

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COMMITTEE  
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION  
BANGALORE

Minutes of the 346<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SRC held at the Conference Hall of  
NCTE, Bangalore on 24<sup>th</sup> – 25<sup>th</sup>, October, 2017.

The following persons attended the Meeting:-

- |   |   |                                 |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Sri. S. Sathyam                              | - | Chairman                        |
| 2. Dr. M.P. Vijaya Kumar                        | - | Member                          |
| 3. Prof. M.S. Lalithamma                        | - | Member (attended on 24.10.2017) |
| 4. Dr. K.S.Mani                                 | - | Member                          |
| 5. Dr. J.D.Singh                                | - | Member (attended on 24.10.2017) |
| 6. Dr. J. Prasad                                | - | Member                          |
| 7. Ms. Angelin Golda<br>Regional Director (I/c) | - | Convenor                        |

The following members did not attend the Meeting:

- Prof. K. Dorasami, Prof. Sandeep Ponnala and the Representatives of the Govts. of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana and Karnataka

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

Consideration of Court Cases, Processing of applications, Show Cause Notice reply and  
VT report: (Volume-1)

<p>1. SRCAPP2016 30157 M.P.Ed 1 unit Mother Terasa College of Physical Education, Pudukottai, Tamilnadu</p>	<p><b>Mother Terasa College of Physical Education, Veerapatti Village, Mettusalai, Illuppur Taluk, Veerapatti City, Pudukottai District-622102, Tamil Nadu</b></p> <p>Mother Teresa Educational Charitable Trust, Veerapatti Village, Mettusalai Street, Illuppur Taluk, Pudukottai City &amp; District-622102, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Mother Terasa College of Physical Education, Veerapatti Village, Mettusalai, Illuppur Taluk, Veerapatti City, Pudukottai District-622102, Tamil Nadu for offering M.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 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. 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 B.P.Ed course in the State of Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application has been scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and documents were placed before SRC in its 327<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. NOC not given.</li><li>2. Photocopy of title deed is given. Title is clear. We need a photocopy certified by the Sub-Registrar. Land area is adequate.</li><li>3. LUC is in order.</li><li>4. EC is in order.</li><li>5. BP is approved. Built-up area shown is 3364.31 sq.mts.</li><li>6. BCC is not approved by competent authority. Built up area shown is 3010 sq.mts.</li><li>7. FDRs not given.</li><li>8. Cause composite inspection.</li><li>9. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.</li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, inspection of the institution for M.P.Ed course was scheduled through online mode during 01.02.2017 to 21.02.2017. Two VT members have been given their acceptance for the visit.</p> <p>Hard copy of Visiting Team report was received on 22.02.2017. The SRC in its 331<sup>st</sup></p>
---	--

meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup>, February, 2017 directly considered the VT Report and decided as under:-

1. They have B.P.Ed. operating since 2008 (1 unit)
2. NOC is given.
3. Land area is inadequate: available is 6.3 acres as against a requirement of 8 acres.
4. Built-up area required is 2700 sq.mts; available is 3010 sq.mts.
5. FDRs in original are required for verification.
6. Issue SCN for rejection.

Before issuance of Show Cause Notice, in the meantime based on the website information of the SRC decision; the institution has submitted a reply on 07.03.2017 (hard copy) along with LUC, Affidavit & original FDRs.

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

1. Their reply relating to land area and FDRs are seen.
2. FDRs @7+5 lakhs per programme, per unit, are required.
3. The NOC given is only for B.P.Ed., not for M.P.Ed.
4. Issue Show Cause Notice for rejection.

Before issuance of SCN, based on the website information of the SRC decision, the institution has submitted representation through e-mail on 04.04.2017 and hard copy received on 04.04.2017.

The reply was placed before SRC in its 335<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. The NOC is from the State Govt. and not from the affiliating body.
2. Reject the application.
3. Return FDRs, if any.
4. Close the file.

As per the decision of SRC, a Rejection order was issued to the institution on 20.04.2017

An e-mail dated 19.06.2017 received by R. C. Chopra Section Officer NCTE, regarding Brief and records of Regulatory files No.91-13<sup>th</sup> on 20.06.2016.

A letter was addressed to R. C. Chopra Section Officer NCTE along with Original File/records on 21.06.2017.

The Appellate Authority vide No.89-317/E-2576/2017 Appeal/13<sup>th</sup> meeting - 2017 dated

21.08.2017 was received by this office on 29.08.2017 and the committee concluded that:-

"AND WHEREAS the impugned refusal order dated 20.04.2017 on the ground that NOC is from the State Government and not from the affiliating body is therefore, substantiated. Recommendation of State Government is obtained by Regional Committee under clause 7(4) of the regulations whereas under clause 5(3) the onus of obtaining and submitting NOC issue by affiliating body rests with the applicant institution. Appeal Committee, noting that NOC was not submitted by appellatant institution, decided to confirm the refusal order dated 20.04.2017.

AND WHEREAS after perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, the documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Committee concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition and therefore, the appeal deserved to be rejected and the order of the SRC is confirmed."

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

An e-mail received from Advocate Shri. M.T.Arunan on 12.09.2017. A letter addressed to the Advocate Shri. M.T.Arunan regarding W.P.No. 23935 of 2017 filed by Mother Teresa College of Physical Education, Pudukottai Dist. Tamil Nadu on 12.09.2017.

The institution submitted its written representation on 21.09.2017 along with a copy of court order dated 14.09.2017.

A court order dated 14.09.2017 received by this office on 27.09.2017 in the High Court of Judicature at Madras in W.P.No. 23935 of 2017 filed by Mother Teresa College of Physical Education, Pudukottai Dist. Tamil Nadu and stating as under:-

5. *"It is seen that the petitioner in pursuant to the order passed by the first respondent has sent a communication on 22.08.2017 informing that they have obtained the No Objection Certificate from the affiliating body apart obtained the same from the Government. If the petitioner has obtained the No Objection Certificate from the state Government and the affiliating body as well, I do not think that there will be any difficulty to the second respondent to re-consider the issue once again based on the said No Objection Certificate given by the affiliating body, since such was the only reason stated to reject the request of the petitioner*

6. *Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned orders are set aside. Consequently, the matter is remitted back to the second respondent (SRC-NCTE) for passing fresh order, after considering the No Objection Certificate issued by the affiliating body as well. Such exercise shall be done by the second respondent within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.*

		<p><b>The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. We had rejected their application for non-submission of NOC.</li><li>1.2 The Appellate Authority had confirmed our order.</li><li>1.3 But, the H.C quashed our order ; and directed us to consider the NOC submitted subsequently by them.</li><li>2.1 It will be difficult for us to accept this directive. We had rejected many many cases for non-submission of NOC within the stipulated date. Giving a different approach to this case will be unfair to all those cases.</li><li>2.2 We should, therefore, go up in appeal.</li></ol>
02	APS09442 D.El.Ed St. Marys College of Education, Mahabubnagar , Telangana	<p><b>St. Mary's College of Education No.8-2-217, Padmavathy Colony, Mahabubnagar - 509 002, Telangana.</b></p> <p>St. Mary's Vidyalaya Educational Society, Mahabubnagar, Andhra Pradesh submitted an application on 20.12.2007 to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to St. Mary's College of Education No.8-2-217, Padmavathy Colony, Mahabubnagar- 509 002 Andhra Pradesh for D.El.Ed Course. The application was processed and deficiency letter was issued to the institution on 01.04.08.</p> <p>The institution was given 90 days time to fulfill the deficiencies. The file closed as per MIS list.</p> <p>The institution filed a court case vide Writ petition No. 8865 of 2011 in the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, Andhra Pradesh verses NCTE-SRC, Principal Secretary, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh and The Director of School Education, Hyderabad as first, second and third respondents respectively.</p> <p>Hon'ble High Court of Judicature of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad after hearing the arguments of Advocate of Petitioner directed to issue Show Cause Notice on 01.04.2011 to respondents herein to show cause as to why this WP should not be admitted in the circumstances set out in the petition and affidavit filed in the WP. Post after two weeks.</p> <p>Hon'ble High Court of Judicature of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad passed an order in WP 8865 of 2011 on 21.04.2011. The WP was filed seeking a direction by way of Mandamus to declare the action of respondents in not considering the application of the petitioner society for grant of permission for running a D.Ed Course from the academic year 2011-12 as arbitrary and illegal.</p> <p>St. Mary's College of Education submitted an application dt.20.12.2007 seeking permission to run D.Ed Course. The application of the petitioner was processed and letter dt.01.04.2008 was issued to the college pointing out certain deficiencies. The grievance of the petitioner is that even though it is intending to comply with the</p>

objections and deficiencies pointed out by the respondents, the respondents are not acceding to the request of the petitioner.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner relied on a Judgment of this Court in the case of AP GIRIJANA SEVAKA SANGH vs National Council for Teacher Education and others, rendered in WP No. 6712 of 2009, "*Wherein a learned single judge of this Court has held that once an application is filed, it has to be considered with reference to the policy which was in force at the time when the application was made. He further contended that the respondents are not acceding to the request of the petitioner mainly on the ground of change in the policy, which is contrary to the aforesaid judgment on this court. As it is stated that the petitioner is yet to comply with the deficiencies pointed out in the letter dt. 01.04.2008, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the WP with a direction to the respondents to consider the request of the petitioner to start D.Ed Course as per policy which was in force at the time when the petitioner has applied for grant of permission to run the said course, subject to the petitioner complying with the objections/ deficiencies pointed out by the respondents in the letter dt 01.04.2008. Subject to the above directions, the W P is disposed of No costs.*"

The Court order along with file placed before SRC in its 206<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 09<sup>th</sup> & 10<sup>th</sup> June, 2010 considered the matter and decided to "*cause inspection and process on resubmission of the original application along with all the relevant documents as originally submitted along with this application.*"

A letter dt. 07.07.2011 was issued to the institution to submit the original application and related supporting documents within 30 days.

The institution submitted its reply vide letter dt. 15.07.2011, received in the office on 15.07.2011.

The inspection of the institution was conducted on 26.07.2011 and VT report and other related documents were received on 28.07.2011.


The SRC in its 210<sup>th</sup> meeting of SRC held on 22-23<sup>rd</sup> August 2011 considered the VT Report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and decided to serve show cause notice.

A show cause notice was issued to the institution on 02.11.2011. The institution submitted its written representation on 01.12.2011.

The SRC in its 216<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> January 2012, considered the matter and decided to issue show cause notice under Section 14/15 of NCTE Act.

A show cause notice was issued to the institution on 01.03.2012. The institution submitted its written representation on 23.05.2012, which was after stipulated time of 21 days.

The SRC in its 224<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2012 considered the show cause

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

notice reply and decided to issue "LOI." Accordingly, letter of intent was issued on 28.06.2012. The institution submitted its reply along with faculty list and relevant documents on 30.07.2012.

The SRC in its 230<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup> August, 2012 considered the LOI reply and decided to issue "formal recognition."

Formal Recognition order issued to the institution on 27.08.2012 with an annual intake of 50 (Fifty only) students from the session 2012-2013.

On 08.02.2016 a letter was received from the Director of School Education, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad vide No.Rc.No99/A/TE/TSCERT/2014 dated 06.02.2016, regarding the observations of the Affiliation Committee in respect of private D.El.Ed / B.Ed colleges in the State of Telangana along with the list of 76 colleges to SRC, NCTE for taking further necessary action under section 17 of the Act.

SI No	Deficiencies Observed	Number of colleges
1	Submitted Fake and Fabricated documents	35 (Existing) (Annexure 1A) 02 (New) (Annexure 1B)
2	Functioning in leased premises even after stipulated period	04 (Annexure II)
3	Shifting of College Premises without the permission of SRC NCTE	16 (Annexure III)
4	Submission of fake NOCs	15 (Annexure IV)
5	Not possessing land in the name of the society/Institution	04 (Annexure V)

The matter was placed before SRC in its 302<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 09<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> February, 2016, and the Committee considered the letter from the Director, School Education Department, Telangana State and decided that "What with the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 16 time-limit pressure on us, it is not possible to go into these complaints at this time. Process and put up after March 16".

As per the decision of SRC, the matter was again placed before SRC in its 309<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter in respect of (76 colleges) regarding not fulfilling the deficiencies and decided to issue show cause notice on the following ground:

- Submitted fake land document (Gift Settlement deed 1569/2011 of SRO, Mahabubnagar) with the inspection report.

Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 13.05.2016. The institution did not submit show cause notice reply even after the stipulated period.

The SRC in its 318<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> & 09<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 considered the matter and decided to withdraw recognition on the following grounds:

1. In 37 cases, the Director of School Education, Telangana, had commented adversely on the genuineness of the land documents furnished.
2. Based on that report, Show Cause Notices were issued to all the 37 applicants.
3. Replies to the Show Cause Notice have been received from 26 out of the 37 cases. These replies may be sent to the Director of School Education, Telangana, for their comments about the validity/genuineness of the land documents and their admissibility in these cases of the Teacher Education Institutions concerned.
4. In the remaining 11 cases, for failure to respond to the Show Cause Notice, action may be taken to withdraw recognition.
5. In those cases in which the applicants had forged the documents to make them appear as registered documents when in fact they were only unregistered, a reference should also be made to the Registration Office concerned for considering criminal action against the erring institutions.
6. Copy for information to the affiliating body—the SCERT, Govt. of Telangana.

Accordingly, a letter to the Director, SCERT was sent on 26.09.2016.

As per the decision of SRC, withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 26.10.2016.

An e-mail received from the Advocate Shri K. Ramakanth Reddy, along with the WP filed by the institution on 22.09.2017.

Accordingly, as directed the brief of the institution was sent to the Advocate on 22.09.2017.

On 28.09.2017 the institution submitted its written representation along with Court Order in WP No. 32426 of 2017 dated 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2017 by High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad. The Hon'ble Court Order stated as under:

*"...It is a case of the petitioners that the second petitioner is an Educational Institution running from the year 2012 offering D.Ed., courses. In the year 2016, notices were issued to the petitioners alleging that the college's Gift Settlement Deed, which has been filed evidencing the property rights, is a fake one and on the said ground, the permission granted to the petitioner-institution was withdrawn. Thereafter, petitioners approached the respective registration authorities and obtained re-registration with respect to the property and thus they rectified the alleged deficiency. After making good of the deficiency by rectifying the deeds, petitioners made representations on 20.12.2016 and 22.03.2016 to restore the recognition granted. Though several representations made, they are not being considered, the petitioners are seek a writ of mandamus to declare that action of the respondents in not considering the explanation/representations*

		<p>of the petitioner's society dated 01.07.2016j, 29.11.2016, 20.12.2016, 20.02.2017 and 22.03.2017 as illegal and arbitrary.</p> <p>2. Sri. K. Ramakanth Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that the representations would be considered in accordance with law.</p> <p>3. In the light of the respective submissions, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to pass appropriate orders on the representations of the petitioners, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.</p> <p>4. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition, shall stand closed. No costs.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. In accordance with the court order, the case is taken up for consideration of their representation dated 01.07.2016 and 22.03.2017.</b></li><li><b>2. They claim that their title deed is genuine. The SCERT declared it to be fake because of delay in uploading such documents in their websites by the concerned Sub-Registrar.</b></li><li><b>3. As was done in the other such cases, let us send the title document in this case to the concerned sub-Registrar for authentication</b></li></ol>
03	SRCAPP 14691 B.Ed-AI SRCAPP 14690 BA.BEd., BSc.BEd The Kavery College of Education, Salem, Tamilnadu	<p><b>The Kavery College of Education, Plot No.143/2, 165, M. Kalippatti Village &amp; Post, Mettur Taluk, Mecheri Town, Salem District-636453, Tamilnadu.</b></p> <p>The Kaavery Educational Trust, Plot No.143/2, 165, M.Kalipatti Road, M.Kalipatti Village &amp; Post, Mettur Taluk, Mecheri Town, Salem District-636453, Tamilnadu has applied for grant of recognition to The Kavery College of Education, Plot No.143/2, 165, M. Kalippatti Village &amp; Post, Mettur Taluk, Mecheri Town, Salem District-636453, Tamilnadu for offering BA.B.Ed/BSc.B.Ed course for four years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2015. The institution 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. A letter was sent to State Government for recommendation on 21.07.2015.</p> <p>Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p>

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

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

1. The institution has not submitted NOC from affiliating body.
2. The hard copy of application is not duly signed by the applicant on every page as per Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014.

The SRC in its 292<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 on careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other related documents, the Regional Committee decided to issue Show Cause Notice for 'Rejection' of the application on the following ground:

- Non Submission of NOC issued by the affiliating body along with application.

Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 21.10.2015. The institution has submitted its written representation on 10.11.2015 and stating as follows:

*".....our Trust has decided to introduce the 4 years duration of BSc.B.Ed/BA.B.Ed course as per the NCTE Regulation 2014 (Recognition Norms and Procedures) from the academic year 2016-17 onwards.*

*We have applied to the Government for the Grant of NOC-No Objection Certificate on 22.06.2015. But till now, we have not received NOC from the affiliating body i.e. Tamil Nadu Government, Higher Education Department.*

*In this regard, we have received Show Cause Notice from National Council for Teachers Education, Bangalore for Non Submission of "No Objection Certificate" issued by the concerned affiliating body and take final decision on our application within a month.*

*The concerned issuing authority, i.e the honorable Vice Chancellor of Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University post is vacant for the past few months. Because of that, the file is till pending in the University office. Hence, we are unable to get NOC from the concerned authority. Since, the institution is an on-going institution without any remarks, the issuance of recognition order for New Courses will improve the efficiency of institution to serve better to the society.*

*Hence, we request you to accord approval to introduce the 4 years duration of BSc.B.Ed/BA.B.Ed courses as a special case and issue necessary permission at the earliest".*

The SRC in its 294<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> November, 2015 considered the matter and it has decided to reject the application for the following ground:

1. Reply not satisfactory.
2. Refuse and close the file.

As per the decision of SRC, refusal order was issued to the institution on 22.12.2015.

Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE Hqrs and the appellate authority vide order no.F.No.89-142/2016 Appeal/6<sup>th</sup> Meeting-2016 dated 09.06.2016 has stated as follows:

*".....the committee noted that according to the provisions of Clause 5(3) of the NCTE Regulations,, 2014, No Objection Certificate issued by the concerned affiliating university has to be sent along with the application. Since the appellant has not fulfilled this requirement, the committee concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition and therefore, the appeal deserved to be rejected and the order of the SRC confirmed.*

*AND WHEREAS after perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, the documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the committee concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition and therefore, the appeal deserved to be rejected and the order of the SRC is confirmed.*

*NOW THEREFORE, the council hereby confirms the order appealed against".*

The same was placed before SRC in its 317<sup>th</sup> meeting held 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 considered the matter and decided to "noted the matter"

On 05.11.2016, this office received a court notice dated 12.09.2016 in W.P No. 31596 of 2016 filed by the institution in the Hon'ble High Court of Madras at Chennai praying for a direction to the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent (Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University) to grant NOC to the institution for starting B.A.B.Ed, B.Sc.B.Ed (4 years integrated course) and B.Ed-AI (2 years course). SRC, NCTE is the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in the writ petition filed.

An e-mail was sent to the advocate Shri. M.T.Arunan on 05.11.2016. with a request to defend the case on behalf of NCTE. The matter is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras.

An e-mail was received from advocate Ms. Sonali Malhoutra, regarding to provide parawise commence and to contest the case in the Hon'ble court on behalf of NCTE on 17.02.2017 and 28.02.2017. Reply sent to advocate Ms. Sonali Malhoutra, along with brief of the case on 06.03.2017.

A letter was addressed to the advocate Ms. Sonali Malhoutra in W.P.(C) No. 1594 of 2017 titled by the kavery College of Education, Salem along with duly signed one set of Counter Affidavit on 20.03.2017.

The institution submitted a letter dated 20.04.2017 received by this office on 25.04.2017 along with documents.

An e-mail was received from advocate Ms. Sonali Malhoutra, regarding that the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents on 21.09.2017.

Now, the institution submitted a letter dated 11.10.2017 received by this office on 13.10.2017 along with order of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and stating as under:-

*"We have proposed to start 4 year integrated programme leading to B.A.B.Ed., B.Sc.B.Ed and B.Ed-Additional Intake from the academic year 2016-17 in The Kavery College of Education, Mecheri, Salem – 636453 and accordingly we have submitted all the necessary documents to the Southern Regional Office, NCTE, Bangalore and Tamil Nadu Teacher Education University, Chennai.*

*As per the reference 2 above we have requested the Southern Regional Office, NCTE, Bangalore for the inspection and approval to start the course 2017-18. Even after the lapse of about 4 months the NCTE has not deputed the VT for inspection and to accord the approval to start the courses from 2017-18.*

*In these circumstances we have been compelled to approach the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and we have received the favourable orders for starting the courses form 2017-18.*

*The Kavery College of Education is functioning for the past 10 years and also it is NAAC accredited one and it is serving for the betterment of rural students. Hence we request you to kindly depute the Visiting Team for inspection immediately and accord approval for starting the 4 year integrated B.A.Ed., B.Sc.B.Ed courses and also B.Ed – Additional intake from the academic year 2017-18."*

The Court order stating as under:-

- 1. The petitioner seeks a prayer for quashing of the order passed by respondent No.2 dated 22.12.2015 and dated 09.06.2016 passed by respondent No.1; he is seeking a direction that respondent No.2 be directed to process the application for B.A./B.Sc.B.Ed and B.Ed. Additional courses of the petitioner institution for the academic sessions 2017-18.*
- 2. Counter affidavit has been filed.*
- 3. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner points out that his case is covered by the judgment in LPA No. 535/2017 National Council for Teacher*

		<p><i>Education and Anr. Vs. Rambha College of Education delivered on 09.08.2017. Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that in a similar situation where the facts were identical, the learned Single Judge had remanded the matter to the Appellate Authority (Respondent No. 1) for a re-consideration and this would be for the current academic session i.e. 2017-18.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. <i>Record shows that the issue was the non-filing of the hard copy of the No Objection Certificate (NOC). The fact that the same issue had been decided in the case of Rambha College of Education is not in dispute. This court allows the prayer made in the writ petition directing respondent No.1 to decide the case of the petitioner (de-hors this objection) in the first meeting of respondent No. 2</i></li><li>5. <i>With these directions, petition disposed of.</i></li></ol> <p><b>The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>The Delhi H.C order is noted.</b></li><li>2. <b>The direction is not easy to comprehend. The direction is to Resp.1.; but, the reference is to "...the first meeting of Resp.2."</b></li><li>3.1 <b>Obtain a copy of the other case cited i.e., the case of the Rambha College of Education.</b></li><li>4. <b>They have now produced a NOC issued by the TNTEU w.r.t. the directive given to them by the Madras High Court. Whether we can take into account a NOC submitted so long after the last date prescribed is a moot point. In the case of Mother Teresa College of Physical Education (SRCAPP30157) we had decided to go up in appeal since giving recognition to a delayedly submitted NOC only in this case ( albeit w.r.t. a court order) will be unfair to the many many cases we had rejected on this ground. Prepare for filing an appeal in this case also.</b></li></ol>
04	APS05859 D.Ed 1 Unit Brilliant D.Ed College, Kolar District, Karnataka	<p><b>Brilliant D.Ed. College, Manjunatha Nagar, Oorgaumpet, K.G.F, Kolar District - 563121, Karnataka.</b></p> <p>The Brilliant Educational Society, Kolar District, Karnataka had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Brilliant D.Ed College, Manjunatha Nagar, Oorgaumpet, KGF, Kolar District-563121, Karnataka for D.Ed course of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students from the academic session 2007-2008 and was granted recognition on 17.09.2007 with the condition to shift to its own premises/building within three years from the date of recognition ( in case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>A complaint letter dated 25.05.2009 was received from the Director, DSERT on 29.05.2009 was considered in the SRC 177<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 22-23 June, 2009 and decided to issue a Show cause Notice to the institution under Section 17 of NCTE Act and Notice was served on 10.8.2009.</p> <p>The institution submitted its written representation on 19.11.2009 which was placed</p>

before 188<sup>th</sup> meeting of SRC held during 28-29 January, 2010. The Committee decided to withdraw recognition for the following reasons:-

1. There is a discrepancy between the building plan and building completion certificate in terms of built up space.
2. Built-up space is inadequate as per the records provided by the institution itself.

As per the decision of SRC, withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 4.3.2010.

The institution preferred an appeal against the order of SRC confirmed the SRC's order vide order F.No.89-529/2010-Appeal dated 19.11.2010.

The SRC in its 199<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 22-23 December, 2010 noted the Appellate authority order.

On 20.09.2013, a Court Order dated 4<sup>th</sup> September 2013 was received from the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore in W.P.No.32705/2013 filed by Dr.M.D.Iqbal Shariff Secretary, Brilliant D.Ed College wherein the Director, D.S.E.R.T is the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent, the Principal, DIET, Kolar is the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, NCTE, Bangalore is the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, NCTE, New Delhi is the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent and the Chief Secretary, Education Dept. Govt. of Karnataka, Bangalore is the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent.

On 3.9.2013, this office received a letter dated 17.8.2013 along with a copy of the W.P.NO. 7106/ 2013 filed by the institution from the Karnataka Secondary Education Examination Board.

On 20.09.2013, the interim order of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore dated 4.9.2013 (copy enclosed) in W.P.No. 32705 of 2013 was received by this office which is as under:-

*"Learned AGA is directed to take notice for R1, R2 & R5.*

*M/s.Haranahalli&Patil, learned advocates are directed to take notice for R3 & R4.*

*Interim stay of Annexures-L & N, for a period of three weeks.*

*Post after two weeks."*

A letter was addressed to the then advocate, Shri. Ashok Haranahalli on 21.10.2013 for vacating the interim stay granted to the institution and also for defending the case in W.P.NO.7106/2013 is filed by the institution.

The SRC in its 254<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25-27 October 2013 noted the matter.

On 24.02.2014, an interim order dated 3.02.2014 in W.P.32705 of 2013 (EDN-REG-P) was received by SRC wherein the Hon'ble Court made the following order :-

*"Interim order is extended till the next date of hearing"*

Accordingly, a letter to Shri. P.S. Dinesh Kumar, Advocate along with copy of interim order dt.03.02.2014 was sent on 30.06.2014.

On 04.07.2014, a court notice in W.P.No.32705/2013 dated 24.02.2014 was received by SRC. A reminder was sent on 31.07.2014 Shri.P.S.Dinesh Kumar, Advocate.

Another interim order in W.P.No.34822-34872/2014 dated 21.07.2014 was received by SRC on 30.07.2014.

The interim order dated 21.07.2014 is as under:-

*"Sri P.S.Dinesh Kumar, learned counsel to accept notice for respondent No.5 Learned counsel for the petitioner to srev petition papers on the learned Counsel for the respondents.*

*In the meanwhile respondent Nos2 and 3 (Director, SCERT and Principal, DIET) are directed to permit the students appearing through the petitioner institution to appear for D.Ed course examinations in Telugu medium for the academic year 2013-14. The same shall however remain subject to the result of these petitions and petitioner college nor the students shall claim equity in the event of failing in the petitioner.*

*Respondent Nos 2 and 3 may also collect the examination fee and penalty, if any, which is also subject to the result of the petitions."*

Accordingly, a letter was sent to Shri.P.S.Dinesh Kumar, Advocate on 07.08.2014.

In the meantime, State Government Higher Education Department letter was received by SRC on 05.08.2014 and 17.09.2014 seeking a report on the action taken by SRC, NCTE.

Accordingly, a letter was sent to Shri.P.S.Dinesh Kumar on 20.10.2014.

Another interim order in W.P.No.34822-34872 of 2014 dated 19.12.2014 was received by SRC on 29.12.2014. Interim order stating as follows:-

*"This court had permitted the students to take up the examinations by the order dated 21.07.2014 making it subject to result of the petition.*

*In that view, the concerned respondents shall announce the results also forthwith which shall also remain subject to result of these petitions."*

The SRC in its 276<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 7-9 January 2015 considered the matter and decided as follows :

1. Ask lawyer to get the 'stay' vacated.
2. Give him the brief on deficiencies to get the petition dismissed.

Accordingly, a letter was addressed to Sri.Pramod.N.Kathavi, Advocate on 04.02.2015 along with brief of the case.

A letter received from Sri.Pramod.N.Kathavi, Advocate on 02.07.2015 requesting to forward the vakalatnama duly signed. Accordingly, a letter was sent to advocate on 02.07.2015 along with Vakalatanama.

A letter was received from Sri. Pramod.N.Kathavi, Advocate dated 03.07.2015 received on 08.07.2015.

The Court order dated 26.06.2015 in W.P.No s 34822-34872/ 2014 stated as follows:-

1. *I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent Nos.1 to 4.*
2. *Learned additional Government Advocate submits that the Southern Regional Committee of the National Council for Teacher Education has withdrawn the recognition accorded to the petitioner-College for D.Ed course on 04.03.2010 (Annexure-R1) which order was affirmed in Appeal by the National Council for Teacher Education as per the order dtd. 19.11.2010. The interim stay of withdrawal of the recognition granted in W.P.No.32705/2013 had expired on 24.02.2014 as the interim stay was not extended from that date. In other words, the withdrawal of the recognition by the National Council for Teacher Education has been in force from the last more than one year. This fact is not disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Accordingly, in the light of withdrawal of the recognition by the National Council for Teacher Education, the decision of respondent No.2 in rejecting the claim of the petitioner referred to in the impugned order dated 27.05.2014 (Annexure-A) cannot be faulted with. The writ petitions are devoid of merit and are accordingly dismissed.*

*Petitions dismissed.*

SRC in its 290<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2015 considered the matter and decided as under :-

1. *The Court Order relating to the affiliating body is seen.*
2. *Ask the lawyer to move the Court for urgent hearing and vacation of 'stay'.*

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed to the advocate, Shri. Pramod N Kathavi on 21.04.2015.

On 20.07.2015, a letter from D.V. Sadananda Gowda dated 18.07.2015 is received by this office which was translated as under :-

*"A copy of the request letter submitted by the management of Brilliant D.Ed*

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

College, Manjunathnagar, Urigampet, K.G.F College is attached. The said college is granted recognition in the year 2009 and the students have written the examination till the year 2014. The institution has complained that Karnataka Secondary Education Examination Board has not conducted examinations for students who have been admitted in the year 2014-15 and the institution has all the basic amenities required

Therefore, in the interest of students, you are hereby requested to examine/verify matters of management, infrastructural facilities, instructional facilities of the institution, impose conditions if necessary and take suitable action as per law."

On 31.07.2015, a certified copy of the Court order dated 07.07.2015 in W.P.No. 32705 of 2013 was received by this office from the advocate, Shri.Pramod N.Kathavi which is as under :-

1. In this writ petition, the petitioner is challenging the order dated 04.03.2010(annexure- L) passed by the southern Regional Committee of National council for Teacher Education ,withdrawing recognition granted to Brilliant D.Ed College , withdrawing recognition granted to Brilliant D.Ed College, Manjunatha Nagar, for conducting D.Ed Course. The petitioner is also challenging the order of the appellate authority dated 19.11.2010(Annexure-N) wherein the aforesaid order dated 04.03.2010 is affirmed.
2. I have heard Sri.M.T.Nanaiah,learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner and perused the aforesaid two orders. The two impugned orders at annexure-L & N to the extent they are relevant read as follows:

Order dated 04.03.2010 at Annexure -L:

..... B ased on the complaint received from the State Government , notice was issued to the institution on 10.08.2009.The institution submitted its written representation on 19.11.2009.

SRC in its 185<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> January 2010 considered the written representation along with original application and other documents available and decided to withdraw recognition for D.Ed course for the following reasons :

- There is a discrepancy between the Building plan and Building Completion Certificate in terms of built up space.
- Build – up space in inadequate , as per the records provided by the institution itself.

It is hereby ordered that recognition accorded to Brilliant D.Ed College, Manjunatha Nagar, Robertsonpet, K.G.F – 563 121, Kolar District , Karnataka for conducting D.Ed course is withdrawn."

Order dated 19.11.2020 (Annexure -N) passed in appeal :

".....AND WHEREAS, the Council noted that the figures of built up area in the copy of the building plan and the copy of the building completion certificate dated 10.07.2009 enclosed to the appeal do not tally. While the copy of the building plan indicates 6,187 sq.ft each on ground and first floors, the copy of the building completion certificate indicates an area of 25' x 200' ( 1'0 rooms).The appellant has enclosed copies of a different building plan and the building completion certificate dated 04.09.2009 indicating ground floor area as 10,800 sq.ft to his reply dated nil and received in SRC on 19.04.2009 to the show cause notice dated 10.08.2009 in view of the discrepancies in the figures and submission of different documents at different times showing inconsistent figures of covered area, the claim of the appellant about the adequacy of built up area can neither be relied upon nor accepted. The Council therefore came to the conclusion that the appeal deserved to be rejected and the order of the SRC confirmed.

After perusal of documents, memorandum of appeal, affidavit, VT Report and after considering oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the council reached the conclusion that there was no ground to accept the appeal and hence there was no ground to accept the appeal and hence it should be rejected. Accordingly, the appeal was rejected and the SRC's order dated 04.03.2010 was confirmed.

The Council hereby confirms the orders appealed against."

3.I find no legal infirmity in the above quoted orders and the consideration made by both the authorities to warrant interference under the extraordinary jurisdiction of the Court under articles 226 and 227 of the constitution of India. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. In view of dismissal of the writ petition, I.A.No.1/2015 filed for grant of interim stay also stands dismissed. Petition dismissed."

The Southern Regional Committee in its 291<sup>st</sup> meeting held during 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> August, 2015 considered the matter, court order dated 07.07.2015, Appellate authority order dated 19.11. 2010 (Annexure-N) and decided as under :-

- No change in the decision to withdraw recognition taken in the 185<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28-29 January 2010.

On 09.01.2015, a Court notice in W.A No 4873 of 2015 was received by this office from the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru. The W.A.No. 4873 of 2015 was filed by Dr.Iqbal Shariff Vs The Director, District Secondary Research and Training Centre, Bengaluru, Karnataka being aggrieved by the order of the Hon'ble Court in W.P.No. 32705 of 2013

A letter was addressed to the advocate, Shri. Pramod Kathavi on 03.02.2016 to defend the case on behalf of NCTE in the W.A.No. 4873 of 2015 filed by the institution.

In the meantime, on 18.03.2015, the institution submitted a written representation along with a copy of the Court order in W.A.No. 4873 of 2015 dated 25.02.2016.

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

The institution has represented as under :-

*" As you are well aware of the fact that College has filed Writ Appeal W.A.No. 4873 of 2015 before the Hon'ble High Court against the order of learned single judge in W.P.No.32705/ 2015, 3496/ 2015 and 25873 of 2015*

*It must also be within your knowledge, the Hon'ble Division Bench of Karnataka by its order dated 25.02.2016 has directed to conduct inspection of college with regard to adequacy of infrastructure (The copy of orders enclosed )*

*We request you to, issue appropriate terms / application & other necessary details to be complied on seeking inspection of college in terms of Court order."*

The Court order dated 25.02.2016 in W.A.No. 4873 of 2015 is as under:-

*" Miss Niloufer Akbar, learned additional government advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent Nos 1, 2 and 5.*

*Mr.Pramod Kathavi, learned advocate accepts notice for the respondent No.s 3 and 4*

*Therefore, the matter is ready as regards service, by appearance.*

*The recognition of the Brilliant D.Ed College, Manjunathnagar, was withdrawn as there were certain lapses regarding the building .*

*Mr.D.Ravi Shankar, learned advocate for the appellant submits that if immediately an inspection is conducted, it would reveal that the building satisfies all requirements*

*We, therefore, direct the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) to arrange for an inspection team and to hold an inspection of the college premises to ascertain as to whether the building is suitable for running the D.Ed College in terms of the Acts and Rules."*

The SRC in its 309<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 12<sup>th</sup>& 14<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-

- Cause inspection as ordered by the court.

On 27.07.2016 and 01.08.2016 letters were received from the institution as under:-

*"As per the court order the NCTE team is going to conduct inspection of our Brilliant D.Ed College Manjunatha Nagar OOrgaumpet, K.G.F.*

*Sir I kindly request you good self to postpone the date till further information".*

As per the decision of SRC, VT fixed through online procedure and the inspection of the institution was conducted on 15.11.2016 and 16.11.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 17.11.2016.

The SRC in its 324<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 07<sup>th</sup> – 08<sup>th</sup> December, 2016, considered the VT report and decided as under:-

1. "Land is in the name of an individual.
2. LUC-not given
3. EC is old. Latest EC required.
4. BP is in order.
5. BCC is not in format. Roofing not specified.
6. According to BP, built up area is inadequate.
7. FDRs not given.
8. Faculty list-not given.
9. Issue Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition."

As per the decision of SRC a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 16.12.2016. The institution has submitted written representation on 03.01.2017.

Further, an e-mail received by this office on 14.08.2017 from the advocate, Shri. Basavaraj V.Sabard with request to intimate the result of inspection and all other information connected with this case. Accordingly, a letter along with brief of the case was addressed to advocate on 01.09.2017.

A letter dated 06.10.2017 along with a Court judgment in WA No. 4873 of 2017 is received by this office from the advocate. Shri. Basavaraj. V.Sabard on 09.10.2017.

Court Order stated as under:-

"The present appeal is directed against the order dated 07.07.2015 passed by the learned Single Judge whereby the learned Single Judge dismissed the petition.

1. We have heard Mr. Ravishankar D.R., learned counsel appearing for the appellant and Mr. D.Ashwathappa, learned AGA for respondents 1,2 and 5 and Sri Basavaraj V Sabarad, learned Advocate for respondents 3 and 4.

2. It appears that when the appeal came to be considered on 25.02.2016, the following under passed:

"Miss Niloufer Akbar, learned additional government advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 5.

Mr. Pramod N.Kathavi, learned advocate accepts notice for the

respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

Therefore, the matter is ready as regards service, by appearance.

The recognition of the Brilliant D.Ed College, Manjunathnagar, was withdrawn as there were certain lapses regarding the building.

Mr. D.R.Ravishankar, learned advocate for the appellant submits that if immediately an inspection is conducted, it would reveal that the building satisfies all the requirements.

We, therefore, direct the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) to arrange for an inspection team and to hold an inspection of the college premises to ascertain as to whether the building is suitable for running the D.Ed college in terms of the Acts and Rules."

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondent nos. 3 and 4 states that pursuant to the interim order passed by this Court, fresh inspection has been carried out and the report is also prepared and the same is to be considered by respondent non.3 and he submits that the appropriate decision shall be taken on 21 & 22/09/2017 in the next meeting.

4. In view of the above, we find that no further order deserves to be passed because ultimately, if the decision is found to be in favour of the appellant, the appellant may get the benefit for continuation of the recognition but, if the decision is found to be for withdrawal of the recognition, the same will be a fresh ground for the appellant for challenging the said decision before the appellate authority thereafter, in accordance with law. Hence, subject to the aforesaid observations, the present appeal is disposed of."

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

1. Title is clear. Land area is adequate.
2. LUC is in order.
3. EC is old. Latest EC will be required.
4. BP is in order.
5. BCC is approved. But, built up area is inadequate only 10,800 Sq ft.
6. The reply to our SCN on the point of built up area is unsatisfactory. Against a requirement of 1500 sq mts they have only 1003 sq mts.
7. Reject the application

05	SRCAPP3552 M.Ed 1 Unit Maruthi College of Education, Salem, Tamilnadu	<p><b>Maruthi college of Education, Plot/Khasara No.491/2D,490/4A,490/4C, Street No.NH-79, Manuvizhundan South Village &amp; Post, Attur Taluk &amp; City, Salem District – 636121, Tamilnadu</b></p> <p>Maruthi Educational Trust, Plot No.491/2D,490/4A,490/4C, Street No.NH-79, Manuvizhundan South Village &amp; Post, Attur Taluk &amp; City, Salem District – 636121, Tamilnadu applied for grant of recognition to Maruthi college of Education, Plot/Khasara No.491/2D,490/4A,490/4C, Street No.NH-79, Manuvizhundan South Village &amp; Post, Attur Taluk &amp; City, Salem District – 636121, Tamilnadu for offering M.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 23.06.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 29.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 07.07.2015 followed by Reminder on 22.02.2016 and Reminder II on 05.11.2016.</p> <p>Sub-clause (3) of Clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was found deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <p>Application is not signed by the applicant on all pages of application as per Sub-clause (3) of clause 5 of Regulations, 2015.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NOC from affiliating body is not submitted along with application.</li> </ol> <p>The SRC for in its 292<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 29-30 Sept, 2015 considered the matter and decided to <i>issue show Cause Notice for rejection of application.</i></p> <p>Accordingly, a Show cause notice was issued to the institution for Non Submission of NOC on 21.10.2015. The institution submitted reply on 23-12-2015.</p> <p>SRC in its 295<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> -30<sup>th</sup> November &amp; 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2015 considered the matter and decided as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The reply to the SCN is not satisfactory. They have admitted the deficiency. We</i></li> </ul>
----	---	--

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

*cannot wait indefinitely from them to produce the NOC. According to the Regulations it is the responsibility of the applicant to secure and attach the NOC from the affiliating body. That being so, it is decided to reject the application.*

The SRC in its minutes dated 31.01.2016 decided as follows:

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

The institution submitted NOC from TNTEU dated 20.11.2015 on 23.12.2015.

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

1. Existing B.Ed is in leased premises
2. Contiguity with M.Ed to be shown
3. EC latest, BCC to be submitted
4. Cause Composite Inspection
5. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents

As per the decision of SRC, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members on 22.02.2016. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.02.2016 and VT report along with documents received on 26.02.2016.

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

1. BP and BCC have not been given.
2. EC shows land is mortgaged.
3. Issue SCN for rejection.

Before issuance of show cause notice, as per website information the institution submitted reply on 05.04.2016 along with some relevant documents.

The SRC in its 309<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> April 2016, the committee considered the SCN reply and decided as under:

1. Land is on Mortgage
2. Issue SCN Accordingly.

Accordingly, a Show cause Notice was issued to the institution on 16.05.2016. The institution submitted reply on 20.06.2016.

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

- The land used for the College of Education as per LUC and Plan viz 491/2D, 490/4A/490/4C are covered under mortgage as per EC.
- Pl. ask the institution to explain.

Accordingly, a letter was sent to the institution on 17.09.2016. The institution submitted its written representation on 23.08.2016 along with documents.

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

1. The Mortgage issue is cleared by EC dated May 2016.
2. Issue LOI for M.Ed (1 Unit).

Accordingly, Letter of intent sent to the institution on 29.11.2016.

The institution has not submitted reply so far.

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

1. The LOI was issued only in November 2016.
2. Give them further time till 15 Feb. 2017 failing which we will be constrained to reject the application.
3. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 02.02.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the LOI on 15.02.2017 and 20.02.2017.

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

1. Staff as per Regulations.
2. Issue Formal Recognition for M.Ed.-1 unit w.e.f. 2017-18.

As per the decision of SRC, Formal Recognition order was issued to the institution on 01.03.2017.

A Court order dated 06.09.2017 received by this office on 22.09.2017 in WP No 23939 of 2017 and WMP No.25215 of 2017 and stating as under:-

*"...Mr.M.T.Arunan, learned standing counsel takes notice for the first respondent. Mr.A.Kumar, learned Special Government pleader takes notice for the second respondent and Mr.U.Venkatesan, learned standing counsel takes notice for the third respondent.*

		<p>2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned standing counsels appearing for the respondents.</p> <p>3. The present writ petition is filed only for seeking a direction to the third respondent to consider the application of the petitioner dated 21.03.2017, wherein and whereby the petitioner sought for grant of affiliation for conducting M.Ed., course from the academic year 2017-2018 on merits and grant permanent affiliation based on the recognition granted by the first respondent on 01.03.2017.</p> <p>4. The grievance of the petitioner is that the said application filed before the third respondent has not been considered so far. Therefore, without expressing any view on the merits of the claim made by the petitioner, I only direct the third respondent to consider the application of petitioner dated 21.03.2017 and pass orders on the same on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of No costs. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is closed".</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:-</b></p> <p><b>1.The direction of the court order is to the TNTEU.</b> <b>2The Court order is noted.</b></p>
06	APSO8199 B.Ed VEL Teacher Training Institute, Dindigul, Tamilnadu	<p><b>VEL Teacher Training Institute, No.7/4, Jawahar Nagar, New Dharapuram Road, Palani, Dindigul District-624601,Tamil Nadu.</b></p> <p>VEL Teacher Training Institute, Dindigul District-624601, Tamil Nadu has submitted an application of seeking grant of recognition to D.T.Ed course on 12.01.2007.</p> <p>The application was processed and recognition was granted for offering D.T.Ed course with an intake of 50 students on 28.02.2008 at No.7/4, Jawahar Nagar, New Dharmapuram Road, Palani Dindigal -624601, Tamilnadu with the conisation to shift to own premises within 3 years.</p> <p>Inspection for shifting of premises for B.Ed course was already conducted on 08.02.2011. The visiting team report was placed before SRC in its 201<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2011 the committee decided to issue show cause notice.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its letter dated 14.02.2011 along with DD of Rs.40000/- towards inspection fee on 18.02.2011 for shifting of inspection (D.T.Ed) from rental building to own permanent building.</p> <p>The committee in its 202<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> March 2011 considered the letter dated 18.02.2011 and decided to serve show cause Notice. The committee considered the VT Report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidence and its was decided to serve show cause notice under section 17 of NCTE Act.</p>

Accordingly notice was issued to the institution on 12.04.2011 The institution submitted its reply on 09.05.2011 for the following:

1. The ground floor is being constructed for B.Ed programme. The proposed construction of First floor for D.T.Ed is not yet completed. Building construction is incomplete.
2. A School is being run in the same Building in which teacher education programmes are conducted
3. Building completion certificate not submitted from the Government authorized Engineer/competent authority.
4. No full view of the building is shown in VCD.
5. No drinking water facilities.
6. Psychology Lab is not according to the NCTE norms prescribed for teacher education programme.
7. Language Lab is not available.
8. Science Lab is yet to be set up.
9. Details of FDRs for Endowment and Reserve Fund for each course i.e. B.Ed and D.T.Ed courses is required.
10. Land Use Certificate and Encumbrance Certificate is required in English version
11. Built up area earmarked for each course is not given in affidavit.

The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 11.05.2011 along with relevant documents.

The reply of the management of the show cause notice was duly considered in its 205<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> May, 2011. The reply of the institution is not convincing and hence unsatisfactory.

The committee decided to withdraw the recognition for D.T.Ed course run by Vel Teacher Training Institute, Dindigul District Tamil Nadu, with effect from 2012-13 to enable the present batch of student to complete the course.

Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, Withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 27.06.2011.

A court order dated 26.07.2011 in W.P.No.8254 of 2011 The Hon'ble High court of Madras filed by VEL teacher training institute.

A letter was addressed to advocate Sri. A Shivaji on 03.08.2011 regarding request to kindly provide the legal opinion as to whether this is fit case to file an appeal against the final order in W.P.No.8524 of 2011 pertaining to the institute.

A letter was addressed to Advocate Sri.A.Shivaji on 05.08.2011 Original judgement order dated 26.07.2011 W.P.No.8254 of 2011 copy enclosed.

Again a letter was addressed to Advocate Sri.A.Sivaji on 24.08.2011 enclosed duly signed affidavit pertaining to W.P.No.8254 of 2011 dated 26.07.2011.

A letter addressed to Advocate Sri.A.Shivaji on 20.10.2011 along with counter affidavit in W.P(MD) No.10949 of 2011 filed by Vel College of Education.

The institution submitted written representation on 09.02.2012 regarding the institution functioning continuously request for revoking the withdrawal order issued by SRC and pray for the revised order.

A letter was addressed to the Advocate Sri.A.Shivaji on 13.03.2013 seeking request to inform the latest status of filing appeal against the court order as the institution has requested to revoke the withdrawal order.

A letter dated 23.03.2013 received by this office 28.03.2013 from the advocate Shri.A.Shivaji regarding W.P(MD).No.1332 of 2011 against W.P.(MD)No.8254 of 2011.

The Court order dated 02.08.2017 received by this office on 21.09.2017 from the advocate Shri A.Sivaji regarding the W.A.(MD)No.1332 of 2011 filed by NCTE against the order in W.P (MD) No.8254 of 2011 and stating as under:-

*"Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letter Patent against the order passed by this Court in W.P.(MD)No.8254 of 2011 dated 26.07.2011.*

*Prayer in WIND). 8254/ 2011 :*

*Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a WRIT OF CERTIORARI, calling for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the Respondent in his proceedings Ref.F.No.AP508199/D.T.Ed./TN/2011/29195 dated 27-06-2011 received by the Petitioner on 06-07-2011 and quash the same as illegal.*

*For Appellant : Mr.A.Sivaji*

*For Respondent : Mr.C.Venkatesakumar for M/s.Ajmal Associates*

*JUDGMENT*

*(Judgment of the Court was delivered by M.M.SUNDRESH, J)*

*The writ appeal has been preferred against the order of the learned single Judge dated 26.07.2011, passed in W.P.(MD) No.8254 of 2011.*

*2. The learned counsel appearing for submitted that nothing survives for adjudication in this matter.*

*3. The learned counsel appearing for the Appellant submitted that no instruction is forthcoming.*

		<p>4. We do not propose to keep the writ appeal pending any further since the matter is pending from 2011. In fact, we have given time on three occasions to get instruction. In such view of the matter, we close the writ appeal for want of instruction. However, liberty is given to the appellant to reopen the case, if proper instruction is given. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is also closed".</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This is a shifting case. We had caused a VT Insp. The VT reported 'incomplete construction'. We rejected the application.</li><li>2. They went to H.C. The H.C. quashed our order. We preferred an appeal. The Appellate Court also has quashed our order.</li><li>3.1 We have now to cause a fresh inspection at our cost, to assess the present status.</li><li>3.2 Prepare for VTI accordingly.</li><li>4. It is not clear why we withdraw the recognition. Please check the old files and report. We have to brief the VT on the issues to be specifically covered.</li><li>5. In spite of clear instructions and repeated reminders, the Lawyer has told the court that 'he has no instructions' which led the court to dismiss our appeal. We should consider referring this case to the Bar Council</li></ol>
07	APSO4366 TTC 1Unit Government Teacher Training Institute, Ernakulam, Kerala	<p><b>Government Teacher Training Institute, Cheruvattoor Post, Nellikuzhi Village, Kothamangalam, Ernakulam District -686691, Kerala.</b></p> <p>Government Teacher Training Institute, Cheruvattoor Post, Nellikuzhi Village, Kothamangalam, Ernakulam District -686691, Kerala submitted application for grant of recognition to TTC course on 24.08.2005.</p> <p>The application was processed and inspection of the institution was carried out on 24.04.2007 to verify the essential documents as per the NCTE Regulations, Human Resources, infrastructural and instructional facilities provided by the institution.</p> <p>The SRC in its 134<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> – 31<sup>st</sup> may 2007 and 1<sup>st</sup> June 2007, on careful perusal of the original file of the institution VT Report, Video CD, Written representation from the institution and other related documents, Act of NCTE, 1993, Regulations and guidelines from time laid on the table of the Committee, the Regional committee noted that the following deficiencies;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The space in the building is Inadequate.</li><li>• The equipment in Science lab, Psychology lab., and E.T.Lab are not adequate.</li><li>• The Library has to be strengthened.</li></ul>

Accordingly, notice was issued to the institution on 14.06.2007. The institution submitted its written representation on 10.07.2007 which was placed before SRC in its 139<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> August 2007. The Committee considered the matter and decided to grant conditional recognition.

As per the decision of the SRC, Grant of conditional recognition letter was issued to the institution on 09.08.2007. Since the institution has not submitted any reply, one more letter was issued to the institution on 24.09.2008 the institution has not submitted written representation even after a lapse of ten months.

The matter was brought before the SRC in its 168<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2008. SRC decided to issue show cause notice under section 14 of NCTE Act.

Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 06.02.2009. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 20.02.2009, which was placed before SRC in its 171<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> March, 2009. The Committee decided to issue show cause notice on the following deficiencies;

- The built up space provided for proposed course is not adequate. The details of built up space available with approved building plan, building completion to be submitted for proposed course.
- As per reply to the notice institution is not owning any building to house Teacher Training institute.
- The institution has Rs. 120 lakhs for purpose of construction of new building. As per regulations of NCTE 2007 para 8(10) states that "At the time of inspection, the building of the institution shall be complete in the form of permanent structure on the land possessed by the institution in terms of Regulation 8(7) equipped with all necessary amenities and fulfilling all such requirements as prescribed in the norms and standards. The applicant institution shall produce the original completion certificate, approved building plan in proof of completion of building and structure/asbestos roofing shall be allowed."
- The vouchers for purchases of equipment in Science, Psychology, E.T. and Library books to be submitted for verification.

Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 09.04.2009. The institution has submitted show cause notice reply along with documents on 01.05.2009.

The documents was processed and placed before SRC in its 176<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2009 the committee decided to Cause Inspection to the institution under Section 17 of the NCTE Act for shifting of the building.

Further matter is no correspondence.

Final show cause notice was issued to the institution on 22.07.2009. the institution has submitted reply on 04.08.2009 & 10.08.2009.

The SRC in its 181<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> – 21<sup>st</sup> August 2009 considered the written representation and decided to withdraw the Conditional Recognition immediately for the following reasons:

1. The institution stated in reply to show cause notice that the building to be constructed by the Panchayat body and the Secretary Rural Development Commission office informed that an estimate of Rs. 15 lakhs sanction is getting administrative and technical sanction for obtaining fund from RIDF. In view of above the Committee observed that the institution has not constructed building and in the existing building, built up space is not adequate to run the proposed TTC course.
2. The institution has not submitted Annexure-I, II and III and also the teaching regular faculty are not appointed for the proposed course.

Accordingly, withdrawal of Conditional Recognition order for TTC course was issued to the institution on 03.09.2009.

Institution preferred an appeal against the withdrawal order dated 03.09.2009 to the Appellate authority, NCTE New Delhi the Appellate Authority considered and remanded back to the SRC for issue of revised order for withdrawing the recognition of the institution for D.Ed with prospective effect.

The SRC on careful perusal of the Appellate Authority order dated 05.01.2010 received on 16.01.2010 remanding back the case for issue a revised order treating the institution as recognised and withdrawing the recognition with prospective effect.

The matter was placed before the SRC in its 188<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2010 the committee decided to Refusal order be issued.

As per the decision of the SRC, modified refusal order was issued to the institution on 04.03.2010.

On 19.07.2010, a copy of the Court order in W.P.No. 21311/2010 was received by this office from the advocate, Dr.Abraham P. Meachinkara, filed by the state of kerala before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala at Eranakulam.

The Court Order is as under:

Admit. Urgent notice. There will be an interim stay as prayed for, for two months and the petitioners are permitted to admit students for TTC Course in the Government TTI, Cheruvattoor. The petitioners will take earnest efforts to see that all the infrastructural facilities as directed by the National Council for Teacher Education are provided at the earliest.

post after two months.

Accordingly, brief of the case was sent to the advocate on 26.07.2010.

The institution has submitted representation on 20.06.2015 and 09.12.2015 requesting to reinstate the permanent Recognition for D.Ed (TTC) course.

A letter was issued to the institution on 12.07.2016 informing the institution recognition cannot be reinstated as it has already been withdrawn by SRC vide order dated 04.03.2010.

On 07.02.2017 the office has received a court order dated 17.12.2016 in W.P(C) No.21311 of 2010 which is as under:

"The Government runs a Teacher Training Institute at Cheruvattoor Post, Nellikuzhi Village, Kothamangalam, Ernakulam District. In the course of time, the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), the first respondent, exercising its powers under section 14(3) (b) of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 ('the Act') issued Ext.P20: it withdrew the recognition granted to the petitioner Teacher Training Institute for the academic year 2010-11. It also issued consequential directions. Aggrieved, the Government filed this writ petition.

2. This court on 09.07.2010 stayed the de-recognition because the state represented that it had already allotted sufficient funds and that, within six months, it would cure the deficiencies, if any. It would thus comply with the Act. The stay granted on 09.07.2010 has continued, & continues to this day, much beyond six months, however.
3. The learned counsel for the respondents has fairly submitted that given the efflux of enormous time, nothing survives. Even going by the state's stance, initially it only needed six months' time to comply with the statutory conditions, avers the learned counsel, so the matter obviates any adjudication. According to him, the writ petition could be closed, leaving it open for the respondent authorities to re-inspect the institute and proceed further under law.
4. The learned Government pleader has concurred with the learned Standing counsel's Suggestion.
5. Given the passage of time and changed circumstances, I set aside Exts.P15, P19 and P20. I leave it open for the respondent officials to inspect the petitioner institute and proceed under law if any deficiencies are, still, found.

This writ petition is disposed of as above. No order on costs".

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

1. Court order is noted.
2. Cause inspection for D.El.Ed (1 unit)
3. Ensure adherence to 2014 norms and standards.

		<p>4. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents. 5. Put up in April.</p> <p>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 02.03.2017 to 22.03.2017. Visiting Team Report was received on 14.03.2017.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the visiting team report and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. In deference to the Court order, we had caused VT Inspection.</b></li><li><b>2. The VTI Report clearly points out that the built up area is hopelessly inadequate. The requirement is 1500 sq mts ; whereas they have only 817 sq mts.</b></li><li><b>3. Issue SCN accordingly.</b></li></ol>
08	<p>SRCAPP2016 30219 M.Ed 1Unit Sathyasai B.Ed College, Thiruvallur, Tamilnadu</p>	<p><b>Sathyasai B.Ed College, Paruthipet Village, Avadi Town, No.7, Rajaji Street, Poonamallee Taluk, Paruthipet city, Thiruvallur District-600071, Tamil Nadu.</b></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. 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>a) Failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the National council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 on or before the date of submission of online application.</i></li><li><i>b) Failure to submit print out of the applications made online along with the land</i></li></ol>

*documents as required under sub-Regulation (4) of Regulation 5 within fifteen days of the submission of the online application".*

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 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 shall be acceptable irrespective of the date of online submission of application.

The SRC in its 322<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> October, 2016 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

- All the 5 cases in which hard-copies were received after the last date are summarily rejected.

Accordingly, Rejection order was issued to the institution through online on 21.10.2016. 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/6<sup>th</sup> 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 337<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> & 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided to "Process the application."

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

1. 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 344<sup>th</sup> 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 Committee considered the above 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

SRCAPP2448  
B.Ed  
1 Unit  
Sri Shiva Sai  
College of  
Education,  
Mahbubnagar  
, Telangana

**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**

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.

The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.

A copy of application was sent to State Government for recommendation on 21.07.2015. Sub section 2 of section 7 of the Regulations 2014 read as under:-

2(a). Failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the NCTE Rules

1997 On or before the date of submission of online application.

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

The SRC considered the matter in its 291<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup> 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:

- The Institution has not submitted hard copy of application within 15 days from the date of online submission of application.

As per the decision of SRC a rejection order was issued to the institution on 20.10.2015.

NCTE-Hqrs letter dated 14.01.2016 received on 19.01.2016 stating as follows.

*"...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."*

The institution has submitted NOC from SCERT dated 29.05.2015.

As directed the application was processed and placed before SRC in its 304<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> - 20<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under;

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.Ed
5. Cause composite inspection
6. 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.

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.

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

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 02.05.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible.

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

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.

The SRC in its 313<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 02<sup>nd</sup> & 03<sup>rd</sup> May, 2016 considered the matter and decided to "Issue Formal Recognition for B.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2016-17."

Accordingly, as directed by SRC Formal Recognition order was issued on 02.06.2016 with an annual intake 50 students.

Now, a letter received from Smt. Ranjeev R. Acharya, I.A.S, Special Chief Secretary to Govt., Education Department, Government of Telangana vide D.O. Letter No. 4890/SE.Trg/A2/2016-2, dated 12.10.2017 reads as under;

*".....the National Council for Teacher Education (Southern Regional Committee), Bangalore, granted recognition to Sri Shiva Sai College of Education, Survey No. 1112/A2, Bharat Nagar Street, Leeja (V), Post, Taluk & City, Mahaboobnagar District, Telangana for conduction (1 unit) from the academic session of 2016-2017, subject to the fulfillment of certain conditions.*

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

3) In the Memo No. 4890/SE-Trg/A2/2016-17 dated 14.06.2016, while enclosing the copy of the NCTE order received vide reference 1<sup>st</sup> cited, the Director of School Education, Telangana, Hyderabad was requested to furnish the inspection report along with his remarks, as per the new NCTE Norms and Regulations of 2014, to the Government immediately.

4) It is also to inform that the NCTE (Southern Regional Committee) Bangalore granted recognition to certain B.Ed/B.P.Ed/M.P.Ed Colleges for conducting B.Ed course of 2 years duration from the A.Y.2016-2017. While these colleges were being inspected before issue of permission by the State Govt. for starting these new colleges in the state, 12 colleges approached the Hon'ble High Court to direct the State Government to grant permission to them expeditiously. On the Hon'ble High Court Commom Order dt 16.09.2016 in W.P.Nos.26870 and batch cases, wherein the Hon'ble Court directed to give permission to these 12 Colleges, the State Government has filed Writ Appeals as the State Government found that these Colleges had deficiencies in the staff appointments because they did not have the experience as required under the NCTE norms. Moreover, the Director of School Education in his letter dt: 27.07.2016 and Spl.CS(E) in D.O. letter dt: 21.09.2016 addressed to the Regional Director, NCTE, Southern Regional Committee, Nagarabhavi, Jnana Bharathi Campus, Bangalore had already informed the NCTE that the State of Telangana does not require any more new B.Ed Colleges because already the State has (223) Colleges with 22,450 intake and the demand for B.Ed Teachers in only about 5,000 in Government Secondary Schools and that more than 2.5 lakh qualified candidates are already available in the State, for whom sufficient placements are not forthcoming and any new Colleges/intake will make the existing Colleges also unviable.

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

6) The Hon'ble Supreme Court on 04.08.2017 while disposing the SLP No. 3708-3716/2017, has passed the following order:-

- "we are not inclined to interfere with the judgment of the High Court. Needless to say, if at any point of time the NCTE feels that the regulations have been violated, it can take appropriate steps against the College. The NCTE may also take note of assertions made by the State Government relating to any deficiency, but that will not effect the 'No Objection Certificate' issued by the State Government and the recommendation granted by the NCTE. The purpose of stating the same is only for future.

- Mr. Talukdar, learned counsel appearing for the N.C.T.E., has assured the Court that the N.C.T.E shall carry out its function in accordance with the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 and the regulations framed there under and also see that the institutions that have been granted recommendation are properly functional. Our so saying would not mean that the judgment of the High Court shall not be given effect to. When we say that the High Court order shall be given effect to, all the parties to the litigation shall give effect to the judgment of the High Court and act with quite promptitude."

7) Sri Shiva Sai College as mentioned at para (1) above, has filed W.P.No. 1677/2017 on 17.01.2017 to expedite the permission of the State Government. This College kept quiet for nearly one and a half years so far, after receiving NCTE recognition. In the reference 5<sup>th</sup> cited, the Commissioner and Director of School Education, Telangana, Hyderabad, has given a report in respect of Sri Shiva Sai College of Education, Gadwal, Jogulamba Gadwal District, that One Faculty Member namely Sri. T. Anjaneyulu, Lecturer in Pedagogy of Telugu is falsely shown by the College because that Lecturer is inducted already in the College namely Venkata Sai Diploma in Elementary Education, Devarkonda, Mahabubnagar District. Moreover, no teacher of Sri Shiva Sai College of Education has the teaching experience of 3 years in a Secondary School as per the NCTE norms and it is not a composite College.

8) Thus, Sri Shiva Sai College of Education has not fulfilled the NCTE norms. In the recognition order of the NCTE received vide reference 1<sup>st</sup> cited, it is mentioned that "If the institution Contravenes any of the above conditions or the provisions of the NCTE Act, Rules, Regulations and orders made of issued thereunder, the institution will render itself vulnerable to adverse action including withdrawal of recognition by the regional committee under the provisions of Section 17(1) of the NCTE Act."

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

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

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

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

11) Therefore, based on these observations of the Hon'ble Courts and the NCTE norms, it is felt appropriate that before implementing the orders of the Hon'ble Court in

	<p>the W.P.No. 1677/2017, dated 19.09.2017 regarding Sri Shiva Sai College, the State Government must address NCTE indicating the deficiencies as mentioned at para (7) of this letter, for their necessary action, as mentioned at para (8) of this letter.</p> <p>12) Therefore, considering all the above facts, it is requested to kindly withdraw the Recognition given to Sri Shiva Sai College of Education, Mahaboobnagar District for conducting B.Ed programme of (2) years."</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the letter from Govt of Telangana and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1.The Telangana Govts communication is noted.</b></li><li><b>2.1 Out of the deficiencies alleged, only one is of relevance to our granting recognition.</b></li><li><b>2.2 The material issue is about duplication of one Faculty member viz., Asst. Prof (Telugu)-Anjaneyalu.</b></li><li><b>3. Issue SCN accordingly</b></li></ol>
10 --	<p>A letter dated 11.09.2017 received from the Section Officer NCTE vide no. F.No. App1011/49/2017-Appeal Section-Hq in respect of Unilateral decision taken by SRC in its 305<sup>th</sup> SRC meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> to 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 to reopen the rejected cases. The letter stated as under:</p> <p>I am directed to say that a note was received from the members of Appeal Committee of NCTE Headquarters (cop enclosed).</p> <p>In the above note the members of Appeal Committee informed that during the appeal hearing one of the application whose application seeking grant of recognition was refused by NRC on ground of failure to submit NOC issued by the affiliating body on or before the cut of date of submission of hard copy of application. The fact has been brought to the notice of the Appeal Committee that SRC in its 30<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> to 27<sup>th</sup> February 2016 decided to reopen and process all the rejected cases by accepting NOCs irrespective of dates of issue.</p> <p>On the above issue, the members of Appeal Committee requested for an investigation/ inquiry. Accordingly, with the approval of the competent authority a two members committee was constituted vide office order dated 29<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 (copy enclosed). The two members committee submitted its report on 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2017 with the directions that the SRC may be asked to produce the total number of such cases along with complete details of the institution describing the circumstances in which such applications were re-opened, processed and granted recognition. A copy of the report is enclosed.</p> <p>It is requested that the above information may kindly be furnished at the earliest.</p> <p><b>The Committee asked SRO to put up the matter tomorrow.</b></p>

11	SRCAPP2468 BSc.B.Ed 2 Units Senthil College of Education, Puducherry	<p><b>Senthil College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.229/2/2,229/2/1,228/2/3p, Plot No.42(R.S.No.158/8C), Villianur Village, Post &amp; Taluk, Puducherry City, Puducherry, District – 605110, Puducherry.</b></p> <p>Senthil Education Society, Plot No.36, Thiyagaraja Street, Puducherry Village &amp; Post, Puducherry Taluk &amp; City, Puducherry District - 605001, Puducherry applied for grant of recognition to Senthil College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.229/2/2,229/2/1,228/2/3p, Plot No.42(R.S.No.158/8C), Villianur Village, Post &amp; Taluk, Puducherry City, Puducherry District – 605110, Puducherry for offering BA.B.Ed/BSc.B.Ed course of four years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 27.05.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 05.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter was sent to State Government for recommendation on 12.06.2015, followed by Reminder-I on 22.02.2016 and reminder II sent on 30.11.2016.</p> <p>Sub-clause (3) of clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was found deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The institution has not submitted NOC from the affiliating body along with application.</li><li>2. The application is not duly signed by the applicant on all every pages of the hard copy of the online application.</li></ol> <p>The matter was placed before SRC for in its 292<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 29-30 Sept, 2015 and the Committee considered the matter and decided to issue show Cause Notice for rejection of application in the following ground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Non Submission of NOC issued by the affiliating body along with application.</li></ul> <p>Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 21.10.2015. The institution submitted written representation on 19.11.2015.</p> <p>The SRC in its 295<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup> November and 01<sup>st</sup> December 2015</p>
----	--	--

considered the documents submitted by the institution along with institution's reply dated 19-11-2015 to the show cause notice and decided as under:

The reply to the SCN is not satisfactory. They have admitted the deficiency. We cannot wait indefinitely from them to produce the NOC. According to the Regulations it is the responsibility of the applicant to secure and attach the NOC from the affiliating body. That being so, it is decided to reject the application.

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

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

As per the direction of SRC, application was processed and placed before SRC in its 303<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as follows;

1. Contiguity with existing B.Ed.
2. Discrepancy in Sy.no. In land and other documents.
3. Built up area is inadequate for existing and proposed programmes
4. BCC is not approved by competent authority
5. Cause Composite Inspection
6. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.
7. Ask whether they want BA;B.Ed or B.Sc;B.Ed

As per the decision of SRC, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members on 22.02.2016. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 20.02.2016 and VT report along with documents was received on 22.02.2016.

The SRC in its 305<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> & 26<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 considered the VT report and other relevant documents and decided as under:

1. Inadequate built up area
2. CD is working
3. Issue SCN accordingly.

Before issuance of show cause notice, the institution submitted its written representation on 01.03.2016.

The SRC in its 306<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> – 04<sup>th</sup> March, 2016 considered the institutions written representation and decided to issue show cause notice for rejection for the following ground;

1. The time given by NCTE (HQ) till 30.05.2015 only for the existing course

covered by the RPRO. We cannot take that into consideration. The built-up area available is adequate only for the existing courses. Even if they surrender 1 unit of D.El.Ed, even then, the area available will not be adequate for the proposed courses.

2. The court order is yet to be received. In any case, in the normal course, it is reasonable to assume that the court will deal only with what is pending before it and not any new applications.
3. That being so, the two new applications-B.Sc;B.Ed and B.Ed-AI-are not maintainable.

Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 20.05.2016. The institution has submitted its reply along with court order on 13.06.2016.

The institution submitted written representation on 12.07.2016 requesting to give three months time for conducting the required built up area for B.SC.B.Ed course.

The SRC in its 317<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 considered the show cause notice reply and decided as under;

1. They have D.El.Ed (2 units, B.Ed(2 units). They want B.Sc,B.Ed (1 unit) and B.Ed-A.I.(1 unit). The total required built-up area will be (2000+2000+500+1500) 6000 sqms. As against this they have only 3772 sqms. They want time till Sept to complete the additional area required.
2. Time is given till 30 Sept 2016.
3. Let them add the construction and approach us thereafter.

Before issuance of letter to the institution, the institution submitted written representation along with relevant documents on 05.08.2016.

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

1. Their contentions about the built-up-area requirements are not correct.
2. They need 2000 (for D.El.Ed-2 units) + 2000 (for B.Ed-2 units) +500 (for B.Sc B.Ed-1 unit)+500 (for B.Ed-A.I-1 unit)
3. They have only 3772 sq.mtrs. This will suffice only for D.El.Ed( 2 units) +B.Ed (1 unit) or vice versa.
4. There is no scope for any new course. The existing courses themselves have to be the preuned.
5. Issue SCN accordingly

Accordingly Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 30.11.2016.

The institution submitted its written representation for SCN on 09.12.2016 and stating as under;

"I am to refer to the minutes of the meeting of SRC cited (8) above and to state that no reply based on the above, has been received by us from your office and our society would come forward as detailed below.

1. We withdraw our proposal of starting B.Ed., Additional intake.
2. We will close our two units of Diploma in Elementary Education course in case our new proposal is accepted. Students did not come forward to join D.E1.Ed., from the academic year 2012-13 onwards. We have not admitted any student in D.E1.Ed., from the academic year 2012-13 to till date.
3. We will continue our existing two units of B.Ed., programme and we propose to start two units of B.Sc., B.Ed., and one unit of B.A., B.Ed., as permitted in Pope John Paul-II College of Education, Puducherry. A copy of the affiliation order issued by the affiliating body, namely Pondicherry University, Puducherry, to the aforesaid college is enclosed for ready reference. In the circumstances stated above I humbly request you sir to grant new recognition for the new courses as detailed below from the academic year 2017-18 along with the existing 2 units of B.Ed., Programme. The Original orders granting NOC by the Government of Puducherry and Pondicherry University have already been submitted to your office.

1. B.Sc., B.Ed., (Maths) – 1 unit
2. B.Sc., B.Ed., ( Computer Science) – 1 unit
3. B.A., B.Ed., (English) – 1 unit

The constructed area as per the SRC, NCTE, Bangalore for the aforesaid courses will be 500+ 500+ 2000= 3000Sq.mts. We have got 3772 Sq. mts of constructed area. Our college has been inspected twice by two different V.T teams. Our college is accredited by NAAC with 'B' Grade. Proposal for withdrawal of two units of D.El.Ed., will be submitted separately."

The SRC in its 325<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2016 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. The request for B.Ed-AI (1 unit) withdrawal is accepted.
2. Refund FDRs, if any.
3. Close the case.
4. They have also reported that they would be separately submitting, withdrawal letter for D.El.Ed (2 units). When it is received, we can issue a formal order about withdrawal.
5. After action in the 2 cases described above, we can process the applications for the 3 courses-BA B.Ed (1 unit), B.Sc.B.Ed (2 units).

As per the decision of the SRC, Recognition withdrawn order was issued to the institution on 13.01.2017 for SRCAPP2466/B.Ed-AI course.

The institution has submitted representation on 30.01.2017 stating as under:-

"I am to refer to the minutes of the meeting of SRC cited (10) above relating to our Senthil College of Education, Puducherry & submit to state that

1. We are in receipt of the order No.F.No.SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP2466/B.Ed-AI/PO/2016-17/91061, dt 13.01.2017 communicating the decision of your office to accept our proposal of withdrawal of B.Ed AI (1 unit)
2. As stated in our letter cited (9) above we are submitting the filled in application from towards the closure of our two units of D.El.Ed course in our Senthil Teacher Training Institute (Senthil School of Education) Puducherry along with following documents.
  - a) Copy of the recognition order of NCTE, Bangalore.
  - b) Copy of the recognition order available in the website of <http://srcncte.in/granted%20&20withdrawn.htm>
  - c) Copy of recently downloaded print cut of our website.
  - d) Original NOC from the principal, DIET, Puducherry.
  - e) Resolution of the society for the Closure of the Programme.
  - f) Statement about the reason for the closure and completion of the programme are available in the certificate issued by the principal, DIET, Puducherry.
  - g) Proof of settlement of all claims of faculty/staff (Declaration countersigned by principal, DIET, Puducherry.
  - h) Copy of Pan card Society which has been running the Senthil Teacher Training Institute.
3. In the circumstances stated above, we will continue our existing two units of B.Ed units of B.Ed programmed and we proposed to start two units of B.Sc, B.Ed and one unit of B.A, B.Ed as permitted in Pope John Paul-II College of Education Puducherr. A copy of the affiliating body, namely Pondicherry University Puducherry to the aforesaid College is enclosed for ready reference. I humbly request you sir to grant new recognition for the new courses as derailed below from the academic year 2017-18 along with the existing 2 units of B.Ed programme.
  1. B.Sc, B.Ed (Maths)- 1 Unit.
  2. BSc, B.Ed (Computer sciene) – 1 unit.
  3. B.A, B.Ed (English) – 1 unit.
4. The constructed area as per the SRC, NCTE, Bangalore for the aforesaid courses will be  $2000+500+500+500= 3500$  Sq.mts. we have got 3772 Sq.mts of constructed area.
5. The original order granted NOC by the Government of Puducherry and Pondicherry University have already been submitted to your office.
6. Our college has been inspected twice by two different V.T teams.
7. Our college is accredited by NAAC with 'B' Grade.
8. All the required facilities are made available, kindly grant recognition for two units of B.Sc B.Ed and one unit of B.A, B.Ed as stated at para 3 above at the earliest possible.

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

1. They want B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units) and B.A. B.Ed ( 1 unit).
2. To release infrastructure for these new courses they have surrendered D.El.Ed.( 2 units) and B.Ed -A.I.(1 unit).
3. 1. Recognition for B.Ed -A.I.(1 unit) has been withdrawn.
3. 2. Request for closure of D.El.Ed.(2 units) has been received. Requisite formalities have been complied with. The request is accepted. Issue withdrawal of recognition order.
4. Thereafter, process the cases for B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units) and B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit).
5. Put up on 12.2.17.

As per the decision of SRC, the documents of the institution were processed and placed before the Committee in its 330<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2017 and the Committee decided as under :-

1. They have D.El.Ed( 2 units)
2. They have B.Ed ( 2 units)
3. They want B.A.B.Ed (1 unit)
4. They want B.Sc.B.Ed ( 1unit)
5. They wanted B.Ed-A.I( 1 unit)
6. 1. The application for B.Ed-A.I ( 1 unit) has been withdrawn.
6. 2. A decision has been taken to permit closure of D.El.Ed (2 units)
6. 3 This was done to release infrastructure for the new courses
7. According to NCTE(HQ) clarification received now, no TEI can be give more than 2 units for B.Ed.
8. Since the applicant already has B.Ed( 2 units), the applications for B.A.B.Ed(1 unit) and B.Sc.B.Ed( 1 unit) cannot be maintained Reject the applications.
9. In view of this new position, there will be no need for them to wind up D.El.Ed ( 2 units). The permission given for its closure may therefore be withdrawn. They can continue with D.El.Ed ( 2 units)

Based on website information, the institution has submitted a representation in respect of the decision of 330<sup>th</sup> meeting of SRC which is as under :-

"I am to invite a kind reference to the letters/ minutes cited above and to state that our proposal of starting B.Sc.B.Ed, two units B.A.B.Ed , one unit were properly processed and came to final decision, as per the minutes cited above ( 330th meeting of SRC) based on the reports submitted by us and the reports submitted by two V.T.Teams appointed by the SRC,NCTE, Bangalore

As per the minutes cited (5) above, the points No.7 and 8 are reproduced below for ready reference.

Point No.7, according to the NCTE(HQ) clarification received now, no TEI can be given more that 2 units of B.Ed.

Point No.8 since the applicant already has B.Ed ( 2 units), the applications for B.A.B.Ed (1unit) and B.Sc.B.Ed( 1 unit) cannot be maintained. Reject the applications.

The above decision needs reconsideration on the following grounds;

1. Point No.7 relates to B.Ed course. Ours is for B.Sc.B.Ed and B.A.B.Ed. These two are different programmes for which the norms and standards are available in the appendices – 4 and 13 respectively of the notification of the NCTE dated 28th November 2014.

Therefore new clarification said to have been issued by NCTE (HQ) will not apply to our programmes. Moreover, we have contacted Dr.Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Under Secretary (Regulations) NCTE(HQ),

New Delhi over his cell no. 7381106749 today and confirmed from him that no new clarification has been issued from NCTE(HQ) as stated by SRC meeting minutes dated 12th and 13th February, 2017 (SI/No. 20) in respect of B.Sc.B.Ed and B.A.B.Ed

In the circumstances stated above it is clear that no new clarification has been issued by the NCTE (HQ) relating to the starting of B.Sc.B.Ed and B.A.B.Ed.

2. It is a well known fact that nearly five thousand B.Ed colleges in our country have been granted recognition to start B.Sc.B.Ed and B.A.B.Ed along with B.Ed (2 units) for the past two years by all the four regional committees of NCTE.
3. Therefore kindly reconsider our proposal for the grant of recognition to start B.Sc.B.Ed (2 units) and B.A.B.Ed (1 unit) in the Senthil College of Education, Puducherry from the academic year 2017-18 and also accept our closure of Senthil Teacher Training Institute (Senthil School of Education) offering D.El.Ed( 2 units) as already accepted by SRC NCTE, Bangalore in the 329th meeting dated 6th and 7th February, 2017 (SI.No. 96) . Point No.

SRC in its 330<sup>th</sup> Meeting considered the letter dated 10.02.2017 of NCTE Hqrs regarding clarification on certain points with regard to NCTE Regulations, 2014 in respect of four year integrated course and decided as under :-

1. Noted
2. Give copies of the NCTE circulars to all Members.
3. The clarification regarding - 4 year integrated course requires review. Shri. Chaturvedi i.e U.S(NCTE), will pursue with HQ.
4. The clarification regarding addl. intake in D.P.S.E/D.El.Ed/B.Ed covers too many variations of the 3 courses .SRO to put up a comparative tabular chart.

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

In view of the above, an e-mail was sent to NCTE-Hqrs seeking clarification in the matter on 21.02.2017.

In response to this office mail dated 21.02.2017, a clarification letter dated 22.02.2017 is received from NCTE-Hqrs stating as under :-

*"I am directed to refer to your email letter dated 21.02.2017 on the subject above and to say that as per Norms and Standards for 4-years integrated programme leading to B.Sc.B.Ed/B.A.B.Ed degree appendix 13 of regulation 2014, there shall be a basic unit of fifty (50) students and initially two units may be permitted. This can be permitted even if the institution is already having a 2 year B.Ed course."*

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

1. Too many proposals. Too many changes.
2. Some confusion has been added by an error in the indication of our calculation of built-up area required.
3. The final position can be represented as follows:-
  - (i) B.Ed.(2 units) } 2000 sq.mts.  
to continue..... } (required)
  - (ii) D.El.Ed.(2 units) }  
to stand withdrawn } 2000 sq.mts.  
as already ordered..... } (saved)
  - (iii) B.Ed.-AI(1 unit)..... 500 sq.mts.  
(saved)
  
  - (iv) B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit)..... 1500 sq.mts.  
(New) (required)
  - (v) B.Sc.B.Ed.-AI(1 unit)... 500 sq.mts.  
(New) (required)
  - (vi) B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit)..... 1500 sq.mts.  
(New) (required)
- 4.1 Two things have to be clarified here-they have listed 2 B.Sc.B.Ed. courses separately as independent units. The 2014 Regulations refer only to B.Sc.B.Ed. as a recognized integrated course. There is no subjectwise listing. That being so, we can sanction only B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit); and, B.Sc.B.Ed.-A.I.( 1 unit).
- 4.2 The surrender of D.El.Ed.( 2 units) and B.Ed.-A.I.( 1 unit) will release only (2000+500) 2500 sq.mts. of built up area.
- 5.1 B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit) will require 1500 sq.mts.
- 5.2 B.Sc.B.Ed.-A.I.(1 unit) will require 500 sq.mts.
- 5.3 B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit) will require 1500 sq.mts.
- 5.4 In other words, there will be a shortfall of 1000 sq.mts.

6. Let them see this corrected position; understand the mismatch of built-up areas and make their choice of courses.
7. Let them be assured that there was no attempt to fool them by referring to any non-existent clarification from NCTE(HQ). If it comes to that their stand can easily be shown to be factually incorrect.

As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 08.03.2017. Based on the website information of the SRC decision, the institution has submitted a reply on 07.03.2017.

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

1. They have accepted that the proposals have to be trimmed.
2. Instead of considering B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit) & B.Sc.B.Ed.-A.I.(1 unit), we can straight away sanction B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units) in addition to the existing B.Ed.(2 units).
3. Built-up area available is adequate.
4. Issue LOI for B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units).

As per the decision of SRC, a letter of intent was issued to the institution on 17.04.2017. The institution submitted LOI reply on 28.04.2017.

The LOI reply was placed before SRC in its 338<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> May, 2017 the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. Their LOI reply is seen.
2. The Faculty list is examined:
  - It is approved by a nominee of the University and not by the Registrar.
  - It has to be ensured that there is no overlap with the Faculty lists of their old B.Ed.(2 units) and D.El.Ed.(2 units) courses.
  - The staffing pattern is in order.
3. FDRs have been given.
4. They have to give FDRs in original, in joint account, with a 5- year validity@ 7+5 lakhs for each unit of each course, including their old running courses of B.Ed.(2 units) and D.El.Ed.(2 units).
5. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 09.05.2017. The SCN reply was received on 22.05.2017 the matter (agenda) was deferred case.

The institution has submitted again SCN reply on 07.06.2017. The SCN reply was placed before SRC in its 343<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> to 02<sup>nd</sup> August 2017, considered the

matter and decided as under:-

1. The case now relates only to B.Ed.(2 units) Existing and B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units) New.
2. We will process the new application for B.Sc.B.Ed. in general. No subject specification will be indicated. As stated in the NCTE Regulations, it is for the affiliating University to decide how many students will be allocated for which subjects. As directed by the NCTE(HQ), we will confine our processing to the B.Ed. part of B.Sc.B.Ed.
3. That being so, whether the University issues NOC for B.Sc. B.Ed. in general or B.Sc. B.Ed. subjectwise is not of our concern. That is a matter to be settled between the University and the applicant.
- 4.1 The Faculty list is to be approved by the University before our recognition. The list submitted by the applicant, with the approval of the University, will be taken by us to be in the context (and part) of the applicant's case under consideration.
- 4.2 To be specific, the approved Faculty list submitted in this case will have to be for B.Sc.B.Ed. Even if the endorsement reads as 'approved for B.Ed.'
- 5.1 Faculty list for B.Sc.B.Ed.:
  - (i) They have a total of 17.
  - (ii) The list is approved by the University.
  - (iii) In Perspectives Group, 4 are required whereas they have only 3. One Asst. Prof. from Pedagogy of Social Science can be shifted to fill up this gap.
  - (iv) In the Pedagogy group, For 'Maths' as against 3 required, only 2 are there. One Asst. Prof. (Maths-Pedagogy) is required.
- 5.2 Faculty list for B.Ed.
  - (i) The list available is very old. Many members would have even superannuated.
  - (ii) Latest approved list is required.
6. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 09.08.2017.

The institution submitted its written representation on 16.08.2017 along with Pondicherry University letter dated 07.058.2017 and stating as under:-

the institution submitted its written representation on 21.09.2017 along with relevant document and stating as under:-

*"I am to submit the following for favour of consideration.*

1. The NCTE, Bangalore has issued LOI to the Senthil College of Education, Puducherry for stating B.Sc.,B.Ed., (2 units) Vide Lr.

No.F.No.SRCAPP2468/B.Sc.B.Ed/PO/2017/92828, dt. 17-04-2017 (Copy enclosed).

2. The college has fulfilled all the conditions mentioned in the LOI and submitted all the documents on 28/04/2017 (Our Lr. No. 34/SCE/B.Sc., B.Ed./2017, dt. 28-04-2017 – Copy enclosed).
3. The SRC has recorded in its 338<sup>th</sup> meeting, dated 01 – 03 May, 2017 (S.No.22) as follows:
  - The Staffing Pattern is in order.
  - The staff list is approved by the Pondicherry University Nominee, whose name has been approved by the Registrar, Vice – Chancellor of Pondicherry University.
  - NCTE, Bangalore requested the signature of the Registrar in the staff list selected for B.Sc., B.Ed., programme
4. The college approached the Pondicherry University for getting the signature of the Registrar in the staff list.

The University has replied as follows:

The faculty list for B.Sc., B.Ed., programme, can be approved only after grant of affiliations, which will be considered based on their recognition to be granted by SRC, NCTE, for the course in the college. Faculty list cannot be approved by the University before grant of affiliation for the course (Lr. No.PU/AW-1/17/2017-18/38, dt. 18-05-2017 – Copy enclosed).

5. However the Registrar, signed in the staff list for B.Ed, Programme, for which the college has got recognition order, in view of the decision stated at para 4 above.
6. In the SRC 343<sup>rd</sup> meeting dated 01-02 August, 2017, (S. No. 14), the above said staff list has been taken up by the SRC for B.Sc., B.Ed., Programme, even though it is approved by the University for B.Ed., programme and requested to submit fresh staff list approved by the Registrar, Pondicherry University for B.Ed Programme
7. When the college approached the Pondicherry University, for approval to the 2<sup>nd</sup> fresh staff list for B.Ed., programme, they have questioned as follows:

1. How can we approve 17 (First List) + 16 (Second List) – 33 staff members for 2 units of B.Ed., Programme?

In the light of the above the following are submitted

- a. The college has fulfilled all the conditions of LOI and became eligible to get recognition order for B.Sc.B.Ed., (2 units) by 28.04.2017.
- b. In the NCTE notification dated 28-11-2014, (page number 118 &

168), it is stated that,

IN A COMPOSITE INSTITUTION, THE PRINCIPAL AND ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL STAFF CAN BE SHARED.

c. The work load of the staff (already approved by the Registrar, Pondicherry University) for first year B.Ed., Second year B.Ed., and first year B.Sc.B.Ed., is given in page 2

d. The college has been granted affiliation by the Pondicherry University for 2017-18 for B.Ed., Programme based on the sufficient staff and other facilities available vide their Lr.No. PU/AW-1/17/2017-18/83 dated 7/11.08.2017

(copy enclosed)

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

1. The representation of the college is seen. The difficulty posed by the stand taken by the University is noted.
2. We have to clarify the issues, the legal position thereof, and the sequence of actions to be taken.
3. Let us write to the University as follows;
  - (i) The legal position is that the Faculty list has to be approved before the NCTE accords Recognition to a programme.
  - (ii) There should be no problem for the University to approve the Faculty list before affiliation' because under law, the University shall grant affiliation once a programme is granted recognition by NCTE.
  - (iii) The LOI clearly states that the programme in reference. If an Institution is given recognition for B.Ed., the Faculty approved for it can not be confused with the Faculty requirements of another programme of BSc.B.Ed for which LOI is issued to the same institution.
4. The excess' FDRs collected in this case may be refunded.


12 SRCAPP2589  
M.Ed  
1 Unit

CSI College of Education, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala

**CSI College of Education, Plot No.422/4,419/6, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District-695502, Kerala.**

Society for Higher Education of SIUC Community of South Kerala Diocese of Church of South India, Plot No.419/6422/4, Cheruvarakonam Street, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluka, Thiruvananthapuram District - 695502 applied for grant of recognition to CSI College of Education, Plot No.422/4,419/6, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District-695502, Kerala for offering M.Ed course of 2 years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 28.05.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 03.06.2015.

The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures)

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

Reminder- II on 30.11.2015.

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

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

The SRC in its 295<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> - 30<sup>th</sup> November & 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2015 considered the matter, documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On 02.05.2016 and 04.06.2015 a letter was received by this office from the institution

along with BCC and photocopy of the FDRs.

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

*"As per our application for M.Ed Course (Application ID:SRCAPP2589) an inspection team visited our college during 1<sup>st</sup> week of February and based on the VT report a Letter of Intent Prior to grant of recognition was issued subject to the appointment of qualified staff. For staff appointment a selection committee was constituted with Dr.G.R.Santhosh Kumar, Chairman, Board of Studies (Education), University of Kerala as University Nominee, Rev.D. Jacob, Treasurer, CSI, south Kerala Diocese as Management Representative, Prof Jacob Mathew, Former Principal, Government college of Teacher Education, Thiruvananthapuram as Management Nominee and Dr. Sajith C Raj, Principal, CSI college of Education, Parassala as its member. Based on the interview held on 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2016, Two Professors, Two Associate Professors and Six Assistant Professors were selected and appointment as M.Ed Faculty. The list of selected candidates was forwarded to the University of Kerala along with their original documents for Approval/Endorsement which is being processed by the university.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"The Faculty list for the proposed M.Ed course in CSI College of Education, Parasala was submitted to the University of Kerala and was placed in the sub-committee of the syndicate which usually meets prior to the Syndicate meeting. Two defects were noticed by the sub-committee and both of them were rectified by the college immediately. The revised faculty list will be placed in the next syndicate meeting for final approval. A letter from the Registrar of the University of Kerala in this regard is enclosed. As we have already rectified all the other defects noticed by NCTE, I request your good self to be kind enough to extend the time limit for the submission of approved faculty list so that we could get the recognition from NCTE for the M.Ed course for the academic year 2017-18".

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

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

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

The Appellate Authority vide No. F.No.89-277/E-1894/2017 Appeal/12<sup>th</sup> Meeting-2017 dated 10.08.2017 received by this office on 29.08.2017 and stating as under:-

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

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

		<p><i>AND WHEREAS after perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents o record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, Appeal committee concluded to remand back the case to SRC, Bangalore with a request to consider the faculty list which the appellat institution should submit within 15 days of the issue of Appeal orders.</i></p> <p><i>NOW THEREFORE the council hereby remands back the case of CSI college of Education, Parassala, Cheruvakonam, Neyyattinkara, Kerala to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 345<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided to Process.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, the documents are processed.</p> <p><b>The Committee asked SRO to put up the matter tomorrow.</b></p>
12	SRCAPP2016 30153 M.Ed 1 Unit Cosmopolitan College of Education. Kancheepura m, Tamilnadu	<p><b>Cosmopolitan College of Education, Sengadu Village, Nehamiah Nagar, Sriperambudur Taluk, Sengadu City, Kancheepuram District-602002, Tamil Nadu.</b></p> <p>Cosmopolitan College of Education, Sengadu Village, Sriperambudur Street, Chennai Taluk, Kancheepuram District-602002, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Cosmopolitan College of Education, Sengadu Village, Nehamiah Nagar, Sriperambudur Taluk, Sengadu City, Kancheepuram District-602002, 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 30.06.2016. 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. No recommendation received from the State Govt. 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 M.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 was placed before SRC in its 326<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> January, 2016, the Committee considered the scrutiny of the application and decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The applicant is the Cosmopolitan College of Education. Land document shows Cosmopolitan Charitable, Educational, Cultural and Social Development Trust as the owner. Transfer of title to the institution is not indicated.</li></ol>

2. Latest EC is required.
3. LUC is in order.
4. BP is not legible. Does not show Sy. Nos. approved by competent authority.
5. BCC is in the name of an individual. Approved by competent authority.
6. Fee paid in full.
7. FDRs not given.
8. NAAC certificate is given.
9. Issue SCN accordingly

As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations, 2014 a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution through online mode on 13.01.2017.

The institution has submitted a reply through online mode on 02.02.2017.

As directed the matter was placed before the SRC in its 329<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 06th & 07th February, 2017 considered the Show Cause Notice Reply of the institution and decided as under:-

1. The details now submitted show that the clarifications given are acceptable.
2. Cause VT inspection.

As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations 2014 the same is communicated to the V.T. Members through on-line mode on 10.02.2017.

VT members names were generated through online VT module for inspection during the period 20.02.2017 to 12.03.2017.

The Inspection was conducted by VT Members on 06.03.2017 VT report received through hard copy on 13.03.2017.

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

1. Applicant is the College. But, title to properties is with the Society. In other words, on the date of application, the applicant did not have title.
2. Seek clarification from HQ whether such a case can be entertained. Put up on 30.3.17.
3. EC shows some encumbrance.
4. LUC is in order.
5. BP is approved. But, obtain the original.
6. BCC is in order. Built-up area is adequate.
7. 5 years of B.Ed. experience is there.
8. FDRs – 7+5 lakhs for each 'unit' are not adequate.

As per decision of SRC, a letter addressed to the Member Secretary for clarification on

20.04.2017.

Based on the website information of the SRC decision, the institution has submitted representation on 20.04.2017.

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

1. They have B.Ed. running for 8 years.
2. NAAC certificate is there.
3. Land does not belong to the applicant. They should explain.
4. EC is not clear. The earlier mortgage to the Bank of Baroda does not appear to have been redeemed.
5. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of the SRC, a Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 27.04.2017. An email was received by this office on 02.05.2017. A reply for SCN was received on 02.05.2017 (hard copy)

The reply was placed before SRC in its 338<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter decided as under:-

1. Their reply dated 2.5.17 is seen.
2. The reply is not at all satisfactory.
  - 3.1 As regards title, they refer to their affidavit. The relevant document is a sale, lease or gift deed.
  - 3.2 Even according to the affidavit, the title is with the Trust.
  - 4.1 The College is the applicant. Land is owned by the Trust.
  - 4.2 The Regulation requires that the applicant shall have title to the land on the date of application. This requirement is violated.
5. The EC supplied clearly mentions mortgage of property with Bank of Baroda. They have not cared to contradict that. Merely asserting that there is no 'liability' is not enough.
6. With such basic infirmities, it is not possible to process this case further.
7. Reject the application.
8. Return FDRs, if any.
9. Close the file.

As per the decision of the SRC, Rejection order was issued to the institution on 09.05.2017.

An email was received by this office on 25.05.2017 from Dr.S.K. Chauhan, Research officer, NCTE (Hqrs) requesting to forward the status/comments

The VIP reference reply was sent on 11.05.2016 and 15.02.2017.

An e-mail dated 19.06.2017 received by Shri R. C. Chopra Section Officer NCTE, regarding Brief and records of Regulatory files No.91-13<sup>th</sup> on 20.06.2017.

A letter was addressed to Shri R. C. Chopra Section Officer NCTE along with Original File/records on 21.06.2017.

The Appellate Authority vide No. F.No.89-339/E-3157/2017 Appeal/13<sup>th</sup> Meeting-2017 dated: 21.08.2017 received by this office on 29.08.2017 and stating as under:-

*".....AND WHEREAS the Committee noted that according to the provisions of clause 8(4) (i) of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, on the date of application, the institution or society sponsoring the institution should be in possession of the required land. In the present case, the land is in the name of the society, which is the umbrella of the College as could be seen from the order of recognition for B.Ed. course and also the certificate of land issued by the Sub Registrar, there is no encumbrance on the land and the proposed M.Ed. is to be run in the same College. In these circumstances, the condition laid down in clause 8 (4) (i) of the Regulation can be taken as fulfilled by the appellant. The Committee, therefore, concluded that matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC to process the application further as per NCTE Regulations, 2014. The SRC may, however, at the appropriate stage, impose the condition regarding transfer and vesting the title of the land and building in the name of institution within six months from the date of issue of formal recognition as envisaged in clause 8 (4) (iii) of the Regulations.*

*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 to process the application further as per NCTE Regulations, 2014. The SRC may, however, at the appropriate stage, impose the condition regarding transfer and vesting the title of the land building in the name of the within six months from the date of issue of formal recognition as envisaged 8 (4) (iii) of the Regulations. NOW THEREFORE, the Council hereby remands back the case of cosmopolitan College of Education, Sengadu Nehemiah Nagar, Sriperambudur, Tamil Nadu to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above."*

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

As per the decision of SRC, the documents are processed as under;

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

- 1. Based on the Appellate Authority order, we can require the Society to transfer title to properties to the institution within 6 months in case we are able to issue the FR.**

		<p>2.1 There is another deficiency about 'mortgage'. There are 2 gift deeds together covering 9 sy.nos. The EC dated 18.4.2017 covers only one Gift Deed relating to 2 Sy.nos.</p> <p>2.2 Also it covers only the period 1.1.16 to 17.4.17 to say 'no transaction'.</p> <p>3.1 The earlier EC clearly mentioned mortgage with Bank of Baroda.</p> <p>3.2 There is nothing on record to show that this mortgage has been redeemed.</p> <p>3.3 Ask them to produce a new EC covering both the Gift Deeds and all the 9 Sy.Nos. related to show that the title is clear.</p> <p>4. Issue a SCN accordingly.</p>
14	APS05944 B.Ed 1Unit Prathibha College of Education, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh	<p><b>Prathibha College of Education, Sy.No.123/1, 123/2, 123/3, NadimTiruvuru Village &amp; Mandal, Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh</b></p> <p>Prathibha College of Education, Sy.No.123/1, 123/2, 123/3, NadimTiruvuru Village &amp; Mandal, Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh made an application on 02.01.2006 for B.Ed course to SRC, NCTE Bangalore.</p> <p>The SRC after considering the report of the visiting team as well as other relevant materials, granted recognition to the institution for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students from the session 2007-2008 vide order F.No.SRO/NCTE/B.Ed/2006-2007/2188 dated 01.05.2007.</p> <p>The Government of Andhra Pradesh vide letter dated 06.03.2007 forwarded a list of institutions not recommending the name of college with the specific reasons with a request to NCTE-SRC to take necessary action against the institutions, this institution is one of the institutions not recommended.</p> <p>The matter was placed before SRC in its 150<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup>-29<sup>th</sup> December 2007. The SRC after careful consideration of all aspects decided to conduct the inspection of the institution under Section 17.</p> <p>The inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.04.2008 and the report was received. The report was considered by SRC in its 161<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 6-7 August 2008 and upon consideration of all aspects it was decided to issue show cause notice.</p> <p>Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 25.08.2008. The reply was received on 07.10.2008 was placed before SRC in its 166<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 18-19 October 2008.</p> <p>The SRC considered the reply of the institution vis-à-vis the points raised in the show cause notice, the deficiencies pointed out in the report forwarded by State Government, VCD, two visiting team report under section 14 and under section 17 of NCTE Act 1993, and decided to withdraw the recognition from the academic session 2008-2009.</p>

  
 (S. Sathyam)  
 Chairman

Accordingly, withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 22.10.2008.

The institution preferred an appeal to NCTE-Hqrs, accordingly, original file along with comments of the case was sent to NCTE Hqrs on 26.12.2008.

The NCTE Hqrs forwarded appellate authority order dated 09.02.2009 along with original file received by SRC on 24.02.2009. The appellate authority order stated as follows:-

*"...the council noted that the institution was having 1140.24 sq.mtr built up area as per plan and completion certificate dated 14.07.2008 issued by Secretary Gram Panchayath Thiruvur, which was inadequate as per norms. The council, therefore, came to a conclusion there was no jurisdiction in accepting the appeal and that be rejected.*

*After perusal of documents, memorandum of appeal, affidavit, VT report and after hearing oral arguments advanced during hearing, the council reached the conclusion that there was no ground to accept the appeal and that it should be rejected. Accordingly, the appeal was rejected and SRC's order dated 22.10.2008 refusing recognition to the institution was confirmed."*

The institution has submitted willingness affidavit affirming adherence of NCTE Regulations 2014 on 28.01.2015. But revised recognition order was not issued to the institution due to the recognition was withdrawn on 22.10.2008.

In the meantime, an e-mail has been received from Sri.Ramakanth Reddy, Advocate on 19.07.2015 regarding W.P.No 22271 of 2015 filed by Prathiba College of Education, Kallur, Khammam District.

Accordingly, a letter was sent to Sri.Ramakanath Reddy, Advocate on 20.07.2015 regarding status of the college.

An e-mail has been received from Sri.Ramakanth Reddy, Advocate dated 21.07.2015 on 21.07.2015 along with draft counter affidavit in W.P.No.3884 of 2009 filed by the Prathiba College of Education.

Accordingly, counter affidavit duly signed was forwarded to Sri.Ramakanth Reddy, Advocate on 21.07.2015 in respect of WP.No.3884 of 2009 filed by Prathiba College of Education.

The court order in Review WPMP No.29673 of 2015 in WP No.3884 of 2015 dated 24.7.2015. The court order stated as follows:-

*"The original writ petition was filed challenging the orders dated 09.02.2009, where under the appeal preferred by the petitioner was rejected.*

*This court, by order dated 27.02.2009, granted interim direction, which continued till 24.12.2014, when the writ petition was posted for final hearing.*

*After disposal of the writ petition, new Regulations were framed by the NCTE and the petitioner should comply with the new Regulations.*

*Now, the present review petition is filed stating that in view of the closure of the writ petition on 24.12.2014, the NCTE is not considering the application of the petitioner under the new Regulations.*

*In the facts and circumstances of the case, W.P.No.3884 of 2009 was closed, and the closure of the said writ petition does not come in the way of the NCTE from considering the application of the petitioner under the new Regulations, which came into force with effect from 28.11.2014. The petitioner can as well apply under the new Regulations and the same can be considered by the NCTE as per the said Regulations, if the petitioner is otherwise eligible. The writ petition was closed because the order worked out till the date of coming into force of the new Regulations.*

*Review W.P.M.P is, accordingly, disposed of.*

The court order in WPMP No.28724 of 2015 in WP No.22271 of 2015 dated 28.7.2015. The court order stated as follows:-

*".....as the petitioner's institution was permitted to run from the year 2009 in terms of the orders of this court and the same continued till 2014 and as this court in the above mentioned order dated 24.07.2015 in review WPMP No 29673 of 2015 in W.P.No.3884 of 2009 held that closure order does not come in the way of considering the request of the petitioner under new regulations and as the similarly situated institution, as mentioned supra, is already included in the list for counselling, balance of convenience is in favour of the petitioner.*

*In view of the same, there shall be interim direction to the respondents to include the petitioner college in the list of colleges for A.P.Ed CET 2015 and allot the students to the petitioner college.*

*Post the matter after four weeks".*

The court notice in W.P.No.22271 of 2015 dated 28.07.2015 received on 12.08.2015. Accordingly, a letter was sent to Sri.Ramakanth Reddy, Advocate on 28.08.2015.

The SRC in its 292<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 considered the matter and it was decided as under:

1. Comply with the Court order.

2. Collect fees as per new Regulations.
3. Obtain documents as per New Regulation. Process and put up.

As per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 25.11.2015.

The institution has submitted written representation on 07.03.2016, stating as under:

*"I herewith submit the affidavit for 50 students intake and I also assure that I will abide by the norms of NCTE for 50 students intake".*

The institution has submitted its representation along with documents as per New Regulations on 04.07.2017. It stated as under:

*"We already requested for 01 unit on 07.03.2016. We are here with submitting documents along with court order for one unit and requesting to consider our documents."*

The documents were processed and placed before the SRC in its 343<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> – 02<sup>nd</sup> August, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. The Court order is noted.
2. The Court has ordered continuation of recognition.
3. The College has assured in writing on 7.3.16 that their admission has been restricted to 50(w.e.f.16-17).
- 4.1 The built-up area of 1540 sq.mts. is adequate only for 1 unit. We, therefore, process this case as a case of B.Ed.(1 unit).
- 4.2 Inform the Affiliating University accordingly. They may be requested to ensure that the college does not admit more than 50 students.
5. In view of the facts stated above, their request for reduction from 2 units to 1 unit is accepted.
- 5.1 The Faculty list is approved; but, it is signed by the Registrar, only in the last page. Other pages have been authenticated by the CDC (of the University).
- 5.2 In the Perspective group, out of 2 Asst. Profs. required, one is vacant. The other is shown to have M.A.(Foundation course) without showing the subject.
- 5.3 Three Asst. Profs. in P.A., F.A., and Phy.Ed. are not there.
6. Issue SCN accordingly.

No Decision was conveyed to the institution.

As directed agenda was prepared for RPRO and placed before SRC in its 344<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2017 and decided as under:

1. The College was functioning, on the strength of the 'stay' order of the Court.
2. The College has filed an affidavit to run a B.Ed.(1 unit) course and to abide by the 2014 Regulations.

3. In pursuance of this affidavit, let us process this case for recognition under the 2014 Regulations. It will be too late to issue an RPRO at this stage.
4. Documents have already been examined.
- 5.1 The Faculty list was found to have many deficiencies.
- 5.2 Issue SCN as already directed.
6. Put up in the next meeting.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was issued on 24.08.2017.

Now, the institution submitted its written representation along with faculty list on 16.10.2017 and stating as under;

*".....the NCTE in its 344<sup>th</sup> meeting considered the request for one unit and decided that the documents for one unit are in order accept staff list, issue show cause notice and put up in September. We are here with submitting the staff list approved by Krishna University for one unit. If there are any other requirements also we will submit them immediately.*

*Krishna University is requesting us to ask one unit sanction order for 2017-18. Many institutions have got one unit order recently. Our institution is not got one unit order. Hence we request you is to give us at least conditional recognition order as given to the others. Otherwise we will loss this academic year."*

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

- 1.1 This is an old case of B.Ed.(1 unit) sanctioned in 2007.
- 1.2 It has continued to function on the strength of a 'stay' order from the Court after our withdrawal of recognition order in 2008.
- 1.3 Accordingly, this treated as a RPRO case.
- 2.1 As per the Court order, the institution was required to submit documents.
- 2.2 The documents were examined. Only the Faculty list was found to be defective.
- 3.1 They have submitted a revised Faculty list duly approved by the Universtiy.
- 3.2 Asst. Prof.(Tel)(Shri. Nageshwara Rao) has scored less 50%(i.e.'C'grade); hence not qualified.
- 3.3 Asst. Prof. in Fine Arts with P.G. degree is not there.
4. Issue SCN accordingly.

15	APS00375 B.Ed 2Units Jayamukhi College of Teacher Education, Warangal, Telangana	<p><b>Jayamukhi College of Teacher Education, Mahabubabad Revenue Division, Moqdumpuram Village, Chennaraopet Mandal, Warangal District-506332, Andhra Pradesh</b></p> <p>Jayamukhi College of Teacher Education, Mahabubabad Revenue Division, Moqdumpuram Village, Chennaraopet Mandal, Warangal District-506332, Andhra Pradesh was granted recognition for offering B.Ed course vide order dated 17.09.2003 with an annual intake of 100 students with condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises within three years from the date of recognition (In case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>Institution submitted Shifting fees of Rs. 40,000/- on 24.09.2007. A letter was issued to the institution on 26.05.2009 regarding submission of Documents for shifting of premises from temporary building to permanent building.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification new Regulations 2014, seeking consent on their willingness to fulfill the revised norms of and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>On 16.02.2015, the institution submitted affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students.</p> <p>The SRC in its 276<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> January, 2015 decided to issue provisional recognition orders to the existing institutions and the committee also decided to maintain a check list of such cases for verification in October/November and for causing inspection.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the Regulation 2014, a revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 30.06.2015 along with Original FDRs with an annual intake of two basic 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 17.09.2003.</p> <p>Institution submitted documents for shifting of premises from temporary building to permanent building on 03.08.2015. The Documents were processed and placed before SRC which considered there in its 315<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> - 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2016 and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. They have shifted without NCTE approval.</li><li>2. Only ₹ 40,000/- was paid towards the inspection fee. ₹ 1,10,000/- more remains to be paid.</li><li>3. BP and BCC are not approved by competent authority. BCC is not also in format.</li><li>4. Original FDRs and latest Faculty list are not given.</li><li>5. LUC and EC are in order.</li><li>6. Collect the balance of 'Fee' and cause inspection.</li><li>7. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.</li></ol>
----	--	--

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, Inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 12.07.2016.

The institution has submitted its written representation on 08.07.2016 as under:

*"We, Jayamukhi College of Education, Narsampet, Warangal, humbly submit that, as we have given consent for 2 units of B.Ed., course for the academic year 2015-16 and had taken admissions as per it. Now, we are unable to run the B.Ed., Programme as 2 units from the academic year 2016-17 due to some unavoidable circumstances. Hence, we request the authorities to make it as one unit from the academic year 2016-17 onwards to run the Programme successfully."*

As per decision of SRC, inspection of the institution was conducted on 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> September, 2016. VT report along with documents and CD received on 17.09.2016.

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

1. Title is clear. Land area (3.95 ha) is adequate.
2. LUC & EC are in order.
3. BP is not approved by competent authority. Built-up area (3668 sq mts.) is adequate.
4. BCC is in order. Built-up area (3668 sq.mts.) is adequate.
5. FDRs are required in original, in joint account with a 5-year validity @7+5 lakhs per programme.
- 6.1 Faculty list is required in original. Every page should be certified by the Registrar.
- 6.2 Faculty list-staffing pattern is in order.
- 6.3 Service Certificate of Principal is not there.
7. They have shifted without permission. Order thereon will be passed after they remove the deficiencies.
8. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 31.05.2017.

The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 17.07.2017.

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

1. **Deficiencies pointed out earlier have been removed. But, new deficiencies have cropped up in the Faculty list.'**

		<p>2.1 For B.Ed.(2 units), a total faculty of 1+15 are required; they have only 1+12.</p> <p>2.2 Two more Asst. Profs. In Perspective are required; one of them should be in Sociology/Philosophy.</p> <p>2.3 One Asst. Prof(FA) is required.</p> <p>2.4. Asst. Prof(Telugu) has only 54% in M.Ed. which is inadequate.</p> <p>3. Issue SCN accordingly.</p> <p>4. Ratification of shifting without permission will be given after these deficiencies are removed.</p>
16	<p>APS00025 B.Ed 2 Units VPR College of Education, Kadapa, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p><b>VPR College of Education, Rayavaram, Mydukur Road, Proddattur, Khadarabad, Kadapa-516362, Andhra Pradesh.</b></p> <p>VPR College of Education, Rayavaram, Mydukur Road, Proddattur, Khadarabad, Kadapa-516362, Andhra Pradesh was granted recognition for offering B.Ed course vide order dated 14.05.2003 with an annual intake of 100 students with condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises within three years from the date of recognition (In case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>The institution submitted a proposal for shifting of premises along with shifting fee of Rs. 40,000/- and necessary documents on 11.03.2011. The committee considered the matter and decided to cause inspection.</p> <p>As per decision of SRC, inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 21.03.2011. The inspection of institution was conducted on 30.03.2011. VT report along with documents and CD received on 05.04.2011.</p> <p>The SRC in its 204<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> &amp; 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2011 considered the VT report and decided to issue show cause notice for the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per VT/VCD observation of the building is still under construction and incomplete.</li> <li>• Building completion certificate from the competent Govt. Engineer is to be submitted.</li> <li>• Consolidated salaries being paid to the staff.</li> </ul> <p>Accordingly, show cause notice was issued on 27.05.2011. The institution submitted reply along with documents on 07.06.2011.</p> <p>The SRC in its 208<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> &amp; 14<sup>th</sup> July, 2011 considered the reply of the institution and decided to "Permit shifting to new premises." Permission hereby accorded to VPR College of Education, Rayavaram, Mydukur Road, Proddattur, Khadarabad, Kadapa-516362, Andhra Pradesh to shift the premises to the new location / building at Sy. No. 182, Peddachepalli village, Kamalapuram Mandal-516289, Y.S.R District, Kadapa, Andhra Pradesh.</p>

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC shifting order was issued to the institution on 07.09.2011.

On 21.01.2015 the institution has submitted the affidavit expressing their willingness to process their application as per Regulations 2014, and the Revised order was issued to institution on 06.05.2015.

On 14.07.2015, a letter received from the institution regarding request for change of address to "V.P.R College of Education, Rayavaram, Mydukur Road, Proddatur instead of VPR College of Education, Kamalapuram. Accordingly corrigendum was issued on 04.08.2015.

The institution submitted its representation on 07.08.2015 and stating as under:

"I am herewith submitting a few lines for your kind consider and request to give favorable address in the regard.

As per the reference list cited the Regional Director, NCTE, Bangalore has pleased and approved the request of the Management for change of address of the college.

Instead of words:- "VPR College of Education, Rayavaram, Mydukur Road, Proddatur, Khadarabad, Kadapa-516362, Andhra Pradesh"

May be read as:- " V.P.R College of Education, Peddachepalli Village, Kamalapuram Mandal, Y.S.R (Kadapa) District-516289, Andhra Pradesh"

While at the time of request to change the address unfortunately it was mistyped by our staff member as Peddachepalli instead of Reddy Colony.

In this regard I am request you Madam to be kind enough to change the words of Pedda Cheppali as Reddy Colony. And may be read as "VPR College of Education, Reddy Colony, Kamalapuram, Kadapa District-516289, Andhra Pradesh."

The institution submitted its representation along with DD of Rs. 1,50,000/- and relevant documents on 19.11.2015 and stating as under:

"I am herewith submitting a few lines for your kind consideration and request to give favourable orders in this regard

In the reference 1<sup>st</sup> cited the Governing body of CSSR & SRR Educational Society, Kamalapuram, unanimously resolved to taken over the educational institutions of VPR College of Education (B.Ed) and VPR Institute of Elementary Teacher Education (D.Ed) from the Proddatur Developmenty Trust, Proddatur in

the near future. And the Secretary of the educational Society will look after the matter in providing the instructional and infrastructural facilities to the above institutions at an early date.

In the reference 2<sup>nd</sup> cited the Governing body of Proddatur Development Trust, Proddatur on its Governing body meeting on 10.01.2014 unanimously resolved to hand over the VPR College of Education (B.Ed) and VPR Institute of Elementary Teacher Education (D.Ed) institutions to CSSR & SRR Educational Society, Kamalapuram.

The Governing body of CSSR & SRR Education Society in its meeting dated: 14.10.2014 allocated 1.00 acre of land is S.No: 715/2 for VPR College of Education and VPR Institute of Elementary Teacher Education. And resolved to start the construction of building immediately ( Resolution copy enclosed).

Now the CSSR & SRR Educational Society, Kamalapuram completed the instructional and infrastructural facilities to VPR College of Education (B.Ed) and VPR Institute of Elementary Teacher Education (D.Ed) in 1.00 acre of land with own buildings. The land is registered in the name of the CSSR & SRR Educational Society. We have enclosed all the relevant documents for fulfilling the conditions laid by the NCTE, Regulations 2014.

In the reference 3<sup>rd</sup> cited above the Yogi Vemana University, Kadapa issued no objection certificate for changing the management of VPR College of Education from Proddatur the development Trust to C.S.S R & S.R.R Educational Society.

In the reference 4<sup>th</sup> cited above the D.D Rs. 1,50,000/- in favour of the Member Secretary, NCTE, New Delhi, drawn in SBI, Kamalapuram bearing no. 081960, dt:13.11.2015.

In this circumstance I humble request you madam to be kind enough and give favourable orders in shifting the college from Pedda Cheppali Village, Kamalapuram Mandal to Reddy Colony, Kamalapuram of Kadapa District and Change of management from Proddatur Development Trust, Proddatur to CSSR & SRR Educational Society, Kamalapuram of Kadapa District at an early date please."

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

1. All formalities for change of management have been completed. Permit the change. Issue a letter accordingly.
2. Correct our records accordingly.
3. All documents are in order. Inspection Fee paid. Cause 'shifting inspection (APS00025 & APS02702)
4. Ask VT to collect all documents esp. FDRs and approved Faculty list.

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 22.06.2016.

The institution has submitted written representation on 29.06.2016. It's stated as under:

"...We submitted proposals in our letter first cited in reference and requested to consider for change of management of the college and also for change of premises from pedda Cheppali village, Kamalapuram mandal to Reddy colony, Kamalapuram of Kadapa district.

Thank you very much for your orders dated 22.6.2016 (Ref.2) for considering the change of management and permitting us to change.

Through our letter 3<sup>rd</sup> cited, we requested you to change the address as specified in the first para.

We are very sorry to bring to your kind notice that you have not corrected the change of address in your office records. I once again request you to arrange to record the correct address for clear communications.

Further, you have communicated your orders dated 22.6.2016 to the Registrar, S.V.University, Tirupati by oversight. Presently the college is under the affiliation of Yogi Vemana University, Kadapa, Andhra Pradesh. You are requested to make corrections in your records accordingly.

The above corrections may please be made and send a copy of the correct address for our information."

The VT has been generated through online VT module for inspection during 30.07.2016 to 18.10.2016.

The inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.09.2016 and the VT report received along with documents on 26.09.2016.

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

1. The change of management has been effected.
2. The new land belongs to the new management. Land area is adequate.
3. LUC – not given.
4. Latest EC is required.
5. BP – not given.
6. BCC is approved. Built-up area required is 3500 sq.mts; but, only 2864 sq.mts. are available. Only D.El.Ed.(2 units) or B.Ed.(2 units) can shift. They must choose which one they want to retain so that recognition for the other can be withdrawn.

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

7. FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity@7+5 lakhs for each programme.
- 8.1 Faculty list is only in a photocopy. Original, duly approved by the Registrar in each page is required.
- 8.2 Service Certificate of Principal is not given.
- 8.3 Asst. Prof.(Persp.) – 2 more (Socio/Phil.) are required.
- 8.4 In Pedagogy – One Asst. Prof.(Social Science) is required.
- 8.5 One Assisnt Prof.(Fine Arts) is required.
9. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent to the institution on 30.05.2017.


The institution submitted reply along with documents on 20.07.2017.

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

1. Change of Management was permitted long ago.
  - 2.1 The new land belongs to the new Management.
  - 2.2 Shifting can be permitted only after all deficiencies have been rectified.
3. LUC & EC are in order.
- 4.1BP & BCC are in order.
- 4.2 But, built up area is inadequate ; they need 1500 + 500 + 1500 + 500 for B.Ed (2 Units) and D.El.Ed (2 Units).
5. FDRs are in order
  - 6.1 In the Faculty list, the service certificate of Principal is not given.
  - 6.2 The other deficiencies are :
    - (i) Asst. Prof (Physics) (Laxminarayana has only 53% in his MSc.
    - (ii) Asst. Prof (Sociol)-Chinna Venkateswara does not have M.Ed.
    - (iii) Asst Prof (FA) is not there.
7. Issue SCN accordingly.
8. They have requested for a further correction in the present address. Get it done before we come to issuing shifting permission.

17 SRCAPP 14556 B.Ed 2 Units Abu Sawood B.Ed College, Kurnool, Andhra	Abu Sawood B.Ed College, Plot No.357/3, Bastipadu Village and Post office, Kallur Taluk, Kurnool District - 518002, Andhra Pradesh.  Abu Sawood Educational Society, Plot No.87-520, Sri Nagar Colony, Kurnool Village B-Camp Post office, Kallur Taluk, Kurnool District - 518002, Andhra Pradesh had applied for grant of recognition to Abu Sawood B.Ed College, Plot No.357/3, Bastipadu Village and Post office, Kallur Taluk, Kurnool District - 518002, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.Ed course of Two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section
--	---

Pradesh	<p>14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 29.06.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 13.07.2015.</p> <p>The Institution submitted No Objection Certificate Dated 29.06.2015 issued by the Rayalaseema University along with the hard copy of application.</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 the application was sent to State Government for recommendation on 21.07.2015 and Reminder-I on 05.10.2015 and Reminder-II on 18.01.2017.</p> <p>The Sub-clause (3) of clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application."</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was found deficient as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>The application is not duly signed by the applicant on all pages as per Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014.</i></li><li>•</li></ul> <p>The SRC in its 292<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held during 29<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"The 1128 cases, in which digital signature is not available on each page in the applications received online, have to be seen as violating Regulations 5.3 of the 2014 Regulations. But, it has to be recognized in this context that the said omission was due to a technical difficulty of there not being a provision in the on-line application system to upload digital signatures. In our opinion, it will not be correct to hold them responsible for not uploading digital signatures when the system had no scope for such uploading because of a technical snag. Accordingly, we condone this omission and admit the applications for processing"</i></p> <p>A letter seeking information on composite character of the institution was sent on 05.10.2015. The institution submitted reply on 05.11.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed for causing inspection and placed before SRC in its</p>
---------	---

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

295<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> November, & 01<sup>st</sup> December, 2015. The Committee considered the matter and decided to "await show cause notice reply".

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

- Issue SCN for stand-alone status of B.Ed course.

Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 05.12.2016. The institution has submitted its Show cause notice reply along with document on 28.12.2016.

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

1. The B.Ed.(2 units) case can be considered at the new site proposed subject to shifting of the D.El.Ed.(1 unit) to the new site.
2. Land at the new site measures 2 acres. Title is clear. Land area is adequate.
3. LUC is in order.
4. EC is given.
- 5.1 BP is in order.
- 5.2 BCC – not submitted.
6. NOC is given.
7. Cause composite inspection for B.Ed (2 units) and D.El.Ed ( 1 unit).
8. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC inspection of the institution was noticed through online mode on 18.02.2017 and inspection of the institution was fixed between 28.02.2017 to 20.03.2017.

Now, an email received by the VT member on 11.04.2017 and stating as follows:

*".....as per telephonic talk with you, I forwarded message Dr. Mohammad Hasan, the visit schedule is 16.02.2017 and 17.03.2017. I am requested to you please arrange the alternate VT member in place of Dr. Mohammad Hasan, so I completed the assignment given by you."*

The SRC in its 335<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 considered the VT member representation and the Committee decided as under:

1. We had ordered VT inspection.
2. One Member has reported that he is not able to contact the other.
3. May be, the Tel.No. given is not correct. Please try to contact him from here. Failing that, we can consider ordering VT inspection afresh.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC Regional Director contacted the institution and

stated as under;

*"...contacted with the institution, he informed that they are willing for V.T. They also informed that Dr. Suresh Pachauri was in contact with institution and Dr. Mohammad Hasan could not go for inspection due to bad health. We may appoint fresh VT with approved of SRC".*

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

1. In this case, because of ill-health of one of the VT members, the VT inspection could not be conducted.
2. The College has been ready for the inspection. We have to order inspection afresh.
3. Unfortunately, because of this lapse, the applicant will lose a whole academic year.
4. Be that as it may, let us progress the process by ordering VT inspection afresh.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC inspection of the institution was generated through online mode on 08.05.2017 and inspection fixed between 12.05.2017 & 01.06.2017.

Inspection of the institution was conducted on 03.06.2017 and VT report along with documents and original CD received on 07.06.2017.

The SRC in its 342<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 05<sup>th</sup> & 06<sup>th</sup> July, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Title is clear. Land area is adequate for both the courses. (4052 sq.mts. available; 3000 required).
2. LUC is in order.
3. EC is only for the area covered (0.65 acre) by the Sale Deed. There is no EC for the area (0.35 acre) covered by the Gift Deed. Total area required is 0.72 acre.
4. BP is a photocopy in small size. Duly approved original Blue print is required.
5. BCC is in order. Built-up area is adequate; and, according to the BP.
6. FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7+5 lakhs for each programme.
7. Obtain Latest Faculty list for D.El.Ed. Once we are able to decide about permission to shift the D.El.Ed.(1 unit) course, we can issue LOI for B.Ed.(2 units).
8. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent on 12.07.2017.

The institution submitted reply along with documents on 02.08.2017.

4		<p>The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. All documents are in order.</li><li>2. All deficiencies have been rectified.</li><li>3. Faculty list of D.El.Ed (1 Unit) is in order.</li><li>4. Permit shifting of D.El.Ed (1 Unit)</li><li>5. Issue LOI for B.Ed (2 Units)</li></ol>
18	APS00324 B.Ed 2Units Pragathi College of Education, Rangareddy, Telangana	<p><b>Pragathi College of Education, Rangareddy District, Telangana</b></p> <p>Princeton Educational Society, Hyderabad, Telangana had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Pragathi College of Education, Rangareddy District, Telangana for B.Ed course of one year duration from the academic session 2002-03 with an annual intake of 120 students. The institution was granted recognition on 08.04.2003 for an intake of 100 students with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises/building within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in rented premises). The institution has submitted shifting proposal along with DD of Rs.40,000/- bearing No.543049 dated 25.08.2007 on 10.09.2007.</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was sent to the institution on 26.05.2009 regarding submission of all documents for shifting. The institution has submitted its written representation on 17.06.2009 along with some relevant documents for shifting the institution in permanent location.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>On 27.01.2015, the institution submitted the affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students.</p> <p>The SRC in its 276<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> January, 2015 decided to issue provisional recognition orders to the existing institutions and the Committee also decided to maintain a check list of such cases for verification in October/November and for causing inspection.</p> <p>Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 11.05.2015 with an annual intake of two basic units of 50 students each with a finding that the institution has not shifted to its own premises as stipulated in its Formal Recognition order dated 08.04.2003.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its written representation on 30.07.2015 along with shifting fee of Rs. 1,10,000/- DD No. 274569 dated 29.07.2015 and relevant documents.</p>

The institution has submitted its written representation on 06.08.2015 regarding the institution already shifted to permanent premises- update of address and change of name of society to Kommuri Pratap Reddy Educational Society.

The institution has submitted its written representation on 31.10.2015 along with some relevant documents.

The documents was processed and placed before SRC In its 315<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> -18<sup>th</sup> June, 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. They have shifted without NCTE permission.
2. All documents are in order.
3. Built-up area is adequate.
4. Original FDRs are not given.
5. Inspection fee has been paid. Cause Inspection.
6. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.

As per the decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 12.07.2016 and VT members through online mode. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 06<sup>th</sup> & 07<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 09.11.2016.

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

- 1.1 They have shifted without NCTE approval.
- 1.2 They have changed the Management without NCTE approval.
- 1.3 This has significance because the title to lands at the new place belongs to the new Management.
2. The NCTE Regulations have no provision for change of management. NCTE(HQ) have advised that requests for change of Management cannot, therefore, be considered.
- 3.1 Ask them to explain how they took such actions unauthorisedly. Only after this matter is settled can we consider other issues.
- 3.2 If this matter is not satisfactorily settled, we may have to withdraw recognition.
4. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent to the institution on 30.05.2017.

The institution submitted reply along with documents on 28.06.2017 and placed before SRC in its 343<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> & 02<sup>nd</sup> August, 2017 considered the matter and decided that "put up in the next meeting."

		<p>The SRC in its 344<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> &amp; 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The issue relating to change of Management has been satisfactorily explained. It is a case of only a change in the name of the Management and not the Management itself. We accept this explanation.</li><li>2. They have shifted without permission. We have to consider this.</li><li>3. Process the documents collected and report.</li></ol> <p>As per decision of SRC, documents were processed.</p> <p><b>The Committee asked SRO to put up the matter tomorrow.</b></p>
19	APS01905 B.Ed 2Units Digvijaya Rural College of Education, Tumkur, Karnataka	<p><b>Digvijaya Rural College of Education, Hadavanahalli Gate, Near Mysore Cement Factory, Turuvekere Taluk-572211, Tumkur District, Karnataka</b></p> <p>Digvijaya Rural College of Education, Hadavanahalli Gate, Near Mysore Cement Factory, Turuvekere Taluk-572211, Tumkur District, Karnataka had submitted an application for starting B.Ed course on 31.12.2003. The institution was granted recognition on 30.11.2004 with an annual intake of 100 students.</p> <p>The office was in receipt of letter dated 21.05.2011 from the Vice-chancellor, Tumkur University, Tumkur enclosing a list of 19 institutions along with their internal committee observations, requesting to initiate immediate action. This matter was taken up with the institution through SRC 221<sup>st</sup>, 215<sup>th</sup>, 224<sup>th</sup> meeting and finally due to non-cooperative of institution</p> <p>A letter was addressed to the institution on 18<sup>th</sup> January, 2012 to be ready for inspection.</p> <p>Dr. S. Thangasamy, Director vide letter dated 31.1.2012 stated that the VT members need not visit the college at Turuvekere Taluk since it is a rural college. Further, there is no written letter from the institution requesting for postponement. Since the institution was not ready for inspection, a blank inspection report was submitted by the VT members.</p> <p>The SRC in its 224<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> June 2012, considered the matter and it was decided to serve final Show Cause Notice under NCTE Act.</p> <p>A Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 09.07.2012.</p> <p>The institution did not submit any reply. The institution did not submit reply of Show Cause Notice even after the expiry of stipulated time of 21 days from the date of issue of the notice.</p>

Keeping in view, the honorable Supreme Court order in Civil Appeal No. 1125-1128/2011 in SLP No. 17165-68/2009 filed by NCTE Vs ors, which reads as under:

"An institution is not entitled to recognition unless it fulfills the conditions specified in various clauses of the Regulations. The Council is directed to ensure that in future no institution is granted recognition unless it fulfils the conditions laid down in the Act and the Regulations and the time schedule fixed for processing the application by the Regional Committee and communication of the decision on the issue of recognition it strictly adhered to".

The SRC in its 246<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 2<sup>nd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> June 2013 considered the non-reply of the institution to the issue of show cause notice dt. 09/07/2012 and decided to withdraw recognition.

Accordingly, withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 25.7.2013.

On 12.12.2013, a Court order dated 7.10.2013 in writ petition filed by Sri Vishwabharathi Education Soceity, Sri. Vsihwabharathi Group of institutions, Near KMF Mallasandra-572107, Tumkur Tq, Tumkur Vs. the State of Karnataka and others wherein the SRC, NCTE was the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent was received. The institution was again approached and based on the documents submitted by it. The recognition was restored vide order dated 31.05.2015.

The SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 27<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup> may, 2016 considered the reply of the revised order and decided as under:-

*"For cases of B.Ed (2 units) in the existing institution, where RPRO, had been issued. We have to cause inspection to check adherence to the 2014 Regulations. This action will have to be completed by July, 2016 so that revised Formal Recognition can be issue w.e.f. 2016-17 to enable them to make admissions in time.*

*Action to check the documents in these cases (about 1885 in number) will take time. Instead of waiting for that action to be complete for placing them before the SRC, to save time, VT inspection can straightaway be ordere . VT inspection Reports can be considered along with examination of the documents*

*Regional Director is authorized to initiate action accordingly. The institutions concerned may be alerted about suh action so that the y will be prepared to receive th visiting team they may also be advised to keep in readiness latest approved faculty lists for submission to the VTs.*

Inspection letter was issued to the institution on 13.06.2016. The institution requested for withdrawal of inspection notice vide letter dated 28.06.2016.

SRC in its 318<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 08<sup>th</sup> & 09<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 considered the matter and decided to issue Show Cause Notice under NCTE Act for the following deficiencies:-

1. Built up area according to BCC and the earlier VT inspection report falls short by 2000 Sq.ft. Fresh inspection is therefore required.
2. Built up area is adequate for B.Ed (1 unit)
3. Faculty list in Original is not given. It is also not approved by competent authority.
4. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.

As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 17.09.2016. The institution has submitted reply to the show cause notice on 06.10.2016 and also requested for one unit.

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

- 1 RPRO case.
- 2 Documents are in order.
- 3.1 Request for reduction from B.Ed (2 units) to B.Ed (1 unit) is approved subject to the following conditions:
  - (i) The reduction will be w.e.f. 2017-18. The students admitted into the 2 units in 2016-17 will however be entitled to continue with and complete their 2<sup>nd</sup> year course in 2017-18.
  - (ii) Admissions in 2017-18 will be limited to one unit of 50. The affiliating Universities will please ensure that this is strictly observed.
  - (iii) Notwithstanding the restriction of admission in the first year course to 50, there will be no reduction in the faculty strength of 1+15, as prescribed in the 2014 Regulations because of the continuing workload in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year course. The affiliating Universities will please ensure that this is strictly observed.
  - (iv) The faculty strength can be reduced to 1+9 w.e.f. 2018-19. This arrangement will come into force with immediate effect because of the urgency of admissions relating to proximity of counseling. But, it will be subject to subsequent production of the underlisted documents by the institutions concerned.
    - (i) Resolution of the sponsoring society.
    - (ii) NOC of the Affiliating University.
    - (iii) No Dues Certificate relating to the Teaching faculty.
    - (iv) No Dues Certificate relating to the non-Teaching Faculty.
2. These cases will be processed for RPRO purposes separately, subsequently.
3. Issue order for the reduction of strength accordingly and resubmit for RPRO processing.
- 3.2 Issue order accordingly.

x		<p>4. Faculty list of 1+15 is in order for total strength as well as for the staffing pattern.</p> <p>5. Faculty list is signed only by the Dy. Registrar and only in the last page. It should be attested by the Registrar on all pages.</p> <p>6. Issue SCN accordingly.</p>
20	APS04840 B.Ed 2 Units S.B.G. Sanskrit Mission B.Ed College, Trichy, Tamilnadu	<p><b>S.B.G. Sanskrit Mission B.Ed College, Bazar Street, Mutharasanallur, Trichy-620101, Tamilnadu.</b></p> <p>S.B.G. Sanskrit Mission B.Ed College, Bazar Street, Mutharasanallur, Trichy-620101, Tamilnadu was granted recognition for B.Ed course of one year duration from the academic session 2005-06 with an annual intake of 100 students on 13.11.2006 with a condition to the institution shall shift to its own premises/building within three years from the date of recognition. (in case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>The institution submitted shifting proposal on 04.02.2010. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.04.2011 and the VT report along with documents was received on 22.04.2011.</p> <p>The SRC in its 205<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> May, 2011 considered the VT report and decided to issue Show Cause. Accordingly, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 28.06.2011.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014, a letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015</p> <p>The institution has submitted willingness affidavit as per regulations 2014 on 21.05.2015. Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 27.05.2015. That the institution has not replied to show cause notice dated 28.06.2011.</p> <p>A letter was received from the institution on 03.11.2015 along with relevant documents.</p> <p>The SRC in its 320<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 considered the matter and decided to issue Show Cause Notice for the following -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This is a RPRO case of B.Ed (2 units)</li><li>2. Inspection will be required to check adequacy of built up area</li><li>3. Both the land documents are in the individual's name</li><li>4. LUC is in order</li><li>5. EC is in order</li><li>6. BP not approved</li><li>7. BCC not in format, not approved</li></ol>

		<p>8. FDRs not given 9. Affidavit not given 10. Fee not paid 11. Faculty list is not approved 12. Issue SCN accordingly.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issue to the institution on 15.10.2016. The institution submitted reply on 03.07.2017.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land documents are in order. But, title is in the name of an individual'. It should be changed to be in the name of the Society or the Institution.</li> <li>2. LUC is in order.</li> <li>3. Latest EC is required.</li> <li>4. BP is in order. Built up area approved is 2440 sq mts.</li> <li>5. BCC is not in format not approved.</li> <li>6. FDRs are required in original with a 5 year validity @ 7+5 lakhs per programme.</li> <li>7. Faculty list is not submitted.</li> <li>8. Issue SCN accordingly.</li> <li>9. Ratification of the shifting done without permission and issue of a Fresh Recognition at the new site and under the 2014 Regulations can be considered only after the deficiencies are removed.</li> </ol>
21	APS04004 B.Ed 2Units Crescent B.Ed College, Bangalore Rural, Karnataka	<p><b>Crescent B.Ed College, MMU Pharmacy College Campus, Sri Rama Devara Bett Road, Ramanagaram -571 511, Bangalore Rural District, Karnataka.</b></p> <p>Crescent Educational Trust, Bangalore, Karnataka had submitted an application to the SRC of NCTE for grant of recognition to Crescent B.Ed College, MMU Pharmacy College Campus, Sri Rama Devara Betta Road, Ramanagaram -571 511, Bangalore Rural District, Karnataka for secondary (B.Ed) course of one year duration from the academic session 2005-06 with an annual intake of 100 students and was granted recognition on 22.02.2006 with condition to shift to its own premises/building within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>The SRC in its 176<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 27<sup>th</sup> &amp; 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2009 and the committee decided to institution which have not shifted to the permanent premises even after the expiry of three years time limit be issued notice under section 17 of NCTE Act for further action.</p> <p>This office received an interim order dated 23.8.2013 on 3.9.2013 from the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore(copy enclosed). The SRC, NCTE was invoked as sixth respondent and was merely a proforma party.</p>

On 31.12.2014 letter was issued to the institution on affidavit expressing adherence to Regulation 2014. The institution submitted its written representation along with affidavit on 20.01.2015.

The Provisional revised order issued to the institution on 18.05.2015 with an intake of 100 students.

On 31.07.2015 & 30.10.2015 the letters are received by this office from the Principal, Crescent B.Ed College, Ramanagaram District, Karnataka as under:-

*"We have additional built up area of 12,000 Sq.feet for B.Ed Course and we have provided additional infrastructure and appointed additional Staff for two years B.Ed Course and we are submitting land documents, EC, Land Use certificate, Building Plan and Staff list in the specified proforms for your kind perusal."*

On 29.02.2016, a letter was received by this office from the institution regarding submission of faculty information.

The SRC in its 321<sup>st</sup> meeting held during 28<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. "Affidavit, BCC, Certificate of Registration of Society and Bye Laws- notgiven.
2. Original FDRs not given.
3. Approved Faculty not given.
4. Latest EC is in the name of an individual. EC in the name of Society is required.
5. Issue SCN accordingly"

As per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 19.10.2016.

The institution has submitted reply to the show cause notice on 11.11.2016, 25.11.2016 and 23.02.2017.

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

- 1. Land deed is not available as required under 2014 Regulations.**
- 2. Lease Deed is for the building only. That is also in the individual's name. They should have shifted to their own premises within 3 years of recognition.**
- 3. Latest BP of their own premises is not given. BP is available only for**

★		<p>the leased building.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. BCC for the leased building shows adequate built up area of 3451 sq mts</li><li>5. EC is not available for their own land. Also, the EC available is in the name of an individual.</li><li>6. FDRs are required in original, with a 5 year validity @ 7 + 5 lakhs per programme ; in joint account.</li><li>7. Faculty list is given. But it does not give subject details, Also, every page is not authenticated by the Registrar.</li></ol> <p>8.1 Issue SCN accordingly giving a time-limit for reply. 8.2 Send a copy for information to the University concerned</p>
22	APS02283 B.Ed 1 Unit J.S.S Institute of Education, Chamarajana gar, Karnataka	<p><b>J.S.S. Institute of Education, Chamarajanagar, Pin-571313, Karnataka.</b></p> <p>J.S.S. Mahavidyapeetha, Dr. Sri Shivarathri Rajendra Circle, Mysore-570004, Karnataka had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to J.S.S. Institute of Education, Chamarajanagar, Pin-571313, Karnataka for Secondary (B.Ed) course of one year duration from the academic session 2004-05 with an annual intake of 100 students and was granted recognition on 30.11.2004 with a condition to shift to its own premises/building within three years from the date of recognition. ( in case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>On 31.12.2014, a letter was issued to the institution for submission of affidavit expressing adherence to Regulations, 2014. The institution has submitted its written representation along with affidavit on 20.01.2015.7331</p> <p>Revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 16.05.2015 with an intake of 100 students.</p> <p>The institution submitted written representation on 19.11.2016 requesting for one unit.</p> <p>The SRC, in its 324<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 07<sup>th</sup> – 08<sup>th</sup> December, 2016 consider the request for one unit and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. "No inspection is required in this case.</li><li>2. Return the fee if already paid.</li><li>3. The request for reduction from 2 units to one unit is accepted.</li><li>4. Ask them to submit all relevant documents by 30.12.2016.</li><li>5. Process; and put up."</li></ol> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to institution on 16.12.2016.</p> <p>On, 29.12.2016, a letter along with documents was received from the institution forwarding documents.</p>

The SRC in its 328<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2017 considered the request of the institution and decided as under:-

- "1. There are many gaps in the documents given.
- 2.1. Issue SCN as per the deficiencies cited in the agenda note.
- 2.2. The Sy. Nos. Shown in EC do not feature in the land document."

Deficiencies identified:

1. Photocopy of the building plan submitted but Survey No & Location, extent of land are not mentioned in the building plan.
2. Photocopy of the land use certificate submitted. But total extent not mentioned.
3. Society Registration certificate and Bye-Laws not submitted.
4. Copy of Encumbrance Certificate submitted in Regional Language. As per EC Sy.No. & Total extent of the land not mentioned in EC.
5. As per BCC asbestos roofing not mentioned and original BCC is not submitted.
6. Photocopy of the LUC submitted but total built up area not mentioned. As per LUC in original language and not in the prescribed format.
7. Approved Faculty list not submitted.
8. Affidavit of the institution in the prescribed format along with sy.no. not mentioned.

The institution was accordingly informed vide letter dated 17.02.2017. The institution submitted reply dated 10.03.2017.

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

1. Land documents is there.
2. LUC/EC are in order.
3. BP & BCC are in order.
4. FDRs are in order.
5. Faculty list is not given. Only selection committee proceedings are given.
6. Issue SCN for Faculty list.

23	APS02185 B.Ed 2 Units M.Ed 1 Unit D.El.Ed 1 Unit Sri Murugha Rajendraswa miji B.Ed College, Gulbarga, Karnataka	<p><b>Sri Murugha Rajendraswamiji B.Ed College, Saraswathipur, Kusnoor Road, Gulbarga-585105, Karnataka.</b></p> <p>Reshmi Vividdodesh Sangh, Gulbarga, Karnataka had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Sri Murugha Rajendraswamiji B.Ed College, Saraswathipur, Kusnoor Road, Gulbarga-585105, Karnataka for Secondary ( B.Ed) course of one year duration. The recognition was granted on 30.11.2004 from the academic session 2004-05 with an annual intake of 100 students with a condition to shift its own premises/building within three years from the date of recognition ( in case the course is started in rented premises). On 30.01.2015 the institution submitted the affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students. The revised order was issued to the institution on 15.05.2015 with an intake of 100 students ( 2 basic units of 50 each).</p> <p>The institution submitted reply to the revised order on 29.06.2015 &amp; 31.10.2015.</p> <p>SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 considered the matter of institutions which have been given recognition for offering with an intake of 100 students and directed RD, SRO to initiate VT inspection.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC , an inspection letter was issued to the institution on 22.06.2016.</p> <p>Accordingly, inspection was conducted on 08.10.2016 to 09.10.2016 and the VT report along with documents was received on 12.10.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 341<sup>st</sup> meeting held during 15<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 considered the VT Report and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Title is not clear. Application was from Rashmi Vividdodesh Sangh but the land document is in favour of Rashmi Educational &amp; Charitable Trust. They should explain this. Land area is adequate.</li> <li>2. LUC is in order except for a discrepancy in the area. Land document shows it as 50,985 Sq ft whereas LUC shows it as 57,085 Sq ft.</li> <li>3. EC is in order. In favour of Rashmi Educational &amp; Charitable Trust.</li> <li>4. BP is not approved by Comp. authority shows built up area as 57,095 Sqft (5300 Sq mts).</li> <li>5. BCC is not in original, only a photocopy. Not approved by Comp. authority. Builtup area shown is 1,37,800 Sqft. This violates the limit of 57095 Sq ft permitted by the BP. It also shows a large tinshed. Regulations also not allow temp. structures.</li> <li>6. FDRs are required in original in Joint account with a 5-year validity @ 7 + 5 lakhs per programme. They should submit accordingly.</li> <li>7. They will need 1+15 Faculty for B.Ed (2 units) and 1 + 10 for M.Ed. The Faculty lists submitted have the following deficiencies:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) They are in format. They have 1 + 15 and 1 + 10 But, every page is not</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
----	---	--

- authenticated by the Registrar.
- (ii) They are only a photocopy. Originals are required.
  - (iii) The Composition of subject groups is in order.
  - (iv) The Principal is common for both B.Ed & M.Ed.
8. Built up area required for B.Ed ( 2 Units), M.Ed (1 Unit) and D.El.Ed (1 Unit) is 3500 Sq mt (for D.El.Ed + B.Ed + M.Ed combo) + 500 Sq mt = 4000 Sq mt. whereas what they have is 12402 Sq mt (acc to BCC) and 5138 Sq mt (acc to BP) Although, they have enough under both situations, the major discrepancy between BP and BCC has to be first rectified. They should also clearly indicate the earmarking of area Programmewise.
9. Issue SCN accordingly. Send a copy for inf to the Univ.
10. Put up in Aug. 17

As per the decision of SRC show cause notice was issued to the institution on 06.7.2017.

The institution submitted show cause notice reply on 01.08.2017.

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

1. Land documents are in order.
2. LUC is in order.
3. 3.EC is not clear. 'Search Period' gives only one date, possibly, the issue date. Also, all sy nos given in the land documents are not covered.
4. BP is in order. Shows a built up area of 8472 sq mts which is quite adequate.
5. BCC is in order. Built up area of 8472 is adequate for D.El.Ed (1 unit), B.Ed (2 units) and M.Ed (1 unit).
- 6.1 FDRs for B.Ed & M.Ed are in order.
- 6.2 FDRs for D.El.Ed are not given.
7. Faculty list is in order.
8. Issue SCN for EC and FDR for D.El.Ed.

APS05736  
B.Ed  
2 Units  
Shri Sai B.Ed  
College,  
Hubli,  
Karnataka

**Shri Sai B.Ed College, Navanagar, P.B.Road, Hubli District-580025, Karnataka.**

Shri Chennabasaveshwar Education Society, Hubli District, Karnataka had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Shri Sai B.Ed College, Navanagar, P.B.Road, Hubli District-580025, Karnataka for Secondary (B.Ed) course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students from the academic session 2007 -2008, and was granted recognition on 30.08.2007.

On 21.01.2015, an affidavit was received from the institution by this office for adherence to the Regulations, 2014. The Revised order was issued to the institution on

16.05.2015. The institution has submitted documents in respect of revised order on 30.05.2016.

The SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting, held during 27<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 directed RD, SRO to issue VT in such cases.

As per the decision of SRC, inspection letter was issued to the institution on 13.06.2016 institution submitted Inspection Fees of Rs. 1,50,000/- on 14.07.2016.

As per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was conducted on 09.10.2016 & 10.10.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 17.10.2016.

The SRC in its 339<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 22<sup>nd</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 considered the VT report and decided as under:-

- \*1. Title to land ( Sy.No.161/2 & 161/3) is there. Land area 5.60 acres is adequate for B.Ed ( 2 units).
2. Name of the Trust is not given in the LUC.
3. EC is only for Sy.No. 161/2. We need for Sy No. 161/3 also.
4. BP is only for Sy No. 161/2 admeasuring 3.60 acres.
5. BCC is signed by the Municipal Commissioner approving it. BCC is also only for Sy No. 161/2.
- 6.1 Faculty list is not approved by Registrar in every page. It is also only a photocopy and not in original.
- 6.2 Principal has no Ph.D Experience certificate is not there.
- 6.3 Subject specializations of Faculty are not given.
- 6.4 Faculty list does not cover perf. Arts. Fine Arts and Phy.Ed
7. FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7+5 lakhs for each programme.
8. Issue SCN accordingly.\*

As per the decision of SRC show cause notice was issued to the institution on 30.05.2017.

The institution has submitted a reply on 27.06.2017.

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

1. Land documents are in order. They have stated only Sy nos 161/1 & 161/2 are relevant. They do not have Sy no.161/3. Correct accordingly.
2. LUC and EC are in order.
3. BP is in order. Built up area shown is 2044 sq mts.
4. BCC is not in format. Also built-up area of 1000 sq mts is not adequate for B.Ed (2 Units) ; 2000 sq mts are required.
5. Faculty list is not complete ;

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

		<p>(i) Subject details are not given.  (ii) NCTE Regulations require authentication on every page by the Registrar.</p> <p>6. Issue SCN accordingly</p>
25	<p>APS02113  B.Ed  2 Units  Sri Lakshman Rao Jarkiholi College of Education, Belgaum, Karnataka</p>	<p><b>Sri Lakshman Rao Jarkiholi College of Education, Vidyanagar, Gokak, Belgaum-591307 Karnataka.</b></p> <p>Laxmi Education Trust, Gokak, Karnataka had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Sri Lakshman Rao Jarkiholi College of Education, Vidyanagar, Gokak, Belgaum-591307 Karnataka for Secondary (B.Ed) course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students from the academic session 2004 -2005 and was granted recognition on 25.11.2004 with a condition to shift to its own premises/ building within three years from the date of recognition ( in case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>On 12.02.2015, an affidavit was received from the institution by this office for adherence to the Regulations, 2014. The Revised order was issued to the institution on 30.05.2015 with an intake of 100 students.</p> <p>The institution submitted documents in respect of revised order on 03.11.2015.</p> <p>The SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 27<sup>th</sup> &amp; 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 considered the reply of the revised order and directed RD, SRO to initiate action for VT inspection.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, inspection letter was issued to the institution on 13.06.2016. As per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was conducted on 10.10.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD was received on 17.10.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 339<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 22<sup>nd</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2017 considered the VT report and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a RPRO case.</li> <li>2. Title is clear. Land area is adequate.</li> <li>3. LUC is in order.</li> <li>4. Latest EC is required.</li> <li>5. BP is in order. Built-up area shown is 1910.83 sq.mts. Built-up area is inadequate for B.Ed ( 2 units).</li> <li>6. BCC –not given.</li> <li>7. FDRs in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7+5 lakhs for each programme are required.</li> <li>8. Faculty list is not in original; not in the format; and not duly approved by the Registrar.</li> </ol> <p>8.1 Service Certificate of Principal is not given.  8.2 For the Persp. Group, 3 more qualified Asst. Profs. are required in</p>

	<p>Phil/Sociolo./Psychology.</p> <p>8.3 2 Asst. Profs. are required in Science (Pedagogy). The person currently working as Asst. Prof. ( Sc. Pedagogy) is not qualified.</p> <p>8.4 Asst. Prof.(FA) and Asst. Prof.(PA) are not qualified.</p> <p>9 Issue SCN accordingly."</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 30.05.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted show cause notice reply on 06.07.2017.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land documents are in order.</li> <li>2. LUC is in order.</li> <li>3. EC is in order.</li> <li>4. BP now given shows a built-up area of 2936 sq mts. But, it is not approved by Competent authority.</li> <li>5. BCC in the format and approved by competent authority is required. A mere letter from the Municipal Commission is not enough.</li> <li>6. FDRs are required in original. The FDR for 3 lakhs has expired.</li> <li>7.1 Faculty list approved by the Registrar of the University is not submitted.</li> <li>7.2 The deficiencies earlier pointed out regarding the composition of the faculty have not been rectified.</li> <li>8. Issue SCN accordingly.</li> </ol>
<p>26 APS02184 B.P.Ed 1 Unit Sri Valmiki Education Society's B.P.Ed College, Belgaum, Karnataka</p>	<p><b>Sri Valmiki Education Society's B.P.Ed College Harugeri, Raibagh Taluk, Belgaum District – 591220 , Karnataka.</b></p> <p>Sri Valmiki Education Society's B.P.Ed College Harugeri, Raibagh Taluk, Belgaum District – 591220, Karnataka was granted recognition for B.P.Ed course of one year duration from the academic session 2004– 05 with an annual intake of 50 students on 28.01.2005 subject to the condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises / building within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>On 01.09.2007, a letter was sent to the institution seeking information on shifting of premises from temporary to permanent building.</p> <p>The Principal, S.V.E. Society's B.P.Ed College, Harugeri- 591220 submitted a written representation on 09.10.2007 stating that they have shifted to the building permanent which is more than 7423.09 sq.ft built up area and is situated on the land of</p>

6.27 acres.

The institution submitted a D.D. of Rs.40,000/- which was taken into account vide this office bill no.13355 dated 25.10.2007.

The institution was asked to submit all the documents pertaining to the new premises to examine the proposal of shifting vide F.SRO/NCTE/2008-09/ 13857 dated 05.06.2009. The institution had not submitted any reply.

On 12.08.2013, an e-mail was received from Valmiki B.P.Ed College Harugeri seeking information about how to get permission from NCTE to start a new M.P.Ed course.

The Southern Regional Committee in its 256<sup>th</sup> Meeting held during 4-6 December, 2014 considered the matter, all the relevant documentary evidences and decided to serve Show cause Notice for having shifted to new premises without permission, under NCTE Act, as under ;

1. The Institution was given recognition on 28/01/2005 in temporary premises with a condition to shift to permanent premises within 3 years from the date of recognition given. The institution has shifted to new premises as per their letter dated 01/09/2007, without the prior permission of SRCNCTE, Bangalore. This is a gross violation of NCTE regulations.
2. The institution has not submitted any documents pertaining to new building/premises (where the shifting has been taken place). In this regard the institution has not replied so far to NCTE letter dated 05/06/2009 to submit all the relevant documents pertaining to new building/premises.

As per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 11.02.2014. The institution has submitted written representation on 03.03.2014.

The SRC in its 268<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 4-5 June 2014 considered the matter, reply of the institution vide their letter dated 03.03.2014, all the relevant documents submitted by the institution and advised Southern Regional Office to Re-examine with reference to the new documents given by the institution. The institution had not submitted any new documents.

The SRC in its 273<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> September & 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2014 considered the matter, decided and advised Southern Regional Office to:

Examine the documents relating to the new location for causing inspection. This is a case of shifting without permission. That being so, the 'freeze' order will not hinder this case to be processed.

An email dated 18.12.2014 was received from NCTE H.qrs regarding the guidelines for processing of pending applications.

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

Accordingly, a willingness letter was issued to the institution on 19.12.2014. The institution had submitted affidavit on 01.01.2015.

The Southern Regional Committee in its 279<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 1<sup>st</sup> February, 2016 considered the matter, institution's representation vide letter dated 03.03.2014, affidavit submitted by the institution on 01.01.2015. Decided that, the institution is functioning in its own land and building from the beginning. There is no need for shifting.

The decision of SRC was conveyed to the institution vide this office letter dated 20.02.2015.

On 29.01.2015, the institution has submitted an affidavit affirming adherence to Regulations, 2014.

A revised order for offering B.Ed course of two years duration from the academic session 2015-16 with an intake of 100 students was issued to the institution on 26.05.2015.

On 09.11.2015, the institution has submitted staff list comprising of Principal and Four Lecturers of teaching staff.

The SRC, in its 321<sup>st</sup> meeting held during 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. Their reply covers only the Faculty list.
2. Their reply with respect to the RPRO should cover all other points like title Deed, LUC, EC, BCC, FDRs, latest approved faculty list and, payment of inspection fee.
3. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 14.10.2016.

The institution has submitted written representation on 07.11.2016.

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

- 1.1 The land document is not clear. There are 2 documents for the same sy no. (129/3). They should explain.
- 1.2 Certified copy of the registered deed is not given. Photocopy of a notarized English version will not suffice.
2. LUC is not approved by competent authority. Also, it is not in original.
3. EC is in order.
4. BP is not approved.
5. BCC is in order. Built up area is 1504 sq mts which is adequate.

		<p>6. FDRs are required in original in joint account, with a 5 year validity, @ 7 + 5 lakhs per programme.</p> <p>7. Faculty list approved by the Registrar of the University is required.</p> <p>8. Issue SCN accordingly.</p>
27	APS01974 B.Ed 2 Units V V Sangha College of Education, Bellary, Karnataka	<p><b>V V Sangha College of Education P.D.I.T college campus Dam Road, Hospet taluk 583225, Bellary District, Karnataka.</b></p> <p>Veerasaiva Vidyavardhaka Sangha, Bellary, Karnataka had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to V V Sangha College of Education P.D.I.T college campus Dam Road, Hospet taluk-583225, Bellary District, Karnataka for Secondary (B.Ed) course of one year duration from the academic session 2004-2005 and was granted recognition on 29.11.2004 with condition to shift to its own premises/building within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>On 27.01.2015, the institution has submitted an affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students. The revised order was issued to the institution on 18.05.2015 with an intake of 100 students ( two basic units of 50 each).</p> <p>The institution has submitted a written representation on 08.09.2015 &amp; 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The SRC, in its 321<sup>st</sup> meeting held during 28<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. LUC, EC- not given</li><li>2. BP is not approved</li><li>3. BCC-not given</li><li>4. Original FDRs-given</li><li>5. Original Faculty list is not given. Only photocopy is there.</li><li>6. Society Registration Certificate and Bye-Laws not given.</li><li>7. Issue SCN accordingly.</li></ol> <p>Accordingly, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 22.10.2016.</p> <p>The institution has submitted written representation on 11.11.2016.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.1 The document, supposed to be the title deed, is neither registered nor certified by anybody.</li><li>1.2 Notarised English version of the land document also has not been given.</li></ol>

	<p>1.3 The explanatory note in LUC specifies that the land is sanctioned to an individual (Ms. Ugamadevi) and not to an institution.</p> <p>2. LUC is not given. Only, land Acquisition certificate is given. But the entries refer to other Institutions and not the college of Education.</p> <p>3. BP is in order. Shows a built up area of 1767 sq mts.</p> <p>4. BCC is in order. Built up area of 2063 sq mts shown exceeds the area of 1767 sqmts. Permitted in the BP.</p> <p>5. FDRs are in order.</p> <p>6. Faculty list is approved. But, it does not give subject details making it difficult for us check the other requirements.</p> <p>7. Issue SCN accordingly.</p>
28 AOS00496 B.Ed 2 Units Sri. K. Venkata theppa College Education, Kolar, Karnataka	<p><b>Sri K. Venkatapatheppa College of Education, Chikkaballapur-562101, Kolar District, Karnataka.</b></p> <p>The Southern Regional Committee granted recognition on 11.07.2000 to Sri K. Venkatapatheppa College of Education, Chikkaballapur-562101, Kolar District, Karnataka for B.Ed course of one year duration from the academic session 2000-2001 with an annual intake of 100 students.</p> <p>On 22.01.2015 the institution submitted the affidavit for offering course with an intake of 100 students. The revised order was issued to the institution on 16.05.2015 with an intake of two units of 50 students each. The institution submitted reply to the revised order on 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The SRC in its 314<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 27<sup>th</sup> &amp; 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 considered the reply of the revised order and directed the RD, SRO to initiate action for VT inspection.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter for inspection was issued to the institution on 13.06.2016.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, and the inspection of the institution was conducted on 10.10.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD was received on 13.10.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 329<sup>th</sup> meeting held during 06<sup>th</sup> - 07<sup>th</sup> February, 2017 considered the VT report and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Title is clear. Sy No. 20/2 Land area ( 1.04 acre) adequate.</li><li>2. LUC is in order.</li><li>3. EC is in order.</li><li>4. BP is approved. Built up area shown is 2239sq.ft</li><li>5. BCC is in order. Built-up area is 22395 sq.ft ( 2080 sq.mtr)</li><li>6. FDR-only photocopies given. Originals are required.</li></ol>

	<p>7. Faculty list- only photocopy- not approved. Obtain latest approved faculty list.</p> <p>8. They have not paid the 'fee' claiming to be exempted as aided college. Seek clarification from NCTE (HQ).</p> <p>9. Issue SCN accordingly."</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 09.02.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted a written representation on 03.03.2017.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. FDRs in original have been given.</li> <li>2. They claim exemption from payment of 'fee' being an aided-college.</li> <li>3. The Faculty list is given. It is approved.</li> <li>3.1 The following deficiencies have to be rectified :             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Principal's experience is not specified. In PG he scored only 50% . In M.Ed also he scored only 50.87%</li> <li>(ii) Asst. Prof. (His.)- Shri. N. Shekar scored only 51% in PG.</li> <li>(iii) Asst Prof (Hist.)- Shri. B.G.Krishnamurthy scored only 49.90% in PG and only 50.85 % in M.Ed.</li> <li>(iv) Asst Prof (English) –Shri. Miniraju scored only 54.90% in PG.</li> <li>(v) There is no Asst Prof in FA and Phy.Ed.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Issue SCN accordingly</li> </ol>				
<p>29 APS02786 D.El.Ed 1 Unit</p> <p>APS00232 B.Ed -2units</p>	<p><b>Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College &amp; Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Asifabad Revenue Division, # 12-130, Shivakeshava Mandir Street, Asifabad, Adilabad District-517124, Telangana</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>APS00232/B.Ed (2 units)</th> <th>APS02786/D.Ed (1 unit)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College, Asifabad Revenue Division, # 12-130, Shivakeshava Mandir Street, Asifabad, Adilabad District-517124, Telangana was granted recognition on 08.04.2003 for Secondary (B.Ed) course with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in a rented premises).</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all</p> </td> <td> <p>Mother Theresa Educational Society's, Rajampet, Asifabad District, Adilabad District 504293, Telangana had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana for D.El.Ed course of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students and was granted recognition on 26.08.2005.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	APS00232/B.Ed (2 units)	APS02786/D.Ed (1 unit)	<p>Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College, Asifabad Revenue Division, # 12-130, Shivakeshava Mandir Street, Asifabad, Adilabad District-517124, Telangana was granted recognition on 08.04.2003 for Secondary (B.Ed) course with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in a rented premises).</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all</p>	<p>Mother Theresa Educational Society's, Rajampet, Asifabad District, Adilabad District 504293, Telangana had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana for D.El.Ed course of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students and was granted recognition on 26.08.2005.</p>
APS00232/B.Ed (2 units)	APS02786/D.Ed (1 unit)				
<p>Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College, Asifabad Revenue Division, # 12-130, Shivakeshava Mandir Street, Asifabad, Adilabad District-517124, Telangana was granted recognition on 08.04.2003 for Secondary (B.Ed) course with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) students with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in a rented premises).</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all</p>	<p>Mother Theresa Educational Society's, Rajampet, Asifabad District, Adilabad District 504293, Telangana had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana for D.El.Ed course of two years duration with an annual intake of 50 students and was granted recognition on 26.08.2005.</p>				

existing institutions regarding notification new Regulations 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revise norms and standards before 31.10.2015.

The institution submitted willingness affidavit on 20.01.2015 for compliance of Regulations 2014.

Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 06.05.2015 for two units with condition that the institution has not maintained/revalidated the Fixed Deposit Receipts towards Endowment and Reserve Funds.

On 30.06.2015 the institution submitted FDRs in joint a/c of Rs.7 & 5 Lakhs towards Endowment and Reserve Fund for a period of 03 years. After verification of FDR's, a letter along with original FDRs was sent to the institution on 30.06.2015.

The institution submitted its representation on 28.10.2015 along with the relevant documents and DD. Rs. 1,50,000/- regarding shifting of premises for Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute D.El.Ed Asifabad and Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College Asifabad.

Another letter was received from the institution on 28.10.2015 for causing inspection for shifting and stating as follows:

*"SRC NCTE has granted recognition DR Rajendra Prasad B.Ed college to run B.Ed Programme for 2002-2003 year at Asifabad and for our Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute to run D.Ed Programme for 2005-06 year at Asifabad. Both these are our Mother Theresa Educational Society's own properties. The Built up Area for these building were sufficient as per the norms prevailing at the time of granting recognition.*

On 08.02.2016, a letter was received from the Director of School Education, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad vide No.Rc.No99/A/TE/TSCERT/2014 dated 06.02.2016 regarding the observations of the Affiliation Committee in respect of private D.El.Ed / B.Ed colleges in the State of Telangana and decided to forward the list of 76 colleges including Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Opp Sai Baba Temple, Rajampet, Asifabad, Adilabad District-504293, Telangana to SRC, NCTE for taking further necessary action under section 17 of the Act.

Sl No	Deficiencies Observed	Number of colleges
1	Submitted Fake and Fabricated documents	35 (Existing) (Annexure 1A) 02 (New) (Annexure 1B)
2	Functioning in leased premises even after stipulated period	04 (Annexure II)
3	Shifting of College Premises without the permission of SRC NCTE	16 (Annexure III)
4	Submission of fake NOCs	15 (Annexure IV)

		<p>Subsequently we have constructed another building for our B.Ed and D.Ed programme together. Together we have constructed a common building at Buruguda Asifabad in S.No 104/C/2,105/E/2 and 45 and applied for shifting of premises to SRC NCTE, Bangalore.</p> <p>Now the Director of School Education Telangana, Hyderabad is insisting on shifting permission order at the new address.</p> <p>Therefore we request you to kindly send the letter to the Director of School Education Telangana Hyderabad to grant us affiliation and admission for the year 2015-2016 as our application for shifting is pending with SRC NCTE Bangalore.</p> <p>We also request you to cause shifting inspection at an earliest and give us shifting orders".</p> <p>The SRC in its 293<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup>-31<sup>st</sup> October, 2015 considered the written representation from the institution vide letter dated 28.10.2015 and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process for causing shifting inspection.</li> <li>• In the meanwhile request the 2 Affiliating Bodies to renew affiliation.</li> </ul> <p>As per the decision of SRC, the documents submitted by the institution on 01.06.2016 were processed and placed before SRC in its 318<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p> <p>The SRC in its 318<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> &amp; 09<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 considered both B.Ed (APS00232) &amp; D.Ed (APS02786) shifting case and show cause notice reply and decided as under:</p>	<p>5 Not possessing land in the name of the society/Institution</p> <p>The matter was placed before SRC in its 302<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 09<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> February 2016. The Committee considered the letter from the Director School Education Department, Telangana State and decided that "What with the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 16 time-limit pressure on us, it is not possible to go into these complaints at this time. Process and put up after March 16".</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, the matter was placed before SRC in its 309<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter in respect of (76 colleges) regarding not fulfilling the deficiencies and decided to issue show cause notice for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shifting of college premises</li> <li>• without the permission of SRC NCTE.</li> </ul> <p>As per the decision of SRC, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 13.05.2016. The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 28.07.2016.</p>	<p>04 (Annexure V)</p>
--	--	--	---	------------------------

  
 (S. Sathyam)  
 Chairman

1. The complaint was that they have been continuing on leased premises even beyond the time given. They have replied to show that they have been pursuing action. Now, of course, they have even shifted without permission.
2. We have already sent a VT to inspect the new premises. Put up when the VT Inspection report is received.
3. Inform Director School Education.
4. Inform Director SCERT.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Science. This needs to be corrected.

- 4.2 Faculty list for D.El.Ed (1 unit):
- Only 1+7 are there against a requirement of 1+8.
  - One Asst. Prof.(Persp.) is required.
  - Asst. Prof.(Sc.), Asst. Prof.(Maths), Asst. Prof.(Eng.) and, Telugu Pandit do not have M.Ed.
5. Issue SCN accordingly.

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

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

**The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-**

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

30	APS08372 B.Ed 2 Units Grace College of Education, Erode, Tamilnadu	<b>Grace College of Education, RSF No.271/2C1, &amp; 2C2 &amp; 271/2C3, Elavamalai Village and Panchayath, Bhavani Kavindapadi Road, Erode-638316, Tamil Nadu.</b>  Anna Nayaki Trust, Namakkal District, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Grace College of Education, RSF No.271/2C1, & 2C2 & 271/2C3, Elavamalai Village and Panchayath, Bhavani Kavindapadi Road, Erode-638316, Tamil Nadu for offering B.Ed course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students from academic session 2006-07 under Section 14(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the Formal
----	--	--

Recognition order was issued to the institution on 26.11.2007.

On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations, 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015.

The institution submitted its willingness affidavit on 12.01.2015 as per Regulations 2014. Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 05.05.2015 for two basic units of 50 students each, with a condition that the institution has not maintained revalidated FDR's of the enhanced values.

The institution has submitted reply on 24.06.2015.

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

- *"For cases of B.Ed (2 Units) in the existing institution, where RPRO, has been issued, we have to cause inspection to check adherence to the 2014 Regulations. This action will have to be completed by July 2016 so that revised Formal Recognition can be issued w.e.f. 2016-17 to enable them to make admission in time.*
- *Action to check the documents in these cases (about 1885 in number) will take time. Instead of Waiting for that action to be completed for placing them before the SRC, to save time, VT Inspections can straightaway be ordered. VT Inspection Report can be considered along with examination of the documents.*
- *Regional Director is authorized to initiate action accordingly. The institution concerned may be alerted about such action so that they will be prepared to receive the Visiting Teams. They may also be advised to keep in readiness latest approved Faculty Lists for Submission to the VTs."*

Inspection intimation letter was issued to the institution on 14.06.2016. The institution submitted its representation on 08.11.2016 along with Demand Draft of Rs.1,50,000/- as an inspection fee.

The Visiting team report was received on 10.11.2016.

The SRC in its 342<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> to 06<sup>th</sup> July, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. Title is clear. Land area is adequate.
2. We need an English version of the title deed.
- 3.1 The title deed refers only to 271/2C2 whereas LUC cites 271/2C1, 271/2C2 and 271/2C3.
- 3.2 The EC refers to 403/1 and 403/1A which are not there in the LUC at all.

	<p>4. The BP and BCC refer to 271/2C1, 271/2C2 and 271/2C3 whereas the title deed makes no mention of 271/2C1 and 271/2C3.</p> <p>5.1 Four photocopies of BP are given. The total built-up area shown is 2212 sq.mts. The entries are not legible. Ask for clear copies in original. They should also clarify why there are 4 copies.</p> <p>5.2 The BCC is approved. But, it shows a total built-up area of 4230 sq.mts. which is far in excess of what is permissible under the BP.</p> <p>6. Latest approved Faculty list not given.</p> <p>7. FDRs are required in original in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7+5 lakhs per programme.</p> <p>8. Issue SCN accordingly.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 12.07.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 20.07.2017.</p> <p>Further, the institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 15.09.2017.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The documents now given remove the deficiencies pointed out vis-à-vis title deed/LUC/EC/BP/BCC.</li><li>2. Total built-up area in the 3 (out of 4) BP documents is which is adequate.</li><li>3. The built-up area shown in BCC is far in excess of the area shown in B.P. But, the area shown in BP is itself adequate for B.Ed (2 Units)</li><li>4. FDRs are in order.</li><li>5. The Faculty list is approved ; and, is in order.</li><li>6. Issue a new FR for B.Ed (2 units) under the 2014 Regulations.</li></ol>
31 APS03622 B.Ed 2 Units APS07543 M.Ed 1 Unit	<p><b>Luise James Teacher Training Institute and Luise James College of Education, Manavilai, Kappiyarai Post, Kanyakumari District-629156, Tamil Nadu</b></p> <p>Luise James Teacher Training Institute and Luise James College of Education, Manavilai, Kappiyarai Post, Kanyakumari District-629156, Tamil Nadu submitted the applications for D.T.Ed Course on 30.12.2002 and D.T.Ed-AI course on 30.12.2005. The institution was granted recognition for D.T.Ed course on 16.09.2004 with an intake of 50 students and D.T.Ed-AI course on 23.12.2006 thus making an annual intake of 100 students, which include the existing intake of 50 and an additional intake of 50 students. Further, the institution had submitted the applications for B.Ed course on 30.12.2004 and M.Ed course on 10.10.2006. The institution was granted recognition for B.Ed course on 02.11.2005 with an annual intake of 100 students and for M.Ed course on 13.07.2007 with an annual intake of 25 students. As per direction of NCTE, the intake of M.Ed course was increased from 25 to 35 vide order dt. 01.09.2010.</p>

The institution vide its letter dated 24.04.2009 submitted Rs. 40,000/- for shifting of premises. Accordingly, the inspection of the institution was fixed between 18<sup>th</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup> April 2011. The same was intimated to the institution on 12.04.2011. Accordingly, shifting inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.04.2011.

The SRC in its 205<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> May, 2011 considered the VT Report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and decided to serve Show Cause Notice for all the Four courses under Section 17 of NCTE Act. Accordingly, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 27.06.2011. The institution submitted its reply on 27.07.2011

The SRC in its 211<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2011 considered the VT Report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and decided to serve Final Show Cause Notice under Section 17 of NCTE Act. Accordingly, a Final Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 15.11.2011. The institution submitted its written representation on 14.12.2011.

The SRC in its 216<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> January, 2012 considered the written reply of the institution vide letter dt. 14.12.2011 on the above matter and also the relevant documents of the institution and noted that the deficiencies still persist and decided to withdraw recognition of all the four courses for the following reasons:-

- Documentary proof is not submitted to show the registered land document in the name of Society, for the survey numbers where the institution is located.
- The earmarked Built up area for each course D.T.Ed, D.T.Ed-AI & B.Ed & M.Ed course not submitted.
- Building completion certificate in the prescribed format from competent authorized Government engineer is not submitted.
- The institution in its reply has stated that B.Ed and M.Ed courses are in separate land & building. The details of the land, approved building plan, building completion certificate and earmarked built up area is not submitted.
- Non-encumbrance certificate from the competent authority in English version is not submitted.
- Original FDRs for Rs. 5 lacs and Rs. 3 lacs towards Endowment and Reserve fund respectively from a Nationalized Bank in joint account for D.Ed, D.Ed-AI, B.Ed & M.Ed course is not submitted. The institution has submitted only two FDR's of 5
- lakhs and 3 lakhs each from Tamilnadu Mercantile Bank Ltd., which is not a Nationalized Bank and not as per NCTE norms.
- No documentary proof is submitted for starting of language learning laboratory.

A withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 27.02.2012.

The Hon'ble High Court of Madras vide interim order dt. 04.05.2012 in W.P. no. 12872

of 2012 and M.P. no. 2 of 2012 filed by Luise James Teacher Training Institute and James College of Education.

The matter was placed before SRC in its 248<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 and SRC decided to File an affidavit as indicated and submit VT inspection Report copy along with it.

Affidavit along with original inspection report was sent to Shri Ramakrishna Reddy on 19.07.2013. In reply, the advocate sent letter to SRC on 25.07.2013 and stated that

*"Each High Court got its own procedure. It is a settled law that procedure of the Court is the law of the Court. As per the said procedure, a detailed counter affidavit along with vacate stay petition: M.P.No.3 of 2012 was filed"*

The SRC in its 250<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> August, 2013 considered the matter and advised Southern Regional Office to send reply to advocate's letter asking him to get remarks of the Court expunged. Accordingly, a letter was sent to the Advocate on 20.08.2013.

In reply, Shri K. Ramakrishna Reddy, Advocate sent a letter on 29.08.2013.

The SRC in its 254<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 25-27 October 2013 considered the matter and decided to take action according to decisions taken in the last meeting, i.e. in 253<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> Sept & 01<sup>st</sup> Oct, 2013.

"In the 253<sup>rd</sup> meeting the members raised the issue relating to institution Luise James Teacher Training Institute and Luise James College of Education, Manavilai, Kapiyarai Post, Kanyakumari District – 629156, Tamilnadu. The issue related to mishandling of the case by SRO's Lawyer Shri Ramakrishna Reddy. The Committee after discussing the matter decided as under:

- In case No. (APS00887-D.T.Ed, APS05081-D.T.Ed-AI, APS03622-B.Ed & APS07543-M.Ed) relating to institution Luise James Teacher Training Institute and Luise James College of Education, Manavilai, Kapiyarai Post, Kanyakumari District-629156, Tamilnadu, application for grant of recognition to their D.T Ed course on 30-12-2002, for D.T.Ed-AI on 30-12-2005, for B.Ed course on 30-12-2004 & for M.Ed course on 10-10-2006, the SRC and SRO have had to face avoidable embarrassment and hardships because of poor handling of the case by SRO's Lawyer (Shri. Ramakrishna Reddy).
- In spite of repeated directions from the Court he did not file a copy of the VT Inspection report despite his having the report as sent by SRC. Also, in spite of repeated instructions from SRC/SRO, he failed to file an appeal. Instead of carrying out instructions in the best interests of the client he has been dilly dallying with meaningless prevarications.
- After careful consideration of the details pertaining to this matter, SRC gave the following directions:
  - (i) The services of Shri. Ramakrishna Reddy as the Lawyer of SRC/SRO should

be terminated with immediate effect.

(ii) A suitable Lawyer to replace him, should be identified and appointed.

(iii) An appeal should be filed in the case as already decided for getting the strictures against the SRC impugned and to get the petition filed by the institution dismissed.

The Tamilnadu Teachers Education University sent letter dated 04.02.2014 regarding functioning of the course under the cover of stay orders of the Hon'ble High Court.

The SRC in its 268<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 4-5 June 2014 considered the Tamilnadu Teachers Education University's letter dated 04.02.2014 received by SRC on 07.02.2014 and decided as under:

- Our orders about filing an appeal have not been carried out. Instruct the Lawyer at once to seek condonation of the delay and file an appeal seeking also vacation of the 'stay' order
- Let us write a terse letter to the Vice Chancellor, pointing out the undignified conduct of the Registrar in writing the unwarranted letter dated 04.02.2014.

The SRC decision was communicated to the Vice Chancellor, TNTEU, Chennai pointing out the undignified conduct of the Registrar in writing the unwarranted letter dated 04.02.2014.

The institution submitted original affidavit for willingness to adherence of NCTE Regulations, 2014 for both M.Ed and B.Ed course on 22.1.2015.


As per Regulations, 2014, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 30.05.2015 for both B.Ed and M.Ed course from the academic session 2015-16 subject to fulfillment of the conditions. This order is subject to the result of MP No. 2 of W.P.No. 12872 of 2012 filed by the institution before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras.

Meantime, a letter was received from Sri .P.R. Gopinathan, Advocate on 25.06.2015, with a request to sign and seal in the affidavits. Accordingly, duly signed additional Counter affidavit in W.P. No. 12872 of 2012 was sent on 25.06.2015.

On 25.8.2015 the institution has submitted written representation along with court order in W.P.No. 12872 of 2012 dated 12.8.2015 was considered by SRC in its 292<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 and the Committee decided as under: "the second VT report had listed several serious deficiencies. The high Court order cannot therefore be accepted without challenge. We should file an appeal.

Shri P.R. Gopinathan had prepared draft Writ Appeal received on 02.06.2016 which was sent to NCTE-Hqrs on 02.06.2016 for approval. NCTE Hqrs conveyed the approval vide letter dated 24.10.2016.

A letter dated 18.09.2016 received from Advocate Sri. P.R. Gopinathan on 22.09.2016.

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

regarding writ appeal against W.P.No. 12872 of 2012 filed by Luise James Teacher Training Institute and James College of Education, Tamil Nadu.

A letter along with duly signed writ appeal and delay condone application were sent to the Advocate Sri P.R. Gopinathan on 26.10.2016.

Inspection conducted on 05.11.2016, the VT report was received on 21.11.2016.

On 15.12.2016, a rectified copy of the affidavit was received from the advocate Shri. Gopinathan. The duly signed rectified affidavit was sent to the advocate, Shri. Gopinathan on 16.12.2016.

The SRC in its 325th Meeting held during 19th to 20th December, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-

- Permission is given for closure of D.El.Ed (1 unit) and D.El.Ed-AI (1 unit) as requested.
- Withdraw recognition for both courses w.e.f. 2013-14. Return the FDRs. Close the D.El.Ed and D.El.Ed-AI files.
- Examine and put up for shifting of B.Ed/M.Ed.
- File the appeal as approved by NCTE (HQ).
- Ask Lawyer to get the 'stay' vacated as already advised.


The decision of 325th meeting of SRC to file an appeal as approved by NCTE(HQ) and to get stay vacated was conveyed to the advocate Shri.Gopinathan on 09.01.2017.

The SRC decision of 268<sup>th</sup> was not communicated to the Vice Chancellor, TNTEU, Chennai pointing out the undignified conduct of the Registrar in writing the unwarranted letter dated 04.02.2014.

In response to the office letter dated 17.01.2017, a reply letter received from TNTEU 21.02.2017 and stated as under:-

*This is to inform that the said letter dated 04.02.2014 was addressed to the SRC NCTE by the former Register of this University based on the extraordinary circumstances prevailed three years back due to threatening of the Management of the said James College of Education, Kanyakumari District by keeping alive the stay order granted by the Hon'ble High Court against the withdrawal of recognition on 27.02.2014 by the SRC / NCTE, by continuously filing counter petition against the University*

*Now in the present scenario during the academic year 2015-2016, the said James College of Education, Kanyakumari District has withdrawn all the pending cases filed against the University and running the College. The entire situation is quite normal. Moreover, the Registrar of this University, who came on deputation to this University has already been relieved after completion of his tenure as Registrar and now the post of Registrar is vacant.*

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

*Under the above circumstances, the subject matter may be closed".*

In response to the office letter dated 25.11.2015. Shri Gopinathan has sent legal opinion 18.05.2017 and stated as under:-

*"I am to state that pursuant to your letter cited in the reference i) of above filed the Writ Appeal as instructed and as the first stage, a Delay Condone Petition, praying for the condonation of 1152 days delay to file the above writ appeal, as mandated by the High Court Rules. The date of filing the delay condone petition is on 16.03.2017 and the connected dairy S.R.No is 22885/2017 and the same is pending with the Hon'ble High Court for adjudication and I have initiated the necessary steps for its earlier Hearing.*

*While so, it is pertinent to mention here that on perusal of the Order dated 12.08.2015, copy of which I'm of the considered opinion that the Hon'ble High Court has clearly mentioned and clarified at the end of the order that the SRC/NCTE has the mandated right to carry on any inspection at the petitioner's institution to verify its Infrastructure Instructional faculties, as per the NCTE's regulations 2014, if it is so required.*

*In the light of the above, I'm of the further considered opinion that the SRC/NCTE may consider to withdraw its decision to file an Appeal, vide its resolution of 292nd meeting held on 29 & 30th September 2015, as the Hon'ble High Court vide this Order dated 12.08.2015 has not put any embargo on SRC/NCTE to conduct its inspection, mandated under the new NCTE regulation, 2014, if it so preference to verify the claim of the Petitioner.*

*Please take note that if, in any event the SRC/NCTE instructs me to conduct the above Writ Appeal, inspite of my opinion and long delay of 1152 days to filing, I have no hesitation to conduct the above Writ Appeal. As a standing counsel, I'm duty bound to place the factual and legal matrix of the above case for the due consideration of the SRC/NCTE.*

*I request the SRC/NCTE to furnish me the necessary instructions at the earliest."*

The court case was placed before SRC in its 341<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. This case was needlessly delayed by the poor handling by our previous Lawyer.
2. The case has progressed with the VT Inspection on 5.11.16. Who ordered this inspection is not clear. Be that as it may.
3. The sale deed shows that title is held by Sh. Premkumar (Founder of the Trust) on behalf of the Trust.
- 4.1 The applicant in both cases – i.e., B.Ed. & M.Ed. – is the James College of Education. They did not have title to the lands at the time of application. The

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

title is still with the Trust. This position is not in accordance with the Regulations. The Trust should transfer the title to the College.

- 4.2 Land area is adequate for B.Ed. & M.Ed.
5. LUC is in order. Only a photocopy is given. Original is required.
6. EC is in order. Only a photocopy is given. Original is required.
- 7.1 BP is not approved by competent authority. Built-up area shown is adequate only for B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Ed.(1 unit) + M.Ed. (1 unit).
- 7.2 There is another BP which cites Sy.No.498/6. This Sy.No. is not there in the Sale Deed. Also, this BP is not approved by competent authority. Both the BPs are in photocopies. Originals are required.
8. BCC is not approved by competent authority. The built-up area shown is in excess of what is permitted by BP No.1. The built-up area permitted in BP No.2 cannot be recognized because Sy.No.498/6 is not reflected in the title deed. BCC is also in photocopy. Original is required. The BCC does not indicate the type of roofing.
9. FDRs are in photocopies. Originals are required for verification. One set had expired in 2016. They are required @ 7+5 lakhs for each programme.
10. VT Inspection report shows that the M.P. Hall roofing is with asbestos sheets. This is highly objectionable. Asbestos roofing should immediately be replaced. There will have to be another inspection to check that at their cost.
11. Faculty lists are in photocopy. Originals are required. Not every page is certified by the Registrar. As pointed out in 7.1 above, we do not know the final composition of the courses they will have. We cannot, therefore, finalize the Faculty list now.
12. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 05.07.2017. The institution has submitted SCN reply on 26.07.2017 along with documents.

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

1. Their reply covers satisfactorily almost all the points raised by us.
2. The point about title – deficiency has been adequately explained by them by referring to the legal lacuna. We accept their position.
- 3.1 Faculty list of B.Ed.
  - (i) One Asst. Prof.(Perf. Arts) is required
- 3.2 Faculty list of M.Ed.
  - (i) One Associate Professor is required
4. Issue SCN accordingly.

As per the decision of SRC, a show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 06.09.2017. The institution has submitted SCN reply on 07.09.2017.

➤		<p>Further, the institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 26.09.2017.</p> <p><b>The Committee considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Their reply is satisfactory. It removes the remaining deficiencies.</li><li>2. Issue a fresh FR for B.Ed (2 units) and M.Ed (1 unit) at the new site, under the 2014 Regulations.</li></ol>
32	SRCAPP 2589 M.Ed 1 Unit	<p><b>CSI College of Education, Plot No.422/4,419/6, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District-695502, Kerala.</b></p> <p>Society for Higher Education of SIUC Community of South Kerala Diocese of Church of South India, Plot No.419/6422/4, Cheruvarakonam Street, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluka, Thiruvananthapuram District - 695502 applied for grant of recognition to CSI College of Education, Plot No.422/4,419/6, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District-695502, Kerala for offering M.Ed course of 2 years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 28.05.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 03.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 05.06.2015, followed by Reminder- I on 12.06.2015 and Reminder- II on 30.11.2015.</p> <p>The Sub clause (7) of clause 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p>"After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course".</p> <p>The SRC in its 295<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> - 30<sup>th</sup> November &amp; 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2015 considered the matter, documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. LUC is to be given.</li><li>2. BP approved by competent authority is to be given.</li><li>3. EC is to be given.</li><li>4. Society Registration certificate and Bye-laws to be given.</li><li>5. BCC should be produced during VT Inspection.</li><li>6. FDRs should be given later.</li><li>7. Cause Composite Inspection.</li></ol>

8. Ask VT to particularly check on the deficiencies and collect all documents.

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

*"As per our application for M.Ed Course (Application ID:SRCAPP2589) an inspection team visited our college during 1<sup>st</sup> week of February and based on the VT report a Letter of Intent Prior to grant of recognition was issued subject to the appointment of qualified staff. For staff appointment a selection committee was constituted with Dr.G.R.Santhosh Kumar, Chairman, Board of Studies (Education), University of Kerala as University Nominee, Rev.D. Jacob, Treasurer, CSI, south Kerala Diocese as Management Representative, Prof Jacob Mathew, Former Principal, Government college of Teacher Education, Thiruvananthapuram as Management Nominee and Dr. Sajith C Raj, Principal, CSI college of Education, Parassala as its member. Based on the interview held on 09<sup>th</sup> June, 2016, Two Professors, Two Associate Professors and Six Assistant Professors were selected and appointment as M.Ed Faculty. The list of selected candidates was forwarded to the University of Kerala along with their original documents for Approval/Endorsement which is being processed by the university. All the other conditions from 3 to 7 as specified in the letter of intent are being fulfilled by us and is ready for your kind perusal. It is known from the University that*

  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman

the Process of Approval/ Endorsement of staff appointment may take nearly 2 months.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 29.11.2016.

The institution has submitted representation on 30.12.2016 and stating as under :-

"The Faculty list for the proposed M.Ed course in CSI College of Education, Parasala was submitted to the University of Kerala and was placed in the sub-committee of the syndicate which usually meets prior to the Syndicate meeting. Two defects were noticed by the sub- committee and both of them were rectified by the college immediately. The revised faculty list will be placed in the next syndicate meeting for final approval. A letter from the Registrar of the University of Kerala in this regard is enclosed. As we have already rectified all the other defects noticed by NCTE, I request your good self to be kind enough to extend the time limit for the submission of approved faculty list so that we could get the recognition from NCTE for the M.Ed course for the academic year 2017-18".

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

1. We have given them enough time to give the faculty list.
2. We cannot wait indefinitely.
3. Reject the application.

4. Return FDRs, if any.
5. Close the file.

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

The Appellate Authority vide No. F.No.89-277/E-1894/2017 Appeal/12<sup>th</sup> Meeting-2017 dated 10.08.2017 received by this office on 29.08.2017 and stating as under:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 1. We issued LOI on 25.04.2016 for M.Ed (1 unit)**
- 2. They have given the reply only now.**

		<p>3. Faculty list is approved. One Faculty member, Prof and HOD (Psy.) Dr. Ida Nancy has only 54% in P.G. (Psy) degree. She is, therefore, not qualified.</p> <p>4. Issue SCN accordingly.</p>
33	APS00324 B.Ed 2Units Pragathi College of Education, Rangareddy, Telangana	<p><b>Pragathi College of Education, Rangareddy District, Telangana</b></p> <p>Princeton Educational Society, Hyderabad, Telangana had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Pragathi College of Education, Rangareddy District, Telangana for B.Ed course of one year duration from the academic session 2002-03 with an annual intake of 120 students. The institution was granted recognition on 08.04.2003 for an intake of 100 students with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises/building within three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in rented premises).</p> <p>The institution has submitted shifting proposal along with DD of Rs.40,000/- bearing No.543049 dated 25.08.2007 on 10.09.2007.</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was sent to the institution on 26.05.2009 regarding submission of all documents for shifting. The institution has submitted its written representation on 17.06.2009 along with some relevant documents for shifting the institution in permanent location.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>On 27.01.2015, the institution submitted the affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students.</p> <p>The SRC in its 276<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> January, 2015 decided to issue provisional recognition orders to the existing institutions and the Committee also decided to maintain a check list of such cases for verification in October/November and for causing inspection.</p> <p>Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 11.05.2015 with an annual intake of two basic units of 50 students each with a finding that the institution has not shifted to its own premises as stipulated in its Formal Recognition order dated 08.04.2003.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its written representation on 30.07.2015 along with shifting fee of Rs. 1,10,000/- DD No. 274569 dated 29.07.2015 and relevant documents.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its written representation on 06.08.2015 regarding the institution already shifted to permanent premises- update of address and change of name of society to Kommuri Pratap Reddy Educational Society.</p>

The institution has submitted its written representation on 31.10.2015 along with some relevant documents.

The documents was processed and placed before SRC In its 315<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> -18<sup>th</sup> June, 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. They have shifted without NCTE permission.
2. All documents are in order.
3. Built-up area is adequate.
4. Original FDRs are not given.
5. Inspection fee has been paid. Cause Inspection.
6. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.

As per the decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 12.07.2016 and VT members through online mode. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 06<sup>th</sup> & 07<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 09.11.2016.

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

- 1.2 They have shifted without NCTE approval.
- 1.2 They have changed the Management without NCTE approval.
- 1.3 This has significance because the title to lands at the new place belongs to the new Management.
3. The NCTE Regulations have no provision for change of management. NCTE(HQ) have advised that requests for change of Management cannot, therefore, be considered.
- 4.1 Ask them to explain how they took such actions unauthorisedly. Only after this matter is settled can we consider other issues.
- 4.2 If this matter is not satisfactorily settled, we may have to withdraw recognition.
- 5 Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent to the institution on 30.05.2017.

The institution submitted reply along with documents on 28.06.2017 and placed before SRC in its 343<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 01<sup>st</sup> & 02<sup>nd</sup> August, 2017 considered the matter and decided that "put up in the next meeting."


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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The issue relating to change of Management has been satisfactorily explained. It is a case of only a change in the name of the Management and not the Management itself. We accept this explanation.</li><li>2. They have shifted without permission. We have to consider this.</li><li>3. Process the documents collected and report.</li></ol> |
|--|---|

As per decision of SRC, documents were processed.

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

1. **The title position is very confusing.**
2. **Seek clarifications from them. Process. And, put up in the next meeting.**



  
(S. Sathyam)  
Chairman