRCAPP2016 30142	B.A.B.Ed/ B.Sc.B.Ed	Sadasivam Kathirkamavalli College of Arts and Science, Thiruvar, Tamilnadu	TN	<p>1. This case was rejected by us. The Appellate Authority confirmed our order. The learned single judge of the H.C. also rejected the W.P..</p> <p>2. Our rejection order was w.r.t. various deficiencies;</p> <p>(i) The affiliating body's NOC was not attached to the application as required under the Regulation.</p> <p>(ii) Built-up area was inadequate.</p> <p>(iii) The applicant did not have clear title to the land, on the date of application, which was violative of the Regulations.</p> <p>(iv) The applicant also did not have clear title to land on the date of application.</p> <p>3.1. The Hon. H.C. rejected the W.P. on these very objections and gave permission to the applicant to apply afresh by following the mandatory requirements.</p> <p>3.2. No fresh application has been filed. It is to be noted here that there is a statutory procedure prescribed in the 2014 Regulations for filing applications.</p> <p>4.1. Knowing that it will not be possible for them to file a fresh application at this stage, they have filed the Writ Appeal.</p> <p>4.2. The Writ Appeal makes factually erroneous observations;</p> <p>(i) There is no provision in law for granting personal hearing in the SRC proceedings. They are misleadingly citing a wrong provision.</p>
----	---------------------	------------------------	--	----	--

**358<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SRC**  
**01<sup>st</sup> – 03<sup>rd</sup>, March, 2018**

					<p>(ii) There is no force in the observation that the Respondent had not considered the VT Inspection Report. The VT Insp Report was considered, along with other records, in the 333<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the SRC on 24.3.17. It is that meeting that the following deficiencies were highlighted ;</p> <p>(i) NOC was submitted belatedly. (ii) There were encumbrances on the applicant's title to the lands. (iii) Built –up area was inadequate.</p> <p>5.The Supreme Court has prescribed 3.3.18 as the last date for issuing FRs w.e.f. 2018-19. That being so, it will not be possible for the SRC to consider this case now for issue of FR w.e.f.2018-19.</p> <p>6.It has also to be submitted in this context that there is a statutorily prescribed sequence for processing the case. It is not open to applicants to rectify deficiencies at their convenience and ask for reconsideration of their case.</p> <p>7.Advise the lawyer accordingly w.r.t. the hearing on 5.3.18</p>
25	SRCAPP2135	B.Ed	Schram College of Education, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu	TN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Appellate Authority has confirmed our order.</li> <li>2. Their order is noted.</li> </ol>
26	SRCAPP3474	D.El.Ed-AI 1 Unit	Little Rose College of Education & Little Rose College of Elementary Education, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh	AP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a case for D.El.Ed-AI (1 Unit).</li> <li>2. Their M.Ed (1 unit) case is being dealt with separately (SRCAPP14786) and is under SCN.</li> <li>3. In this case they have given a reply on 16.1.18 to our LOI dt.15.1.18.</li> </ol> <p>4.1. The Faculty list is not in original ; it is</p>

**358<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SRC**  
**01<sup>st</sup> – 03<sup>rd</sup>, March, 2018**

					<p>only a photocopy.</p> <p>4.2. Also, it is not approved by the Competent authority. Only the Principal of the College has approved it.</p> <p>4.3. Details of the Faculty are also not uploaded on the website.</p> <p>5. Issue SCN accordingly.</p>
27	SRCAPP2016 30219	M.Ed 1 Unit	Sathyasai B.Ed College , Thiruvallur, Tamilnadu	TN	<p>1. We issued LOI for M.Ed. (1 Unit) on 2.3.18. But, the decision was uploaded on our website on 24.2.18 itself.</p> <p>2. The College also had taken advantage of this facility to approach the TNTEU straightaway.</p> <p>3.1. But, because of rush of work reportedly the TNTEU has not been able to take up their case.</p> <p>3.2. In the event, they have requested for 30 days more time.</p> <p>4.1. Unfortunately, SRC can not give such extension of time without reference to the 3.3.18 time limit prescribed by the Supreme Court for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19.</p> <p>4.2. We can certainly give them time till 31.12.18. Only, in that Case their application can be considered for issue of FR with effect only from 2019-20.</p> <p>5. Issue SCN to them accordingly.</p>

28	APSO3254	B.Ed	Annai Fathima Teacher Training College for Women, Erode, Tamilnadu	TN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This is a very old case.</li><li>2.1. The Court had given interim stay of our order for issue of SCN only for two weeks on 8.9.10.</li><li>2.2. Strictly speaking, therefore, the stay should have automatically vacated on 23.9.10.</li><li>2.3. Check with the lawyer whether it was further extended by the Court. If it was not, we can be accused of sleeping over the matter for 7 years.</li><li>3. Check with the affiliating University (TNTEU) whether this College continues to have affiliation ; and, whether there are any complaints against them even now.</li><li>4. If the University still has any complaints, we should revive the action for SCN.</li><li>5.1. Was this college given a RPRO letter ?.</li><li>5.2. If so, we should now take this up, along with the other pending RPRO cases, for processing towards issue of a fresh FR under the 2014 Regulations.</li></ol>
----	----------	------	---	----	--

29	SRCAPP2016 30048	B.Ed-AI	S.V.I College of Education, Pudukottai, Tamil Nadu	TN	<p>1.1. This is a case for the applicant to get a B.Ed-AI (1 unit) programme.</p> <p>1.2. Separately, they have applied for M.Ed (1 Unit) also.</p> <p>2. At some stage they went to the H.C to represent against some decision of ours.</p> <p>3.1. Even as the cases have been progressed at our end, as per the directions of the Court, the case in the court has taken a totally different turn !.</p> <p>3.2. We are under orders to inspect, process and, take appropriate decisions within a given time-frame.</p> <p>3.3. At the same time, based on a wide variety of data Collected and analysed, the court is even considering to order a HALT to further enrolments of teacher-students.</p> <p>3.4. We should not, therefore, rush into decisions in this case.</p> <p>3.5. We may not be accused of deliberately delaying this case in this unusual situation.</p> <p>3.6. In any case, we can not straight away grant their applications because they did not have clear title to the land on the date of application. That they have subsequently redeemed the mortgage can not wipe out the initial infirmity.</p> <p>4. Request NCTE (HQ) to advise us on whether we should proceed to decide these cases notwithstanding the obiter</p>
----	---------------------	---------	---	----	---

					<p>dicta of the Hon. H.C.</p> <p>5. Apprise the NCTE (HQ) of the unusual developments in this case, as detailed in paragraph 3 above, and ask for advice on the further course of action. In fact, from this point of view, it will be more appropriate for the NCTE (HQ) to make submissions to the court than for the SRC (or, for that matter, any RC)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---