SOUTHERN REGIONAL COMMITTEE
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
BANGALORE

Minutes of the 343rd Meeting of SRC held at the Conference Hall of NCTE, Bangalore on 1st – 2nd August, 2017.

The following persons attended the Meeting:-

1.	Sri. S. Sathyam	-	Chairman
2.	Prof. M.S. Lalithamma	-	Member
3.	Dr. M.P. Vijayakumar	-	Member
3.	Dr. J. Prasad	-	Member
4.	Shri. Sanjay Gupta Regional Director	-	Not attended the meeting. (Convenor)
5.	Ms. Angelin Golda Under Secretary	-	Officiated as the Convenor

The following members did not attend the Meeting:

- Prof. K. Dorasami, ~~Smt. Padma Sarangapani~~, Prof. Sandeep Ponnala and the Representatives of the Govts. of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, A&N Islands & Lakshadweep .

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Consideration of Court Cases, Appeal cases, VT reports, Show Cause Notice reply and Request for one unit :(Volume-1)

1.	SRCAPP539 D.El.Ed 1 Unit Sri Raja Rajeshwari D.Ed College, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh	**PMRM Educational Society, P.No.29/152-E-1, S.B.I.Colony, Nandyal Village & Taluka, Kurnool District-518502, Andhra Pradesh** had applied for grant of recognition to **Sri RajaRajeshwari D.Ed College, P.No.29/152-E-14-A, Nandyal Village & Taluka, Kurnool District-518502, Andhra Pradesh** for **D.El.Ed** Course of two years duration under Section 14(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE online on 17.09.2011 and physical application has been received in the office of SRC on 19.09.2011. The application was scrutinized and a copy of application was sent to State Government for recommendation on 20.09.2011 followed by reminder on 14.11.2011. A deficiency letter was issued to the institution on 23.11.2011. The institution has replied to the deficiency letter on 28.12.2011. Recommendation from State Government is not received. The SRC in its 216th meeting of SRC held on 11th -12th January 2012 considered the written reply dated 28.12.2012 and other relevant documents submitted by the institution and decided to cause inspection at the premises to examine whether the institution fulfills all the requirements as per the norms and to ascertain infrastructural and instructional facilities available at the premises for the proposed course. Accordingly, the inspection of the institution was fixed between 01.02.2012 to 04.02.2012. The same was intimated to the institution on 24.01.2012. Accordingly inspection of the institution was conducted on 08.02.2012. The SRC in its 219th Meeting held on 15th-16th March, 2012 considered the VT report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and it was decided to serve Show cause Notice under Section 14(1) of NCTE Act, for the following: • **Original notarized sale deed copies in English version are not submitted.** • **As per VT report, in essential data sheet total built up area is only 10861 sq.ft. for the proposed D.El.Ed course. Which is less than the NCTE norms.** • **In the land usage certificate submitted, it is not stated clearly whether the land is converted from agricultural to non-agricultural or educational purpose. Fresh Notarised land usage certificate from Revenue Divisional Office of the Govt. is to be submitted. Proceedings of Revenue Divisional Officer not submitted for conversion of land**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

from agricultural to educational purposes.

- **As per encumbrance certificate submitted, the land is on lease basis to Narayana Educational Society in 2010. This not permissible as per NCTE regulations.**
- **Proof of completion of 3 academic sessions towards existing B.Ed & TPT course run by the institution from the affiliating body/State Govt. is not submitted.**
- **Earmarked built up area for B.Ed, TPT and proposed D.El.Ed course is not given**

Accordingly, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 04/04/2012.

The institution has not submitted reply for Show Cause Notice even after the expiry of stipulated time of 21 days from the date of issue of the notice.

Keeping in view, Supreme Court vide their 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 226th Meeting held on 9th-10th July, 2012 considered the matter, as the institution has not submitted reply even after stipulated period of 21 days from the date of issue of show cause notice letter dt. 04.04.2012 and with reference to the totality of information collected & based on a collective application of mind, the committee decided as per clause 7(1) of NCTE Regulations 2009, to refuse and reject the application of the institution for recognition of D.El.Ed course.

Accordingly, a rejection order was issued to the institution on 13/08/2012.

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.89-791/2012Appeal/2nd Meeting-2013 dated 01/03/2013 stated that

"...the council noted that the SRC issued a show cause notice to the appellant institution on 04/04/2012 mentioning six deficiencies with

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

the direction to submit a representation within a period of 21 days from the date of its issue. The appellant submitted their reply belatedly on 16/07/2012 which was received on 17/07/2012. While the appellant mentioned in his reply to the show cause notice that the delay was on account of late receipt of land usage certificate, he did not mention his now reported illness as a cause. Further, when he was unable to reply within the stipulated period of 21 days, he did not appraise the SRC about the delay in obtaining the documents and seek extension of time. By the time the reply was sent, the SRC had considered the case of the appellant institution in its meeting held on 9th and 10th july2012 and finding that a reply to the show cause notice dated 04/04/2012 was not submitted. Decided to refuse the recognition. In these circumstances the council concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition and therefore the appeal deserved to be rejected and the order of the SRC confirmed.

After perusal of the documents, memorandum of appeal affidavit and after considering oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the council concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition. Accordingly the appeal is rejected and order of SRC confirmed".

The SRC in is 242nd meeting held on 14th – 16th April, 2013 considered the appellate authority order **noted** the matter.

Brief of the institution was sent to the Advocate Shri. K. Ramakanth Reddy on 18.05.2013.

Now, a court order dated 07.04.2017 was received from the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh on 24.05.2017. It stated as under:

"Petitioner prays for writ of Mandamus declaring the action of respondents 1 and 2 in rejection of application dated 19.09.2011 made by petitioner for recognition and permission to D.El.Ed course as illegal and arbitrary.

Learned counsel appearing for petitioner and respondents submit that in the year 2014, new regulations have come into force. The petitioner is required to apply afresh under the new regulations. Therefore, request the Court to dispose of the writ petition by granting liberty to petitioner to make application under new regulations.

The statement is accepted and the writ petition is disposed of accordingly. As and when application is made by the petitioner, the same may be considered expeditiously by the respondents. No

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		order as to costs. ***Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed."*** **The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:-** **1. The Court order is noted.** **2. The College can make a fresh application whenever NCTE issues a Notification inviting applications.** **3. Put up when so received.**
2.	APS02383 B.Ed 2 Units Sunitha Mahila Mandali's Gurukul College of Education, Mysore, Karnataka	**Sunitha Mahila Mandali's Gurukul College of Education, No.1241, Sri Ganesha Complex, Gurukulam 2nd stage, Near Trinetra Circle, Mysore-570002, Karnataka (APS02383)** was granted recognition on **8/11/2006** from the academic session 2006-07 with an annual intake of **100 students**. Based on complaint from Sri.Chikkanna, Governing Council Member, Gurukul B.Ed. College, Mysore regarding mis-management of the funds collected as fees from the students without providing basic amenities. An inspection of the institution was conducted and based on the report of the Visiting team, the Committee in its 193rd meeting held on 21-22 June, 2010 decided to withdraw recognition of the institution for B.Ed. course and Withdrawal order was issued to the institution vide order No.F.SRO/NCTE/2010-2011/20051 dated 28.07.2010. Aggrieved by the withdrawal order, the institution without preferring an appeal approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka vide W.P.No.26012 of 2010 filed by Sunitha Mahila Mandali. A notice was received from the Hon'ble Court in the above Writ petition on 09.09.2010. A letter was addressed to the Advocate on 14.09.2010 along with brief of the institution for defending the case. But, on 8.12.2010, the institution produced a copy of the stay order and requested RD, SRC, NCTE to give direction to CAC for admission of students. On 15.12.2010, this office issued a letter to the Special Officer for admission of students in lieu of stay order of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka. A letter was also addressed to the Advocate on 22.12.2010 duly signing the statement of objections and affidavit for filing before the Hon'ble Court. On January 5, 2011, another letter was addressed to the advocate enclosing the documents for filing

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

statement of objections.

On 28.02.2012, a complaint was received from Sri. M.C. Chikkanna, Ex-Member of Corporation, Governing Council Member, Gurukul B.Ed. College, Mysore alleging that the institution is offering not only B.Ed. course, but also Nursing course and that whenever inspection team is arriving, suitable arrangements were made by putting different boards at the same place and requested to conduct an enquiry as to how the institution is running many courses at the same place without providing proper infrastructure.

On 14.09.2012, another complaint was received from Sri.M.C.Chikkanna, Member, College Governing Council stating that

" ***Gurukul B.Ed College is running by violating the rules and regulations laid down by the government ,NCTE and Mysore University. Gurukul B.Ed College has permission for admission of 100 students. The college does not have the class rooms to accommodate 100 students. Library, Labs and computers are not available. On the whole the college does not have basic infrastructure for running the college. But still the college is running the B.Ed course. This only shows that the management officials are corrupt and the college is running owing to political pressure.***

Admission to Gurukul B.Ed College can be obtained in two ways.

1. ***Students who pay the amount mentioned by the management authorities without asking for a receipt for the paid amount and questioning the misdeeds of the management will be admitted.***
2. ***Students get admitted by paying the amount fixed by the management but do not attend college. They come only for the exams. They are not supposed to question the lack of infrastructure and misdeeds of the management. Students are blackmailed that If questioned, their*** *internal assessment marks will be cut.*

The college does not have lecturers who are approved by the University. Lecturers are not appointed on the basis of qualification and interview. Lecturers are appointed on the recommendation of the secretary and president and the Managing Committee. Most of the lecturers are not qualified, instead of teaching the students they are collecting fees, admitting students to the college on commission basis .They are unfit to be called as lecturers. They can be called as brokers rather than lecturers. Until they get the approval of the University, they will not function as lecturers; instead they will function as brokers for the management. Students who question these irregularities will be intimated to the

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

management and their internal assessment marks will be cut.

Sunitha Mahila Mandali Trust is running various courses in mysore and the these courses are run with the intention of making money only. In view of the illegal activities of the management, the government vide its office memorandum has cancelled the managing Committee and appointed an administrative officer.(copy of the memorandum is enclosed)

All the above said information is known to the authorities of Mysore University and college development council .Professor V.G. Talwar in the syndicate meeting of the University discussed the issue of Gurukul B.Ed College and decided to discontinue the affiliation of the college. I have enclosed the report in the newspaper regarding this. I am not wrong if is say that the college is existing in spite of all this means there exists corruption , political pressure and sexual favours. You are requested to take suitable action for the closure of this college which is running with illegal activities and irregularities and without the basic infrastructural requirements."

The Southern Regional Committee in its 241st Meeting held during 29th and 31st March 2013 and 1st April , 2013 considered the complaint letter dated. 14.09.2012 and decided to send the complaint to the Registrar & Vice Chancellor of Mysore University for their comments. As per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed to the Registrar and copy marked to the Vice-Chancellor on 01.06.2013.

In the meanwhile, on 19.3.2013, and 30.4.2013 a letter dated 26.2.2013 was received from the advocate, Ashok Haranahalli Associates stating that:

"The above writ petition is filed questioning the order dated 28.7.2010 passed by the 2nd respondent-SRC withdrawing the recognition granted to the petitioner-institution.

The above court matter came up for consideration before the Hon'ble High Court today for preliminary hearing in 'B'group. After hearing the matter, the Hon'ble Court granted time to the petitioner-institution to complete the new building and to comply with the NCTE regulations. It was also observed that till the completion of the building, the petitioner institution shall not make any admission of students. With the above observation, the writ petition was disposed off.

I have applied for the certified copy of the final order, and the same will be sent to you on its receipt."

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

The Southern Regional Committee in its 246th meeting held during 02nd& 04th June, 2013 considered the Hon'ble High Court order and also letter from our advocate regarding "granting of time to the petitioner-institution to complete the new building and to comply with the NCTE regulations. It was also observed that till the completion of the building, the petitioner institution shall not make any admission of students".

The Committee decided and advised SRO to write to the lawyer to file an appeal immediately and to cite the Hon'ble Supreme Court orders while filing the appeal. The Hon'ble Supreme Court order says:

Keeping in view, Supreme Court vide their 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".

Judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP © No. 14020/2009 filed by Adarsh Shiksha Mahavidalaya & others Vs Subhash Rahaangdale & others is:

> *" In future, the High Court's shall not entertain prayer for interim relief by unrecognized institutions and the institutions which have not been granted affiliation by the examination body and or the students admitted by such institutions for permission to appear in the examination or for declaration of the result of examination. This would also apply to the recognized institutions if they admit students otherwise than in accordance with the procedure contained in Appendix-1 of the Regulations".*

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed to the advocate, Shri. Ashok Haranahalli on 14.06.2015 with a request to file an appeal.

On 09.07.2015, the institution submitted an affidavit expressing adherence to

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Regulations, 2014.

A letter was addressed to the institution on 31.05.2015 stating that since recognition of your institution is withdrawn, revised order cannot be issued.

On 10.08.2015, a letter was received from Ms. Jojiana Lakra, Section Officer regarding the recognition status of the institution

As directed, a letter was addressed to the advocate, Shri. Pramod Kathavi on 16.09.2015, seeking information as to whether any writ appeal was filed by NCTE against the order dated 26.02.2013 in W.P.No.26012 of 2010

On 19.10.2015, another letter was received from Ms. Jojiana Lakra requesting to furnish the latest status of the institution

On 31.10.2015, a letter dated 30.10.2015 was received from the advocate, Shri.Pramod Kathavi regarding the W.P.No. 34842-43/ 2015 filed by Sunitha Mahila Mandali.

On 17.11.2015, a reply was received from the advocate, as under :-
"We do not have any papers in relation to WP No.26012 /2010 . On enquiring about the said writ petition we have been appraised that writ appeal No.6506/2013 was filed by the institution (Sunitha Mahila Mandali) and another against the order dated 26.02.2013 passed in W.P.No.26012/2010.The said writ appeal filed by the institution was dismissed on 18.11.2014

It is brought to your kind notice that your letter dated 16.09.2015 provides the name of the institution as Gurukul College of Education which is incorrect. Kindly provide with the correct particulars of the case number and the name of the parties as it causes great inconvenience in obtaining the information that you require.

The institution filed W.P.No. 34842 of 2014 in the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore aggrieved by non issuance of revised order by NCTE.

On 08.01.2016, a letter was received from Shri. Awadhesh Nayak, Under Secretary, NCTE seeking the latest status along with supporting documents in view of the letter from Shri.B.S.Yediyurappa, Member of Parliament

On 10.02.2016, this office received a Court order dated 13.01.2016 in W.P.No.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

34842-34843 /2015 which is as under:-

"The petitioners are before this Court assailing the endorsement/communication dated 31.05.2015 as at Annexure -A to the petition .The petitioner are seeking to issue mandamus to direct the second respondent to reconsider the application dated 12.01.2015 as at Annexure-P to the petition.

2. The petitioners had secured recognition to run the second respondent – institution the petitioners in that light were required to provide all infrastructures as has been indicated as a condition while entertaining the application of the petitioners. Since the required infrastructure is not provided, the respondents had taken action against the petitioners. The Petitioners were before this Court in W.P.No. 26012/2010.This Court while disposing of the petition on 26.02.2013 had taken note that the petitioners had not made any progress with regard to providing infrastructure, yet, as a last opportunity, time was granted till August, 2013 and it was made clear that if the petitioners did not complete the construction within the stipulated period, it is for the respondents to proceed against the petitioners .The construction had not been put up even within the time as had been granted by this Court. The petitioners however sought extension of time which has been granted, but was rejected by this Court

3. In that background, the petitioners had also filed an appeal in W.A.No. 6506 / 2013 seeking indulgence of this Court to permit the petitioners to putout construction within the time frame to be provided.The Division Bench of this court dismissed the appeal on 18.11.2014. In such circumstances, the infrastructure as required had not been provided by the petitioners. The respondents have issued the communication dated 31.05.2015 intimating that the recognition status of the petitioner–institution is withdrawn. The petitioners though aggrieved by such communication, keeping in view the sequence of events that have taken place earlier and when admittedly the construction had not been completed even as per the time as provided by this Court, no flaw could be found with the communication issued by the respondents.

4. Hence, the prayer as made in the instant petitions does not merit consideration .If at all the petitioners complete the construction and provided all infrastructure, it would be open for the petitioners to approach the respondents who would thereafter take note of the same and take a decision in accordance with law keeping in view the Regulations guiding that aspect of matter.

In terms of the above, the petitions stand disposed.

SRC in its 303rd meeting held on 15th February, 2016 considered the matter and

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

decided as under:

"Since the applicant has not approached as per Court order, showing completion of construction and providing infrastructure .No action is required."

On 25.02.2016, the institution submitted a written representation along with relevant documents and a copy of the Court order dated 13.01.2016 which is as under :-

"As per the direction of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, we wish to bring to your kind notice regarding infrastructure facility of our institution that KIADB has allotted 8.2 acres of land for education purpose of B.Ed College of our Trust

So we are enclosing the following details for your kind perusal.

1. Trust Deed

2. Land documents: KIADB has allotted 8.22 acres for our Trust for B.Ed College purpose "

We are submitting allotment letter, land documents and sketch

3. Completion Certificate: The building completion certificate obtained from public works department in the year 2015 is herewith submitted for your perusal.

We hereby request your goodself to kindly give the permission since all the infrastructure has been provided as per your norms and standards

We hope our humble request will be taken into your consideration and the above will be done in our favour."

The SRC, in its 305th meeting held during 25th to 27th February, 2016 has considered the matter and decided as under:-

- *Cause Inspection – Collect fee.*
- *Ask VT to collect all documents.*

On 23.03.2016, the institution submitted a request for postponement of inspection as under:-

"I wish to bring following few lines to your kind consideration on the above subject, due to my medical emergency. I am not in position of getting the inspection done of our institution.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

I am herewith attaching to kindly postpone the inspection for 2 weeks and oblige. I am herewith attaching the medical certificate for your kind perusal.

I hope my humble request will be taken in to consideration and the above will be done in favourable."

The SRC in its 309th meeting held during 12th – 14th April, 2016 considered the request of the institution and decided as under:-

1. Grant time.
2. Cause Inspection after two weeks.

On 27.05.2016, a letter No. F.46-30/2015/VIP/29312 dated 23.05.2016 from Shri. Awadhesh Nayak, Under Secretary, NCTE, New Delhiwas received regarding revoking of grant of recognition to Gurukul College of Education, Mysore, Karnataka and stated as under:-

"The address of the college mentioned in SRC's letter does not match with the address of the college mentioned in the letter of Shri, B.S.Yeddyurappa,Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha). It is therefore to check the address"

Accordingly, a letter was addressed to NCTE, New Delhi on 06.06.2016.

A letter was received from NCTE Hqrs on 18.07.2016 for knowing the status of inspection decided in 309th meeting held on 12th – 14th April, 2016.

As per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was conducted on 10.09.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 13.10.2016.

The SRC in its 324th meeting held during 07th to 08th December, 2016 considered VT report and decided as under:-

1.Title to land is not clear-The 6 year clause in the lease agreement expired in 2014. Did the title-position change then? They should explain.
2.EC not given.
3. LUC is there.
4.BP is given. Details are incomplete.
5.BCC is not in format. Built-up area shown is adequate.
6.FDRs not given.
7.Latest Faculty list not given in the format; also, not approved.
8.Fee not paid.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		9. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly. 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 & 09.02.2017 and also additional documents submitted on 20.02.2017. The SRC in its 331st meeting held during 22nd February, 2017 considered the written representation and decided as under:- 1. *"The built-up area required (i.e.2000 sq.mtrs). is not there* *2.1. On the date of application they did not have title to the land.* *2.2 To this date, the land (purchased in Jan 2017) is mortgaged.* *3. Issue SCN for rejection."* As per the decision of SRC a show cause notice was prepared. But not sent to institution. Based on the website information the institution has submitted written representation on 02.03.2017. The SRC in its 333rd meeting held during 24th March 2017 considered the written representation and decided as under:- *1. "Built-up area is adequate.* *2. Land area is adequate.* *3. Title to land is clear.* *4. BP & BCC are in order.* *5. Land is mortgaged.* *6. Issue SCN for rejection."* Based on the website information the institution has submitted written representation on 27.03.2017 . The SRC in its 334th meeting held during 30th – 31st March 2017 considered the written representation and decided as under:- *1. "All requirements have not been met.* *2. Faculty list is not approved.* *3. They have to give FDRs @ 7 +5 lakhs in original, in Joint account for each unit of each course.* *4. Issue SCN accordingly."* Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 07.04.2017. The institution has submitted show cause notice reply

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

on 05.04.2017.

The SRC in its 335th meeting held during held during 11th – 12th April, 2017 considered the show cause notice reply of the institution and decided as under:-

1. ***" All requirements have been met.***
2. ***The case is ready for restoration of recognition subject to verification of the Faculty list.***
3. ***Request the University to approve the Faculty list without insisting on LOI or a recognition order.***
4. ***Ask the college to submit the latest approved faculty list without further delay.***
5. ***Put up on 26.04.17."***

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution and University on 25.04.2017.

The institution has submitted reply for the deficiencies pointe out in the 335th meeting on 02.05.2017.

The SRC in its 341st meeting held during 15th – 16th June, 2017 has considered reply forthe decision of 335th meeting and decided as under:

"1.1 This case suffered from basic infirmities at initio.
1.2 They did not have title to lands! Buildings at the time of application.
1.3 Strictly speaking, the case should have been summarily rejected.
2.1 Somehow, it got into the process and went through its ups and downs.
2.2 They did approach the Courts of Law during their moments of downs. But, the Courts had appraised the facts more correctly than us to reject their representations. Even their last approach to the Hon'ble High Court in Jan. 2016 met with the same treatment. Their Writ petition was dismissed as not meriting consideration because no flaw could be found with the order issued by the respondent.
2.3 While giving the opportunity to the applicant to approach the SRC again, if necessary, the Court gave freedom to the SRC to take a decision in accordance with law keeping in view the Regulations guiding that aspect of matter.
3.1 The Regulations make specific stipulations of norms an standards. It is even prescribed that deficiencies cannot be rectified after VT Inspection. The Hon'ble Supreme Court had directed that norms and standards should be rigidly enforced. Notwithstanding all this, the SRC had recognized rectification of deficiencies, not just after V.T. inspection, but,

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

even after rejection of the application and withdrawal of recognition.

3.2 As earlier stated, this case merited Summarily rejection for want of title to lands at the time of application. Not observing this legal prescription, the SRC swung to the other extreme of considering restoration of recognition that was withdrawn with reference to other infirmities. In this connection, it is relevant to note that the SRC can resort to limited powers to review its decisions in cases of errors apparent on the face of the record. No such situation prevailed in this case. The decision of the SRC to revive the case (to consider their representation) inspite of irreparable infirmities in the case was clearly excessive display of clemency by it. It was certainly not warranged in the face of the Hon. High Court's permission given to the SRC to go by the law keeping in view the guidelines on the subject.

4. In the result, and for the reasons given above, we are inclined to review our decision to give favourable consideration to their representation regarding late construction of the building and even later acquisition of title to the lands.

5. Apart from the other irreparable infirmities, there are flaws in the Faculty list also.

(i) The certificate of experience given by the Principal does not give the exact dates of service in the AET College.

(ii) There is no Asst. Prof. shown for perspective.

(iii) Under pedagogy, 4 Asst. Profs. have been shown in excess. Out of these, 2 Asst. Profs.in Social Sc. can be shifted to Perspectives. The other two will remain as surpluses in Pedagogy.

(iv) One Asst. Prof.(Psy.) and one Asst. Prof.(Sociol./Phil.) will still be required to be appointed in the Perspective group.

(V) Asst. Prof (FA) and Asst. Prof (PA) are not qualified.

6. Accordingly, reject their application seeking restoration of recognition. The recognition withdrawn by us in 2010 and reiterated in May 2015 remains withdrawn. No further action is necessary.

7. Return FDRs if any.

8. Close the file."

As per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 06.07.2017.

The writ petition No. 28415/2015 filed by Smt. Sunitha Mahila Mandali Gurukul is received by this office from the Advocate, Shri. Basavaraj V Sabarad on 07.07.2017 is as under:-

"The above writ petition filed seeking writ of certiorari quashing the

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

decision/ order of 341st meeting of the 1st Respondent dated 15 / 16.06.2017. On the direction of Hon'ble Court to take notice I have taken notice for Respondent No. 1 and herewith sent writ petition with annexures served on me. The matter will be listed on 07.07.2017 for preliminary hearing.

You are requested to sent parawise remarks with supporting documents immediately."

Accordingly, a letter along with brief of the case is sent to the advocate on 08.07.2017.

On 14.07.2017, a court order dated 10.07.2017 in W.P.No. 28415/2017 and 30956-31067 / 2017 is received by this office which is as under :-

"Learned Counsel for the petitioner has furnished details of 85 students admitted to B.Ed Course for the year 2015-2016 and also details of 27 students who have been admitted for the year 2016-2017.

It is seen from the records that the petitioner has not made the said students as party. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that as the exams are going to be commenced from 12.7.2017, he sought for permission for these students to appear in the ensuing exams.

The petitioner is permitted to make these students as parties and also pay court fee during the course of the day.

At this stage, learned counsel for the respondent submitted that is no specific prayer for grant of interim order in the Writ Petition.

However, oral submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is considered and the following interim order is passed:

Under these circumstances, the students who are being made as parties to the Writ Petition as per the memo enclosed are permitted to appear in 3rd semester and 1st semester examinations, respectively.

The learned counsel for the respondents are directed to communicate the interim order passed by today and permit these students to take up respective examinations.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		Learned counsel for Respondent No. 1 and 2 are permitted to file their statement of objection. *Call this matter on 12.07.2017."* **The Committee considered the above court matter and decided as under:-** **1. The case is sub-judice. The interim order of the Court is noted.** **2. Ask our Lawyer to submit to the Court that the College has admitted students without our recognition.** **3. There is a specific order of the Supreme Court that in such cases, expressing concern for the students' future will be misplaced concern/sympathy. Locate that judgement and give the citation to the Lawyer for incorporating reference to it in his submission.** **4. Keep the affiliating University informed.**
3.	APS05561 B.Ed 2 Units Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Kerala	**Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur, Kannur, Kerala** was granted recognition for B.Ed. course on **7.12.2007** with an annual intake of **100** students with a condition to shift to its own premises within 3 years (in case the institution is started in rented premises). As per the decision of SRC in its 175th meeting, the SRC reviewed the files of the institutions who were granted recognition either in permanent premises or in leased premises. A list of such institutions was prepared and placed before SRC in its 176th meeting. In the 176th meeting of SRC, it was decided to issue Show Cause Notice to the institutions calling for documents for shifting of premises. Accordingly SCN issued on 02.07.2009. The institution submitted its explanation to the Show Cause Notice on 28.7.2009. On 5.10.2011, a complaint against the above institution was received from Sri. Rajesh P.V., Advocate & Notary, Taliparamba, Kannur, Kerala on behalf of Sri. Prakashan.P. This office vide letter dated 21.10.2011 requested the complainant to submit an affidavit of Rs.100/- on non-judicial stamp paper in respect of the complaint received on 5.10.2011.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		Sri. P.V. Rajesh, Advocate & Notary submitted an affidavit on Rs.100/- non-judicial stamp paper duly signed by the complainant Sri. Prakashan.P., S/o. Damodaran, Payyanadan House, Kannothumchal, Chovva P.O., Kannur-6, Kerala. The complainant requested not to recognize Rajiv Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanoor and not to give affiliation as well and to take immediate steps to close down the College since it is alleged that the institution is functioning without complying the terms and conditions fixed by Kannur University and NCTE. The affidavit along with the complaint is enclosed. In the Show Cause Notice dated 02.07.2009, the institution had stated that the construction of the proposed new building had been started and was likely to be completed upto November, 2010. The SRC in its 215th meeting held on 12-13 December, 2011 considered the complaint of Mr. Sri. Prakashan.P and decided that to register this as a shifting case, if a file is already pending, and also to cause inspection at the premises on receipt of Rs. 40.000/- towards inspection fee and to ascertain the facts of the complaint. Accordingly, a visit was scheduled to the institution during 6th February, 2012 to 8th February, 2012. A letter to the institution was addressed vide letter No. APS05561/B.Ed./KA/2011-12/36061 dated 18.01.2012. A fax was received from the institution on 24.01.2012 stating that they are not ready for inspection as the permanent building for the College is under construction. The building will be ready for inspection by the end of May, 2012. As per the decision of 215th SRC meeting held on 12th - 13th December 2011, the visiting team comprising of Dr. S. Thangasamy, Director and Professor, Centre for Educational Research, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai and Dr. C. Raja Moauli, Professor, Dept. of Education, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open University, Hyderabad was proposed to the institution during 6th to 8th February, 2012. On 14.2.2012. The Visiting team submitted a blank report stating that the inspection may kindly be postponed. The SRC in its 224th meeting held on 14th – 17th June, 2012 considered the matter and decided to serve Final Show Cause Notice under NCTE Act. Accordingly, a Final Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 09.07.2012. The institution submitted its written representation on 30.07.2012. The SRC in its 235th meeting held on 21st – 22nd November 2012, considered the reply of the institution dt.30-07-2012 and all other relevant documents and decided to **cause inspection** as per NCTE Act, to examine whether the institution fulfils all the requirements as per the norms, for the proposed

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

programme, subject to the condition that the deficiencies, if any, were duly rectified by the institution, as per the norms.

Accordingly, an intimation letter was sent to the institution on 03/12/2012.

An E-Mail dated 05/12/2012 was received by this office from the Principal, Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education requesting the postponement of inspection to February 2013 as they are not prepared for the inspection as the permanent construction of the building of the college has been 90 % completed. Another letter regarding postponement of inspection is received by this office on 07/12/2012.

An E-mail dated 10/12/2012 and 12/12/2012 from Mr. Balaramulu and Ms.Philomena Lobo was received by this office seeking clarification regarding the date of inspection.

The Inspection team members were informed to conduct the inspection as scheduled vide F.SRO/NCTE/KL/VT/2012/47730 dated 14/12/2012.

Another letter dated 21/12/2012 from the Principal, Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education is received by this office on 24/12/2012 requesting for postponement of inspection to February 2013.

On 30/01/2013, E-Mails from Mr. Balarumulu and Philomena Lobo were received by this office enclosing a brief report of visit to Rajeev Memorial B.Ed College, Mattanur, Kannur, Kerala. The report was as under :

"On 11th January, 2013, Friday, we visited the colleges at 9.00 a.m .We were received by a reluctant Principal, Dr.Pillai. To our great shock and surprise, we found that neither the management nor the Principal had made any preparations for the visit of VT, though it was intimated to them well in advance by both your office and by us. The basic requirements of preparedness like, filling up of the Format supplied by you was not done. No records, be it of the building or academic were kept ready. In short, it was the Principal expected us not to conduct any inspection and asked us to get back."

A blank inspection report and non filed questionnaire had been received by this office on 01/02/2013 along with the letter from the VT members enclosing a report and a few photographs stating that"

"We visited the Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur, Kannur District, Kerala, as reported by the Principal earlier, the college building is not completed nor the records were produced. They were not prepared for the

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

inspection, still as per intimation we have visited the spot and saw that the college is running in the first floor of a commercial complex.

We have enclosed a report regarding the visit, the letter given by the Principal of the College, the formats given by you for the inspection and TA and Honorarium bills.

A copy of the report is enclosed.

A certificate from the Principal, Dr.Vijayan Pillai submitted along with the VT report has states that:

"On the day of their visit, the Manager of Society was not present on our premises due to ill health. Since all the original records are with the Manager himself,

I couldn't produce any document regarding the building or others, for the perusal of the V.T, nor the application format was also filled up and kept ready for the inspection.

I hereby state that, all the relevant records will be produced for inspection once our building is ready and shifted to our new campus."

The SRC in its 241st meeting held on 29th & 31st March 2013 & 1st April 2013 considered the Institution letter dt.11-01-2013 and all other relevant documents and decided to cause inspection in the month of April-2013 under NCTE Act, to examine whether the institution fulfils all the requirements as per the norms, for the proposed programme, subject to the condition that the deficiencies, if any, were duly rectified by the institution, as per the norms.

The inspection of the institution was scheduled for 27thMay, 2013 and the same was intimated to the institution vide this office letter F.No.APSO5561/B.Ed/KE/2013-14/51703 dated 16/05/2013. Accordingly, the inspection of the institution was carried out on 30.05.2013.

The Southern Regional Committee in its 248th Meeting held on 13th – 15th July 2013 considered the VT report, VCD of the institution on the above matter and also the relevant documents of the institution and decided to withdraw recognition for the following reasons:-

- ***Original certified copy of the land documents from Govt. authority is not submitted. The institution has submitted photocopy of the land documents, the land documents is in favour of in individual by name Prof. K.Lakshmana, which is not permissible as per NCTE***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Regulations 2009. Approved blue print of the building plan issued by competent civil authority is not submitted. In the building plan copy submitted, Institution's name is not mentioned.

- *Original building completion certificate from competent Govt. authorized engineer is not submitted.*
- *Original FDRs of Rs. 5 & 3 lacs towards endowment and reserve fund from a Nationalized Bank in joint name is not given.*
- *Notarized land usage certificate from the Revenue divisional office stating that the agriculture land converted to non-agriculture for the educational purpose is not submitted. Proceedings of Revenue Divisional Officer not submitted for conversion of land from agricultural to educational purposes.*
- *Up-to-date encumbrance certificate issued by sub-registrar is not submitted.*
- *Staff is not accordingly to NCTE norms.*
- *Original affidavit is not submitted.*

Keeping in view, the 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 fulfills 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".

Based on the above points the SRC decided to withdraw the recognition of the B.Ed course run by the Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur, Kannur, Kerala, from the academic year 2013-14 in order to enable the ongoing batch of students in B.Ed, course, if any, to complete their course. It was made clear that the institution is debarred from making any further admission subsequent to the date of issue of this order.The Affiliating body / Examining board / body were informed accordingly. Further it was decided to return Endowment funds and Reserve fund deposited with SRC NCTE, Bangalore, if any.

Accordingly, a withdrawal order was issued to the institution vide F.No.APS05561 /B.Ed /KL/2013-14/53312 dated 26.08.2013.

On 08.11.2013, an e-mail was received from K.Priyesh stating as under ;

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

"We wish to inform you that Rajeev Memorial B.Ed College is still working in Kannur District without your recognition. Kindly, please give a direction to Kannur University to stop the college working illegally without your recognition and also please give direction to Rajeev Memorial B.Ed College to stop their cheating to students by taking admissions without your recognition. I got information from the local public that the college authorities still going forward by taking new admissions by hiding that they have no recognition from NCTE.

Kindly take necessary actions, otherwise we have to compel to forward this matter to newspapers, channels etc."

The Southern Regional Committee in its 256th Meeting held on 4th - 6th December 2013 considered the matter, complaint through e-mail on the said college, decided and advised Southern Regional Office to send a copy of the complaint to the Affiliating University along with a copy of the order of withdrawal of recognition for needful action.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter addressed to the Registrar, Kannur University was sent vide F.SRO/APSO5561-B.Ed/KL/2013/55713 dated 27.12.2013

This office did not receive any reply from the University.

The institution filed an appeal under Section 18 of NCTE Act, before the Appellate Authority, NCTE, New Delhi against the withdrawal order of SRC.

On 13.03.2014, this office received the appellate authority order No.F.No.89-667/2013 Appeal/2nd Meeting – 2014 dated 25.02.2014 remanding back the case of Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Thrissur, Kerala to the SRC, NCTE. The Council has made the following observations ;

'The Council noted that the SRC conducted an inspection of the institution on 30-05-2013 and after considering the VT report and other documents decided to withdraw recognition and issued the order dated 27-08-2013 citing the reasons therein. the Council noted that the SRC, before withdrawing recognition, has not issued any show cause notice to the institution as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the NCTE Act. In the circumstances the Council concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to issue a show cause notice to the appellant institution and take further action as per the provisions of the NCTE Act.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		After perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, the documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Council concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to SRC with a direction to issue a show cause notice to the appellant institution and take further action as per the provisions of the NCTE Act. *The Council hereby remands back the case of Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Thrissur, Kerala to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above,* The office memorandum (directive) from the NCTE Hqrs dated 25.04.2014 is as under ; *'The appeal Committee is in agreement with the advice of the legal Counsel about continued consideration of the appeals received so far as also those to be received in future, in accordance with law and procedure. However, in cases where the Appeal Committee decided to remand them to the Regional Committees for such actions like re-issue of deficiency letter/show cause notice or to consider the submissions of the appellant etc. it is felt that it would suffice from the point of view of the committee to state in their minutes that the suggested actions are taken in accordance with the NCTE Regulations.* *Since the revised Regulations are yet to be notified, it would be appropriate if the NCTE administratively informs all the Regional committees that further action on the appellate order in case of 'remand' should be taken only in the light of the revised regulations to be notified.'* *In view of the above legal opinion and Appeal Committee's decision, all the Regional Offices/Committees are directed to act upon the Appellate orders of remanded back cases accordingly.* The above matter was placed before SRC in its 269th Meeting held on 1- 2 July,2014 and the Committee considered the appeal remand order and directed SRO to process and put up after notification of new regulations. On 06.01.2014, a complaint from Shri.Ajaykumar.M, Kannur, Kerala State is received alleging that the college is making admissions without the approval of NCTE.(copy enclosed) The Southern Regional Committee in its 271st Meeting held on 1st August, 2014 considered the matter, decided and advised *Southern Regional Office to process the case after notification of new Regulations.*

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		Further, the Committee considered the complaint from the Shri. Ajaykumar, M. Kannur, Kerala State vide letter dated 06.01.2014, stated that the said college is admitting students now; Committee has noted that the said college recognition that was withdrawn has not yet been restored. Processing of the case after remand can take place only after notification of the new Regulations. Advised Southern Regional Office to inform the University not to allow admission at this stage. Also, the college is to be directed not to admit. As per the decision of SRC, a letters were addressed to the Registrar, Kannur University and the Principal, Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur, Kerala on 18.09.2014 conveying the decision of SRC not allow admissions at this stage. On 02.09.2014, a letter dated 30.08.2014 is received from advocate Shri.V.M.Kurian regarding the W.P.(C) No. 21785 of 2014 in the High Court of Kerala filed by Rajeev Memorial Charitable Society against Kannur University. A copy of the writ petition W.P.(C) No. 21785 of 2014 filed by the institution is enclosed. The writ petition is filed by the Petitioner challenging the Ext. P 15 communication of Kannur University to restrict admission in the academic year 2014 - 15. The petitioner impleaded NCTE as additional respondent as directed by the Hon'ble Court since the above said communication is based on Ext.P11 withdrawal order F.No .APS05561/B.Ed /KL/2013-14/53312 dated 26.08.2013 issued by SRC,NCTE. The above writ petition came up for impleading additional respondent (NCTE) on 29.08.2014. The advocate took notice on behalf of NCTE and has requested to forward necessary instructions in the matter for preparing Counter Affidavit. A letter was addressed to the advocate, Shri. V. M. Kurian on 23.09.2014 with a request to file Counter Affidavit by taking the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court into account. On 01.10.2014, this office has received a letter dated 29.09.2014 from the advocate, Shri. V. M. Kurian regarding W.P.(C) No. 25181 of 2014 filed by the institution. The letter is as under:- ***" The above writ petition (W.P.(C) No. 25181 of 2014) is filed by the petitioner to quash the communication F.SRO/NCTE/KL/APS05561/B.Ed/2014/59642 dated 18.09.2014 issued by the Regional Director, NCTE, directing the petitioner not to allow***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

the admission of students without getting approval from SRC, NCTE. The above writ petition came up for admission before the Hon'ble Court on26.09.2014 and the Hon'ble Court has passed an interim order by staying above communication for a period of 2 months. We have taken notice on behalf of you and writ petition is posted for filing Counter Affidavit. Please forward necessary instructions in the matter for preparing counter affidavit.

A copy of the affidavit filed by the institution [W.P.(C).No. 25181 of 2014] and other relevant documents are enclosed along with the letter.

A letter was addressed to the advocate, Shri.V.M.Kurian on 28.10.2014 along with the brief of the case requesting him to file a Counter affidavit by quoting Hon'ble Supreme Court directions.

The Southern Regional Committee in its 275th meeting held during 1st and 2nd December, 2014, took note of the Interim Court order in the matter. Advised Southern Regional Office to process the said case as soon as the new Regulations are notified and put up in 277th meeting.

A letter seeking consent on the willingness of the institution for considering their application as per Regulations 2014 was sent to the institution on 19.12.2014

In response to this office letter dated 19.12.2014, the institution submitted a reply on 13.01.2015 which is as under :-

"We are in receipt of your letter referred above on 30.10.2014.It is seen from paragraph 2 of your said communication that the Regional Office of NCTE, Bangalore has construed to the effect that we have submitted application for the grant of recognition for conducting the B.Ed course. It appears that the said communication was given on a wrong factual premise. As such we are giving the following clarifications for your kind consideration..

We were given recognition by NCTE in the year 2007 by order dated 07.01.2007.copy enclosed for ready reference. Thereafter the recognition given was withdrawn by SRC, Bangalore by communication dated 26.08.2013.As the action was against law, we had no other option than to challenge the same before the appellate authority. The appellate authority through their dated 25.02.2014 was pleased to set aside the order of SRC Bangalore for the reasons stated in the appellate order. It is thereafter another communication was given to the effect that processing of the application can be made after notification of the new regulation. That

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Communication is on a wrong legal premise. The question which ought to have been considered was whether there are sufficient reasons for withdrawal of the recognition granted in 2007.Therefore there is no justification in adopting a different yardstick in our case. Further the legality of the communication given on 19.09.2014 pursuant to the decision of SRC, Bangalore dated 01.08.2014 is under challenge before the High Court in W.P.C.No. 25181/ 2014.As such there is no justification in considering our case of all other B.Ed Colleges. There is no justification for the selective action as well.Therefore, you are requested to give us hearing before a decision is taken in this regard."

The institution submitted staff list comprising of a principal and seven lecturers.

The SRC in its 278th meeting held during 25th January, 2015 considered the matter, reply of the institution letter dated 13.01.2015 and all the relevant documentary evidence and decided to serve Show cause Notice under NCTE act. For the following deficiencies:-

- **The Institution has not submitted certified copy of the land documents.**
- **Building plan submitted by the institution is not approved by the competent authority, in the building plan submitted, Sy, no. site area, built up area, room and lab specifications are not mentioned.**
- **The institution has not submitted Building Completion Certificate duly approved by the competent authority.**
- **Non- encumbrance certificate not submitted.**
- **Fixed receipts in original are not submitted.**

On 30.03.2015, the institution submitted an affidavit affirming adherence to Regulations, 2014.

On 15.06.2015, a letter dated 10.06.2015 was received from the President Rajeev Memorial Charitable Society, is as under:-

> ***"We are in receipt of the show cause notice and the communication referred above. In view of various earlier proceedings in relation to the matter in issue and the pendency of several writ petitions before the High Court, time is required in preparing a reply in consultation with our counsel. As such you are requested to grant us time till 30th of June by which time a detailed reply will be given with reference to the matter in issue. Inconvenience caused is regretted."***

As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to institution on 13.05.2015.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		The institution submitted written representation on 29.06.2015 as under:- *"We are in receipt of the show cause notice dated 13.05.2015. On receipt of the said notice we have requested time to give the reply to the show cause notice till 30.06.2015. Accordingly we are giving the present reply.* *In the show cause notice given to us, in paragraph 3 it is stated that the complaint given by Sri. Rajesh P.V, given to the University and the NCTE is enclosed. Unfortunately that is seen enclosed along with the show cause notice. Therefore we are deprived of our valuable right to respond to the show cause notice after knowing the contents of the allegations.* *In this connection I would like to bring to your notice that by the proceedings dated 25.02.2014, the appeal preferred by us was allowed by the Appellate Committee and the matter is issue as it then stood was remanded to the Regional Committee for fresh decision, After the said order of the Appellate Committee, the Regulations were amended and the steps to be taken thereafter can only be in terms of the amended Regulations as now in force. You are also aware of the fact that the college was shifted to the new building and the Inspectors deputed by your office had conducted their inspection. The report of that inspection also is available with the Regional Committee. In terms of the amendment of the Regulations, which was carried out in the year 2014 we were called up on to give our affidavit by the Southern Regional Committee to the effect that the institution will fulfill the Norms and Regulations of 2014 as amended. The affidavit was accordingly given as early as on 26.03.2015. A copy of the affidavit given is enclosed for ready reference. In view of the above the matter in issue is required to be considered under the amended Regulations for which the affidavit was given on 26.03.2015.* *It is seen from the show cause notice that the same has been issued based on the meeting of the Southern Regional Committee which was held on 25.01.2015. In view of the substantial changes that have take place, it is requested that the relevancy of the proceedings initiated is lost by passage of time and the amendment of the Regulations.* *In the show cause notice issued by you, you have mentioned about the non-submission of documents. While appeal was preferred against your earlier decision to withdraw the recognition, all the documents were produced in original before the Appellate Committee. Those documents are still with the Appellate Committee as the same were not returned at that stage. It is therefore submitted that I am unable to produce the original documents as of now since those documents are before the Appellate Committee. It is therefore requested that steps may be taken to call for the entire records leading to the appeal based on which the Appellate Committee decided our appeal through their order dated 25.02.2014. Those documents will clearly show that even the basis of the proceedings are based on misconception. However I am enclosing herewith the attested photocopies of the documents about which reference is made in your show cause notice.* *In view of the change in the Regulations and in view of the affidavit filed by us accepting the compliance of the stipulations contained in the Regulations as amended in 2014 you are requested to issue the necessary order for the further continuance of the course in our college."*

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

The SRC in its 290th meeting held during 10th and 11th July, 2015 considered the matter, written reply from the institution vide letter dated 29.06.2015, and all the relevant documentary evidences and it was decided to serve Notice Under Section 17 of NCTE Act for the following :

(i) English version of land document.
(ii) BP & EC issued by competent authority.
(iii) Approved staff list as per 2014 Regulations.

As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 23.09.2015.
The institution submitted a reply on 26.10.2015

On 28.12.2015, the Registrar, Kannur University submitted a representation regarding admissions made by Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Kannur for the year 2015-17 without the revised recognition order which is as under :-

"With reference to the above, I am to inform you that Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur, Kannur ***has admitted students to 2015-17 batch of B.Ed course without the revised recognition order issued by you****.*

Subsequent to the withdrawal of recognition granted to Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur, Kannur, the University granted continuation of provisional affiliation to B.Ed course offered from the college during 2012-13 considering the future of the ongoing batch of students .Further, the University also granted continuation of affiliation to B.Ed course conducted in Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur, Kannur on the basis of the interim order of the Hon'ble High Court and the syndicate decision (copy of both enclosed). The continuation of affiliation to B.Ed course in Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur, Kannur during 2014-15 is under processing .Now it has also come to the notice of the University that the College has admitted students to 2015-17 batch of B.Ed course in Rajeev Memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur Kannur on receiving on receiving the application for 1st Semester Examination of B.Ed course .

The matter is hereby informed for further necessary action in this regard

The University submitted a copy of the Court order dated 14.10.2014 in **W.P.No. 25181 of 2014** which is as under :-

"The petitioner pressed for an order, in so far as seeking inclusion of their name for allotment of students for B.Ed course, enabling the candidates to exercise an option to the petitioner college. The principal of the petitioner

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

college file application for continuation of affiliation for the year 2013-14. In the mean time, the recognition of the petitioner college was withdrawn by the NCTE as per Ext.P11 order. The petitioner filed an appeal against Ext.P11 order before the Appellate Authority constituted under Section 18 of the NCTE Act .Copy of the order passed by the Appellate authority is produced as Ext P14.

2. The Appellate authority remanded the matter especially finding violation of principles of natural justice and the earlier having been issued without Show Cause Notice being served on the petitioner. The matter is said to be pending before the NCTE Regional Branch and the NCTE has issued Ext.P18 order after remand. The NCTE, after remand will only be after notification of the new regulations and hence, advised the Southern Regional Officer regarding the modalities to be resorted for completing the process and not to allow admission at this stage .

3. When a withdrawal of recognition has been challenged in appeal and the same has been remanded, it cannot be said that the withdrawal continues unless a fresh consideration is made on the basis of existing regulations or on the basis of the new regulations. The authority cannot keep the petitioner and the students in limbo and continue operation of withdrawal, on the ground that new regulations are to be framed. Remand having been made, withdrawal is no more applicable and hence the petitioner's recognition would continue unless withdrawal after due service of notice No Show Cause Notice has also been issued to the petitioner till date. In such circumstances, the 2nd respondent shall allot students to the petitioner including the name of the college in the list and allot students from the list prepared by the 2nd respondent.

The University has submitted another Court order dated 03.09.2014 in **W.P.No. 21785 of 2014** which is as under:-

"The learned counsel for the petitioner presses for an interim order. The interim relief sought for as follows:

Pass an order staying the operation of the condition contained inExt.P.15 to obtain explicit order for making admission and further directing the petitioner not to make admission for the academic year 2014-15., pending disposal of the writ petition"

2. Despite impleading NCTE in the party array as per order dated 29.08.2014 in I.A No. 11703 of 2014 and in spite of the appearance made on last occasion, there is no representation when the case is taken up today .The learned counsel for the petitioner points out, withdrawal of recognition by the additional 2nd respondent as per Ext.P11 is no longer in existence, as the same has been intercepted by the appellate authority vide Ext .P14.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

directing the competent authority to issue a proper Show Cause Notice and to proceed with further steps. No such notice has ever been issued to the petitioner so far, submits the learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. *Since the factual position as on date is not brought to the notice of this Court by the additional 2nd respondent, there will be an interim order as prayed for. In so far as the recognition of the petitioner (originally ordered as per Ext.P1) continues by virtue of Ext P14 passed by the appellate authority. However, admission of students, if any, shall be at the sole risk of the petitioner and the concerned students shall be informed as to the pendency of the proceedings before this Court.*

Post after vacation for filing counter affidavit, if any."

The SRC, in its 301st meeting held during 5th to 6th February, 2016 noted the matter.

On 26.05.2015, the institution submitted a request to consider the Show Cause Notice Reply submitted by the institution as under :-

> ***"I have submitted the detailed explanation for the reference cited above on 21.10.2015.I have not received any further communication in this regard from your office. I humbly request you to be kind enough to issue recognition orders for the academic year 2015-17 A copy of the Show Cause Notice is enclosed."***

On 16.06.2016, the institution submitted another reply to the Show Cause Notice.

The SRC in its 318th meeting held on 08th & 09th August, 2016 considered the matter and decided to issue Show cause Notice under Act for the following deficiencies:-

- **All other formalities relating to shifting have been completed albeit belatedly. Only, submission of a Faculty list in the prescribed format and approved by the competent authority is required.**
- **Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.**
- **Put up after 2 months.**

As per the decision of the SRC, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 27.09.2016.

The institution has filed W.P No 36495 of 2016. In the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. Accordingly, brief of the case was sent to the advocate.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

On 23.11.2016, a letter dated 22.11.2016 was received from advocate Shri.V.M.Kurian regarding the W.P.(C) No. 36495 of 2016 in the High Court of Kerala filed by Rajeev Memorial Charitable Society mattannur, Kannur stating as under :-

The subject writ petition is filed by Rajeev Memorial Charitable Society, Mattannur, Kannur seeking direction to the University for conduct of B.Ed Course in the college. The University is not permitting conduct of course on the ground that the college does not have recognition from NCTE. The Hon'ble Court has directed us to find out as to whether the College is recognized by NCTE or not. Please furnish instructions immediately. The case is posted tomorrow (23.11.2016)

On 03.12.2016, a letter dated 25.11.2016 was received from Kannur University, Thavakkar, Civil Station P.O, Kannur stating as under :-

"Please recall the office letter cited as I st above. It has been informed that through Rajeev memorial College of Teacher Education, Mattanur, Kannur affiliated to this University, the same is not seen included in the list of colleges for which recognition have been granted by your institution for the academic year 2015-16.

As per the judgment in WPC No 25181/14 (w) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, students were allotted to the college for 2014-15 However, the College has admitted students for 2015-17 batch also.

I am therefore to request you to look into the matter urgently and intimate the position".

On 08.12.2016, a letter dated 02.12.2016 was received from advocate Shri.V.M.Kurian regarding the W.P.(C) No. 36495 of 2016 in the High Court of Kerala filed by Rajeev Memorial Charitable Society, Kannur stating as under :-

1. ***Petitioner has approached this Court inter alia seeking for a direction to the University to publish the results of the First Semester Examination to the Course of B.Ed undertaken by the student of the college for the academic year 2015-16 and to permit those students to appear for the 3rd Semester practical Examination notified in terms of Ext.P13 and further to permit the students admitted during the academic year 2016-17 to appear for the First Semester B.Ed Degree Examination, November, 2016.***

2. ***The short facts involved in the writ petition would disclose that the***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

petitioner Society is running a B.Ed College. They had recognition from the National Council

for Teacher Education (NCTE) for conducting the said course of one year duration with annual intake of 100 student. Ext.P1 is the NCTE order dated 07.12.2007. Affiliation also granted by the University as per notification dated 08.10.2010, Ext.P3. thereafter the petitioner applied for continuation of affiliation for the year 2013-14, which was granted as per University notification dated 24.08.2013. in the meantime, NCTE issued order dated 26.08.2013 withdrawing the recognition granted to the College for the academic session 2013-14. Petitioner challenged the same before the appellate authority. Which consider the matter and remitted the matter back to the NCTE for fresh consideration. In the meantime, when the University did not permit allotment of student for the academic year 2013-14, writ petition was filed as WP(C) No.25181/14 in which this Court observed that in so far as the matter in now pending before the NCTE, recognition continues unless a fresh consideration is made by the NCTE. In said circumstances, direction was issued to allot student for the academic year 2013-14. It is submitted by the petitioners that pursuant to the appellate order, Ex.P12 Show Cause Notice dated 27.09.2016 was issued by the NCTE in which the petitioner had filed a reply and the matter is now pending before the NCTE. In the meantime, result of the semesters in the various academic years are not being published and the students are not permitted to write the examination. It is at this stage that this writ petition is filed.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the NCTE submits that an enquiry into the Show Cause Notice is still pending consideration. So far no order had been passed in the matter learned counsel appearing for the University submits that the order in WP (C) No.25181/14 was with respect to the allotment of students during the academic year 2013-14. It is submitted that after the said academic year. There is no recognition for admitting students or for allotment of students in the said College According to them, the entire admission of the students after the academic year 2013-14 is without recognition and therefore the students of the petitioner are not entitled to have the results declared or to write the semester examinations.

4. But. It is relevant to note that when in the appellate order, the order withdrawing the recognition had been set aside and the matter was directed to be considered afresh. It has to be assumed that the recognition is still in force. Learned counsel for the NCTE also submits that as matters stand now, there is recognition for conducting the B.Ed

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

course However, the same will be subject to further orders to be passed after conducting enquiry into the Show Cause Notice issued by the NCTE. Having regard to the aforesaid factual situation, I am of the view that there is no reason to detain the students by withholding the result and not permitting them to write the examination until a final decision is taken by NCTE in the matter.

Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of as under:-

a) The University shall declare the result of the examination undertaken by the student of the petitioner.

b) It shall also permit the students to write the examination in the various academic years subject of course to the final decision to be taken by the NCTE in this regard.

The institution has submitted its representation on 19.12.2016 along with appointment order of the principal.

The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th to 05th January, 2017 the committee consider the matter and decided as under:-

1. This is a case in which RPRO should have issued. It did not happen. We cannot issue RPRO at this stage. We have to finally decide the issue of recognition under the 2014 Regulations. The Court order has taken care of the interim periods.

1.1 Ask the institution to submit the faculty list by 31.1.2017.

1.2 Write to the University to speed up their decision. Clarify to them the position regarding our recognition.

2. We can consider issue of recognition once the faculty list is received.

As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution and the Registrar of Kannur University on 18.01.2017.

The institution has submitted representation on 27.01.2017 & 30.01.2017 regarding request you to extend the time to submit the faculty list.

The institution has submitted representation on 13.03.2017 and stating as under:-

"As per the reference cited above, I am here with submitting the faculty list of Rajeev Memorial college of Teacher Education Thillenkri Po, Mattannur Via 670702.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

I humbly request you to be good enough to grant me the revised recognition order at the earliest".

The SRC, in its 335th meeting held on 11th to 12th April, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. **We had withdrawn recognition. It was revived by the Court order. But, that was only for one year i.e., 2014-15. They have continued that facility irregularly without obtaining any extension from the Court.**
2. **They have not cared to comply with our order for submission of the approved faculty list. Delay in this will only give them undue benefit.**
3. **Give them an ultimation to submit the latest approved Faculty list by 26.4.2017.**
4. **Put up on 1.5.17.**
5. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

As per the decision of the SRC, a Show cause Notice was issued to the institution on 21.04.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 25.04.2017 & 28.04.2017.

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

1. **The Faculty list is not in the prescribed format.**
2. **The Faculty list is in regional language. English version not submitted.**
3. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

Accordingly, As per the decision of the SRC, a Show cause Notice was issued to the institution on 09.05.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 11.05.2017 and 16.05.2017.

The institution has submitted representation on 22.05.2017 along with English version of the faculty list 2015-16.

The SRC in its 340th meeting held on 08th to 09th June, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decide as under:-

1. **The revised list is still not in full conformity with the prescribed NCTE format. Pl. ask them to give it in our format with approval by the Registrar in every page. Send a blank form as model.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

2. **For B.Ed.(2 units) they should have 1+9 Faculty; they have proposed only 1+7.**

3. **Principal has the required qualification and experience.**

4. **There is no Asst. Prof. to teach Perspective subjects. There should be 2.**

5. **In Pedagogy Group there is no Asst. Prof. for Mathematics and Regional Language. They should appoint.**

6. **One Asst. Prof. each in Phy.Ed., Fine Arts & Perf. Arts are required.**

7. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, a Show cause Notice was issued to the institution on 16.06.2017 along with faculty list format.

Faculty list format (Annexure-III) was sent to the institution through email on 19.06.2017.
An email was sent to advocate Shri.V.M. Kurian on 19.06.2017 and advocate K.T.Thomas on 21.06.2017 along with the Show cause Notice.

A letter dated 14.06.2017 received by this office on 16.06.2017 regarding W.P.(C) No.19596 of 2017- High Court of Kerala- Rajeev Memorial Charitable Society, requested to send the statement of facts as early as possible to prepare the statement and file. Copy of the writ petition is enclosed herewith.

A letter was addressed to the advocate Shri V.M.Kurian on 29.06.2017 along with the Brief of the case.

As directed by RD, Under secretary discussed with the Chairman, SRC over phone on 19.06.2017 The deficiency point regard to in respect of APS05561 B.Ed (2 units) decided during the 340th meeting of SRC.

Chairman SRC decided to correct the information in Pt 2 of the decision to read as

> **"For B.Ed (2 units) they should have 1+15 faculty; They have only 1+7" and Pt 4 should read a "There is no Asst. Prof. to teach Perspective Subjects. There should be 4".**

As the unit is for 2, he has directed to correct the numbers. Also he has instructed to send the SCN and not to wait till next meeting.

The tele conversation with chairman, SRC informed to RD, SRC-NCTE over phone on 19.06.2017. He has directed to send the SCN on 19.06.2017 to the institute with the signature of the Under Secretary.

The SRC in its 342nd meeting held on 05th to 06th July, 2017 the committee

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

considered the matter and decide as under:-

- **The action taken by the SRO, in consultation with the Chairman(SRC) over telephone us ratified.**

An email was received from the Advocate Shri V.M Kurian on 05.07.2017 and Hard copy received on 07.07.2017 regarding W.P (C) No.19596 of 2017 High court of Kerala filed by Rajeev Memorial Charitable Society and state as under:-

"The above writ petition came up for hearing today. The Hon'ble Court disposed the matter directing SRC, NCTE to consider the explanation submitted by petitioner to the SCN dated 16.06.2017 within 2 weeks and to pass final orders thereon. Certified copy of judgment will be sent on receipt".

A court Judgment dated 03.07.2017 received by this office on 14.07.2017 from the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in W.P.(C) No. 19596 of 2017.

The concluding paras of the Judgment are as under:

"This writ petition is filed by the petitioner, a Charitable Society, complaining that now the 2nd respondent University has issued Ext.P16 notification scheduling allotment of students to the B.Ed. course in various colleges affiliated to it, however, the petitioner's college is excluded on the ground that it does not have affiliation. Material facts for the disposal of the writ petition are as follows:

2. ***Recognition was granted by the 1st respondent to the college vide Ext.P1 order dated 07.12.2007 to conduct B.Ed. course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students. The said course was converted into a two year course by the 1st respondent with effect from the academic year 2015-16 onwards. Thereafter, as per Ext.P2, 2nd respondent made the provisional affiliation absolute. However, despite granting regular affiliation, University continued with its earlier practice of granting "continuation of provisional affiliation" and the petitioner was required to remit the annual administration fee as well as the affiliation fee, evident from Ext.P3. According to the petitioner, the said directives were complied with. Likewise, the demands raised for the successive years were also complied with by the petitioner. As per Ext.P4 dated 24.08.2013, University granted permission to shift the college to its permanent building at Thillenkeri.***

3. ***Matters being so, 1st respondent issued Ext.P5 order, withdrawing the recognition granted to the college. Accordingly, as per Ext.P6 order dated 05.02.2014, the Syndicate of the University decided to dis-affiliate the college. Ext.P5 order passed by the 1st respondent was challenged***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

before the National Council for Teacher Education, New Delhi, and the order passed by the Regional Director was set aside as per Ext.P7 order dated 25.02.2014. Thereupon, the University granted affiliation for the academic year 2013-14, evident from Ext.P8, however, with a rider not to effect any further admissions till explicit orders in this regard are given by the University. Ext.P8 order was challenged before this Court and as per Ext.P9 interim order dated 03.09.2014, this Court permitted the petitioner to admit students. However, the Southern Regional Committee of the National Council by Ext.P10 communication dated 18.09.2014 required the 2nd respondent not to allow admissions of students to the college without prior approval. Ext.P10 order was challenged before this Court and vide Ext.P11 order dated 14.10.2014, permitted allotment of students to the college for the academic year 2014-15.

4. Meanwhile, NCTE issued Ext.P12 show cause notice dated 27.09.2016, notifying a defect to be cured by the petitioner in respect of submission of a faculty list in the prescribed format as approved by the competent authority. According to the petitioner, the faculty list was produced. The students admitted pursuant to Ext.P11 during the academic year 2014-15 passed out from the college. Since the duration of the course having been extended to two years, the students had to complete the course during the academic year 2016-17. They participated in their examination for the second year, however, the results of these students for the 1st Semester examinations were not declared. In the said commotion, the University refused to permit the students to appear for third semester practical examinations as well as the first semester B.Ed degree examinations. Thereupon, petitioner filed W.P.(C) No.36495 of 2016 before this Court, and as per Ext.P13 judgment, the University was directed to declare the results of the examination undertaken by the students and further to permit the students to write the examinations of various years subject to final decision to be taken by the NCTE.

5. However, again, as per Ext.P14 show cause notice dated 09.05.2017, NCTE directed the petitioner to rectify the defects and submit the faculty list in the prescribed format. According to the petitioner, as per Ext.P15 covering letter, the faculty list was submitted. While so, 2nd respondent vide Ext.P16 notification dated 29.05.2017, invited applications for admission to B.Ed. course in the colleges affiliated to it.

   However, the petitioner college was excluded, and it is thus challenging the said action of the 2nd respondent University, this writ petition is filed.

6. First respondent has filed a detailed counter affidavit, refuting the allegations and claims and demands raised by the petitioner. Among other contentions, it is stated that as per Ext.R1(a) dated 16.06.2017,

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

petitioner was directed to show cause providing opportunity to make written representation along with necessary certificates or documents in order to take a final decision in the matter including withdrawal of recognition, within 21 days in respect of the following matters enumerated:

1. The revised list is still not in full conformity with the prescribed NCTE format. Pl. ask them to give it in our format with approval by the Registrar in every page. Send a blank form as model.

2. For B.Ed. (2 units) they should have 1+15 Faculty; they have proposed only 1+7.

3. Principal has the required qualification and experience.

4. There is no Asst. Prof. to teach Perspective subjects. There should be 4.

5. In Pedagogy Group there is no Asst. Prof. for Mathematics and Regional Language. They should appoint.

6. One Asst. Prof. each in Phy.Ed., Fine Arts & Pert. Arts are required.

7. Issue SCN accordingly."

7. Therefore, according to the 1st respondent, the irregularities noted are serious in nature, and without being the same rectified, the continuance of recognition cannot be permitted. Learned counsel appearing for the University submitted that if the recognition is continued by the 1st respondent, the 2nd respondent will consider the continuance of affiliation of the petitioner college.

8. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the 1st and 2nd respondents. Perused the documents on record and the pleadings put forth by the respective parties.

9. The fact discussion made above would make it clear that several irregularities are noted by the 1st respondent as enumerated above. Since a show cause notice, Ext.R1(a), is issued, it is for the petitioner to satisfy the said requirements as are required there under. Even though petitioner has a case that petitioner is entitled to continue with the admission process consequent to the observations made in Exts.P11 and P13 judgments, I am of the considered opinion that the fact situation differs from the facts and circumstances considered by this

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

court in the earlier judgments, since the petitioner is served with Ext.R1(a) notice.

10. In that view of the matter, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner has to rectify the defects enumerated in Ext.R1(a) and submit appropriate reply to the show cause notice in accordance with law, enabling the 1st respondent to consider the issue. Therefore, the 1st respondent is directed to take into account the reply proposed to be submitted by the petitioner to the said show cause notice, and attain finality to the same within two weeks from the date of receipt of reply from the petitioner. If the petitioner is able to secure necessary orders from the 1st respondent, the 2nd respondent shall consider the continuance of the affiliation and permit the petitioner to go ahead with the admissions for the ensuing academic year, at the earliest possible time.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

The institution has submitted (in its 340th meeting) Show cause Notice reply on 24.07.2017 and stating as under:-

Sl. No	Deficiency Pointed out in the SCN	Reply of the institution	Details of the documents
1	The revised list is still not in full conformity with the prescribed NCTE format. Pl. ask them to give it in our format with approval by the Registrar in every page. Send a blank form as model.	*"As per the Ref. cited No.1 the staff Profile of 2015-16 (7+1) is duly attested by the Registrar Kannur University is submitting for the Verification during the Academic year 2015-17 (2 year B.Ed) The Faculty in respect of Phy. Edn, Fine Arts and Performing Arts were appointed on Part-Time basis during 2015-16.*	• The institution has submitted the revised faculty list in the prescribed NCTE format, Copy of the Faculty list approved by the Registrar Kannur University, Kannur. • The institution has appointed
2	For B.Ed.(2 units) they should have 1+9 Faculty; they have proposed only 1+7		
3	Principal has the required qualification and experience.		

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

4	There is no Asst. Prof. to teach Perspective subjects. There should be 4.	*There was only 15+15=30 student to the Kannur University at that time.*	three Assistant Professor
5	In Pedagogy Group there is no Asst. Prof. for Mathematics and Regional Language. They should appoint.	*But now as per the direction of NCTE we have appointed One Asst. Professor each in Phy. Edn, Fine Arts and perfect Arts on*	1) Shri. Namitha Krishnan Asst.Prof in performing Arts,
6	One Asst. Prof. each in Phy.Ed., Fine Arts & Perf. Arts are required.		2) Shri. Chethanvyas Asst. Prof in

te :- a letter dated 25.07.2017 received by this office on 28.07.2017 from the institution and stating as under:-

"We have only one unit from 2015-16, 2016-17 onwards. This matter was intimated to the Kannur university but could not intimate to SRC Bangalore. Now, I request you to sanction only one unit with retrospective effect from 2015 academic year onwards.

I am enclosing herewith the following documents in support of one unit.

1. ***The request made to Registrar Kannur University.***
2. ***Annual report 2016 Kannur University.***
3. ***The names of students admitted in 2016-18 in our College.***
4. ***Order of Kannur University dated 25.03.2017***

II. Regarding 340th minutes of Sl. No. 4 Two Asst. Professors to teach perspective subject was already appointed and included in the 7 +1 Staff profile. Serial No. 6, SAPNA.K and Sl. No. 7, SIMINA K, were the 2 Asst. Professors. They have required qualification as per the Gazette of India - extra ordinary part III, Sec. 4. The required qualification to teach perspectives in education is P.G. Degree in Social Science and M.Ed with 55% of marks. They have P.G Degree in M.A. history, both are Social Science Teachers, so the first condition is already fulfilled.

This is purely an unaided institution started in 2007 unless you grant us Revised recognition order we have no other way but to close the institution. More than 18000 sq.ft building with all facilities are available in the 5.3 acres of land in the College. There are 17 staff working in the College from 2007 onwards".

Remarks :-

- **The institution has submitted the revised faculty list in the prescribed**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

NCTE format, Copy of the Faculty list approved by the Registrar Kannur University, Kannur.

- The institution has appointed three Assistant Professor

  1) Shri. Namitha Krishnan Asst.Prof in performing Arts,
  2) Shri. Chethanvyas Asst. Prof in Fine Arts and
  3) George Thomas Asst Prof Physical Education.

- The institution has submitted Staff Affidavits.

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

1. The Court order is noted.

2.1 The NCTE Regulations prescribe time-limits for rectification of deficiencies.

2.2 But, in this case, the SCN was issued in compliance of a Court order. The replies of the applicant are, therefore, admitted for substantive consideration of 'removal of deficiencies'.

3. The Faculty list is approved. But, the 3 members: Asst. Prof.(Perf. Arts); Asst. Prof.(Fine Arts); and, Asst. Prof.(Phy.Ed.) have been included without approval.

3.1 All 4 positions in Perspectives are vacant. But, one Asst. Prof. in Pedagogy is eligible to be shown under Perspectives.

3.2 Under Pedagogy 8 Asst. Profs. are required. But, out of them 3 are deficient: There is no Asst. Prof.(Maths); there is no Asst. Prof.(Regional Lang.); and, the Asst. Prof.(Pol. Sc.) has got less than 55% in his P.G.(Soc. Sc.) course.

3.3 One Asst. Prof. is qualified in Commerce which is not a recognized school subject. He is, therefore, not qualified to be a Faculty in the Pedagogy group of this programme.

4. In the result, and for the reasons given above, their reply is held to be unsatisfactory. And, accordingly, their application is rejected. And, the recognition granted by us for their B.Ed.(2 units) programme is withdrawn w.e.f. 2017-18.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		5.1 Students in the 2nd year will, however, be allowed to complete their course in 2017-18. **5.2 There will be no new admissions in 2017-18.** **6. In view of this development, there is no need to consider their request for reduction from 2 units to 1 unit.** **7. Inform the affiliating University accordingly also.**
4.	APS05944 B.Ed 2 Units Prathibha College of Education, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh	**Prathibha College of Education, Sy.No.123/1, 123/2, 123/3, NadimTiruvuru Village & Mandal, Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh** has made an application on 02.01.2006 for B.Ed course to SRC, NCTE Bangalore. 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. 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. The matter was placed before SRC in its 150th meeting held on 28th-29th December 2007. The SRC after careful consideration of all aspects decided to conduct the inspection of the institution under Section 17. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.04.2008 and the report was received. The report was considered by SRC in its 161st meeting held on 6-7 August 2008 and upon consideration of all aspects it was decided to issue show cause notice. 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 166th meeting held on 18-19 October 2008. 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. **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.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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 PanchayathThiruvur, 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.***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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 24.07.205 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 292nd Meeting held on 29th-30th September, 2015 considered the matter and it was decided as under:

1. **Comply with the Court order.**
2. **Collect fees as per new Regulations.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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".***

Note:

- **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.**

Now, 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 are processed as under:

Details of Land Documents:	**Photocopy Submitted**
Registered certified copy of the Land documents: Submitted / Not submitted (whether in English or Regional language) (whether certified/notarized English translation submitted)	Photocopy Submitted in Regional Language
Date of registration of land	a) 26.05.2001 b) 11.05.2002
Land registered in the name of	a) Prathibha Educational Society b) Individual Name
Type of title deed i.e. sale deed/lease deed (Govt. /Pvt.)/gift deed	Sale Deed
Survey No/ Plot No/ Khasara No.	a) 123/3 b) 123/1, 2, 3
Extent of land in each Sy. No./ Plot No./ Khasara No.	a) 1624.60 Sq.mts b) 974.82 Sq.mts
AFFIDAVIT:-	**Not Submitted**
Sy.No	
Location	

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Land is on own/lease basis	
Built up area	
Extent	
Notarized copy of Land Use Certificate submitted /Not submitted	**Photocopy Submitted**
Name of the Society/ Trust/ Institution	Prathibha Educational Society
Survey/Plot/Khasara No. and location	123/1, 123/2, 123/3 at Tiruvuru Village
Extent of diverted land	2599.42 Sq.mts
Purpose of diversion	Educational Purpose
Date of issue	29.06.2017
Name and designation of approving authority	Tahsildar
Notarized copy of Encumbrance Certificate submitted/ Not submitted	**Photocopy Submitted**
Name of the Society/Trust/Institution	Prathibha Educational Society
Survey/Plot/Khasara Nos. and location	123/1, 123/2, 123/3 at Nadim Tiruvuru Village
Search for the period	01.01.2016 to 11.06.2017
Extent of land	11658
Any mortgage as per EC	Nil
Date of issue	12.06.2017
Name and designation of issuing authority	Joint Sub Registrar
Blue print/Notarized copy of Building Plan submitted/ Not submitted :-	Photocopy Submitted
Name and address of Society/Trust/Institution	Not Mentioned 123/1, 123/2, 123/3, Nadim Tiruvuru Village, Tiruvuru Mandalam, Krishna District
Whether Building Plan is for the proposed institution/ course or also for some other TEI/course	B.Ed
Plot area/land area	1137.28 sq.mts
Total built-up area	GF - 513.73 Sq.mts FF – 513.73 Sq.mts SF – 513.73 Sq.mts **Total – 1541.19 Sq.mts**
Built up area for the proposed and existing teacher education courses	Mentioned

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Date of approval	15.06.2006
Name and designation of approving authority	Panchayat Secretary
Notarized copy of the Building Completion Certificate submitted /not submitted	**Photocopy Submitted**
Name and address of Society / Trust / Institution	Prathibha Educational Society, Kalluru
Survey/Plot/ Khasara Nos. and location	123/1, 123/2, 123/3 at Tiruvuru Village
Total Built up area for the proposed course and/or for existing course	GF – 513.73 Sq.mts FF – 513.73 Sq.mts SF – 513.73 Sq.mts **Total – 1541.19 Sq.mts**
Type of Roofing	RCC
Purpose for which building is being used/proposed to be used	College of Education
Date of issue	16.06.2017
Name and designation of approving authority	S.Venkateswara Rao, Assistant Engineer
Fees Paid	**Not Submitted**
Faulty List	Submitted
Faculty list approved/not approved	Approved
Whether approved on each page or not	No
No. of faculty as per norms of the course	1+7
Designation of the approving authority	Registrar
Date of approval	02.05.2016

FDR's Details		
	5.00 Lakhs Endowment Fund	**7.00 Lakhs Reserve Fund**
Submitted in Original	Submitted	Submitted
FDR/ Ac number	3167176	3167175
Name of the Bank	Saptagiri Grameena Bank	Saptagiri Grameena Bank
Whether in Single or Joint A/c	Joint A/c	Joint A/c
Duration of FDR	5 Years	5 Years
Date of Issue	09.06.2017	09.06.2017
Date of Maturity	09.06.2022	09.06.2022

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Remarks:

- Land Document submitted in regional language is in individual name for the Sy.no. 123/1, 2 ,3.
- The institution has not submitted Land documents in Notarised English Version.
- The institution has not submitted Affidavit and Fees as per New Regulations.
- The Faculty list contains 8 members.

The Committee considered the above court 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

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		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.**
5.	SRCAPP1090 D.El.Ed 1 Unit Sri Dhanalakshmi, West Godavari, Andhra Pradesh	**Sri Dhanalakshmi Educational Society, Plot No. 7-26-20/9, TTD, Kalyanamandapam Road, Tadepalligudem Village and Post Office, West Godavari District-534101, Andhra Pradesh** has applied for grant of recognition to **Sri Dhanalakshmi, Plot No. 7-26-20/9, TTD Road-1, Tadepalligudem Village, & Post, West Godavari District-534101, Andhra Pradesh** for **D.El.Ed** course online on 29/09/2011 for two years duration under section 14(1) of the NCTE Act. 1993 and the hard copy received on 13/10/2011. The recognition was granted to the institution on 07.11.2013. Further, it is stated that, in the light of Supreme Court order, we cannot give recognition for 2013-14 after 3rd March, 2013 and defend the case specifically, citing the NCTE regulations and the Supreme Court order about strict enforcement of norms/standards. Meantime, two court notices received from the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad on 22.01.2014 & 03.02.2014 in W.P.M.P. No. 48469 of 2013 W.P.No. 39012 of 2013 and W.P.No. 39012 of 2013 directed to appear before court in personally or by counsel on 10.02.2014 at 10.30 a.m. A letter received from NCTE-Hqrs on 11.02.2014 regarding W.P.No. 39012/2013 requested to defend the case including on behalf of NCTE (HQ) and to furnish full facts of the case by return fax. Accordingly, a letter was sent to the advocate Shri. K. Ramakanth Reddy alongwith brief of the case on 28.01.2014. An e-mail letter received from advocate on 24.09.2014. Accordingly, a letter was issued to the advocate along with brief of the case on 08.10.2014. An e-mail letter received from advocate on 16.10.2014 in W.P.No. 39012 of 2013. Accordingly, a letter was sent to the advocate on 03.02.2015. Again, another letter received from the NCTE-Hqrs along with copy of court notice in W.A.No. 1672 of 2014.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		Again an e-mail letter dated 28.07.2015 received from the Advocate Sri. Ramakanth Reddy regarding Vacate Petition in W.A. 1672 of 2014. NCTE-Hqrs forwarded a court order in W.A.Nos. 1672 and 1674 of 2014 in W.P. No. 1672 of 2014 received in this office of SRC-NCTE on 07.11.2015. The SRC in its 295th meeting held on 28th – 30th November & 1st December 2015, considered and Noted the matter. Now, a court order dated 17.04.2017 is received from the Hon'ble high court of judicature at Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh on 24.05.2017. It stated as under: *"Mr. Girimoji Rao submits that the cause in the writ petition is rendered infructuous.* *The statement is placed on record and the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. No order as to costs.* *Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed."* **The Committee considered the above court order and noted the matter.**
6.	AOSO0181 B.Ed 60 intake Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachara Sabha B.Ed College, Ernakulam, Kerala	**Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachara Sabha B.Ed College, Chittoor Road, Ernakulam-681016, Kerala** submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition for starting **B.Ed course** of one year duration from the academic session **2001-2002** with an annual intake of **60** students and was granted recognition on **31.10.2001**. The institution has submitted Performance appraisal report on 21.03.2002. The SRC in its 49th meeting held on 26th to 27th June, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided to **Serve Notice prior to withdrawal of recognition under section 17 of the NCTE Act for not maintaining the minimum staff requirement of 1+7 as per NCTE norms.** Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, notice was issued to the institution on 12.07.2002. The institution has submitted reply on 25.07.2002. A letter dated 08.08.2002 received by this office on 12.08.2002 regarding Renewal of recognition for the B.Ed course run by DBHPS, B.Ed College Ambadimala, Ernakulam for the academic year 2002-2003. A letter was issued to the institution on 04.09.2002 regarding Performance

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		appraisal report. The SRC in its 51st meeting held on 28th August, 2002 the committee considered the matter and decided that **clarification be sought from the institution regarding qualification of teachers.** A letter dated 20.09.2002 received by this office on 23.09.2002 regarding renewal of recognition for the B.Ed course run by DBHPS B.Ed college, Ambadimala, Ernakulam, Kerala for the year 2002-2003. Clarification received from the institution placed before SRC its decision from the institution was placed before SRC in its 52nd meeting held on 9th October, 2002 and the committee considered the matter and decided to Clarification regarding English teaching method in the Hindi B.Ed Programme should also be sought. A letter was issued to the institution on 18.10.2002 seeking Review of Performance Appraisal Report for the year 2001-2002. Performance Appraisal Report was received by this office on 06.11.2002. The SRC in its 53th meeting held on 28th November, 2002 the committee considered the written representation and decided that an intake of 60 be approved to the institution with the condition that persons who do not have PG in Hindi should acquire the same within a period of two years. A letter was issued to the institution on 05.12.2002 seeking Review of Performance Appraisal Report. The institution has submitted representation on 10.12.2002 regarding Functioning of B.Ed Colleges at Ernakulam and Nileshwara in our own Building & regarding Deposit of Endowment fund. The institution has submitted Performance Appraisal report for the academic year 2002-2003 on 20.01.2003. The SRC in its 61st meeting held on 6th June 2003 the committee considered the matter and decided that **Based on the undertaking submitted by DBHPS to NCTE –HQ SRC decided to sanction the existing intake.** A letter was issued to the institution on 27.06.2003 seeking Review of Performance Appraisal Report for the B.Ed course. The court notice was received by this office on 21.03.2012 from the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in W.P.No. 6066 of 2012 filled by Smt. Mary Meena C.J. A letter was addressed to the Advocate Shri.V.M Kurian on 17.04.2012 along

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

with copy of the writ petition.

A court Judgment dated 20.12.2010 received by this office on 22.05.2012 from the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in W.P(C).No. 37615 of 2010.

The concluding paras of the Judgment are as under:

"The petitioner was working as a leave substitute Junior Language Teacher in Hindi in the place of the 5th respondent in the aided school managed by the 4th respondent. The 5th respondent cancelled the unavailed portion of leave and re-joined service. Thereafter the 5th respondent was promoted as HAS (Hindi). According to the petitioner, the 5th respondent is not eligible to be promoted as HAS, whereas the petitioner is. Therefore the petitioner has filed Ext.P7 revision petition before the 1st respondent. The petitioner seeks a direction to the 1st respondent to consider and pass orders on Ext.P7 as expeditiously as possible.

Having heard the learned Government Pleader also I dispose of this writ petition with a direction to the 1st respondent to consider and pass orders on Ext.P7 as expeditiously as possible, at any rate within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this Judgment, after affording an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner and respondents 4 & 5.

The petitioner shall forward a copy of the writ petition along with a certified copy of this Judgment to the 1st respondent for compliance".

On 13.04.2015 Court notice was received by this office on 20.04.2015 from the advocate, Shri.V.M.Kurien in W.P (C) No.11442 of 2015 filled by Mr.Shreenath Mameloo Yadav.

A letter was addressed to the Advocate Shri.V.M Kurian on 04.08.2015 enclosing brief of the case, Recognition order and State Government pay scales to the staff.

A court Judgment dated 29.03.2017 received by this office on 16.06.2017 from the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in W.P.No. 6066 of 2012(G).

The concluding paras of the Judgment are as under:

"The petitioner, a rival claimant to the post of HSA [Hindi] in SNM High School, Chazhoor, Thrissur, against the 4th respondent, is impugning Ext.P7 order, as per which the Secretary to Government has found that the qualification acquired by the 4th respondent is one that has been recognised by the Government of Kerala and that she is, therefore, entitled to be appointed as an HSA [Hindi]. The petitioner's case is that the

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

qualification of the 4th respondent is one that is not recognised, thus that she is not eligible to be appointed as an HSA [Hindi] and that a consequential vacancy should be offered to her. She has, therefore, filed this writ petition seeking several reliefs.

2. I have heard Smt.Sumathi Dandapani, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner, Sri. Harikumar, the learned counsel appearing for the 4th respondent and the learned Government pleader appearing for respondents 1 & 2.

3. The pivot of all the controversies in this case is the qualification of the 4th respondent. Admittedly, the 4th respondent has acquired the qualification of "Shiksha Visharad" awarded by the Hindi Sahithya Sammelan, Prayagh, Allahabad. As per G.O. (MS) No.88/98/Gen.Edn. Dated 17.03.1998, the Government of Kerala had ordered that the tile of Shiksha Visharad be recognised as an alternative training qualification for the appointment of Hindi teachers in aided Upper Primary/High Schools. The 4th respondent, who acquired this title, as is discernible from Ext.R4(a), applied to be appointed as a Junior Hindi Teacher and she was so appointed and approval granted to her. She was, thereafter, promoted as an HSA in Hindi and this was noticed by the petitioner, who claimed appointment to the said post in the School, challenging the promotion of the 4th respondent on the ground that she was not properly qualified. The petitioner has underpinned her case on Ext.P6 G.O. to assert that the 4th respondent is not qualified at all and that, therefore even her initial appointment is vitiated and bad in law.

4. Since the crux of the disputes revolve around on Ext.P6 G.O., I have examined the same quite in detail. The Government says in that order that the recognition given to Shiksha Visharad by Hindi Sahithya Sammelan, Prayagh, Aliehabad will stand withdrawn with effect from March, 2006 based on another Government Order to such effect dated 31.03.2008. As per that Government Order, the Government withdrew the recognition to this title only because the Hindi Sahithya Sammelan, Prayagh, Allahabad had informed the Government that they were conducting the course leading to this title only up to the 2005 batch. The stand of the Government, therefore, in Ext.P6 appears to quite in order.

5. However, in Ext.P6, the Government went one step ahead and also stated that the Shiksha Visharad title of Hindi Sahithya Sammelan, Prayagh, Allahabad acquired up to 2009 wilt be approved provided it was acquired from an NCTE approved Institution. The petitioner maintains that Ext.R4(a) Certificate, relied upon by the 4th respondent, is not one that was issued by an NCTE approved Institution, This contention now appears to be beyond reproach because even the NCTE has filed a statement before this Court today that the Institution, which had issued Ext.R4(a), is not one

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

that is recognised by them. Therefore, the question is whether Ext.R4(a) Certificate relied upon by the 4th respondent would have to be found irregular or unacceptable.

6. The various Government Orders in this issue would show ineluctably that the title of Shiksha Visharad was accepted as an alternate qualification at least until 2006. The various Government Orders, noticed by me as above, do not provide that such title have to be obtained from an NCTE approved Institution. That specific condition was introduced only in Ext,P6 Government Order, which was issued as late as in the year 2010, prescribing that only the title issued by those Institutions approved by the NCTE would be henceforth recognised. Obviously, Government Orders, being executive orders, can only operate perspectively. They cannot operate retrospectively to the detriment of any person, who had already obtained vested rights. Therefore, the only question that is now remaining is whether Ext.R4(a) is genuine or otherwise. I say this because in the Counter Affidavit filed by the Government, they say that even though they had asked several times to the Hindi Sahithya Samrnelan, Prayagh, Allahabad to clarify if Ext.R4(a) is a genuine Certificate or otherwise, they have received no information and on the contrary, that the letters issued to the Hindi Sahithya Sammelan, Prayagh, Allahabad have been returned without acceptance. It is in such scenario that the Government, thereafter, issued Ext.P8 order cancelling the appointment of the 4th respondent as an HSA [Hindi]. I notice from the said order that it has been issued, not because the petitioner's qualification is not acquired from an NCTE Institution, but solely on account that Ext.R4(a) Certificate has not been proved to be genuine or certified to be genuine by the Hindi Sahithya Sammelan, Prayagh, Allahabad. I do not require to go into a detailed consideration of this order, because I see that the petitioner has confined her challenge only to Ext.P7 in this case.

7. Ext.P7 order is one that is issued by the Government in the year 2011. The Government has said therein that, since the condition that the title of Shiksha Visharad obtained only from an NCTE approved Institution will henceforth be recognised, was made by the Government as per Ext.P6 only in the year 2010, it would not apply to the case of the 4th respondent. I cannot find this reasoning to be vitiated or how this could be found to be wrong. As I have already noticed above, Ext.P6 can operate only perspectively. This is more so, because until Ext.P6 order was issued, there is no doubt that Certificates like Ext.R4(a), even though acquired from an Institution not recognised by the NCTE, were being accepted by the Government of Kerala for employment in Government aided Schools. To that extent, I cannot find Ext.P7 to be vitiated or unsustainable in law. What is stated in Ext.P7 is only a restatement of the law that the conditions imposed in Ext.P6 order would only apply prospectively and not to the

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		detriment of persons, who were appointed prior to that. In such view of the matter, I have no hesitation in approving Ext.P7 holding that the rigor in Ext.P6 order would not apply to the 4th respondent, since she was appointed at least 7 years prior to Ext.P6 order was issued. *8. Coming back to the impact of Ext.P8 order is concerned, as I have already stated above, this is not something that has been raised in this writ petition directly, but only collaterally by the petitioner during the hearing. No relief has been sought for based on Ext.P8 order. So since I have found Ext.P7 to be in order, the consequential Ext.P8 order, which was issued not because the 4th respondent was not properly qualified, but because her qualifications were found not certified to be genuine, may not deserve to continue notwithstanding anything contained in this writ petition. I am, in fact, told by the learned counsel for the 4th respondent that proceedings have been initiated by his client against Ext.P8 order and that it is now pending before the hierarchy of Authorities. In such view of the matter, I do not think i required to say anything further on Ext.P8 order.* *In such circumstances, I dismiss this writ petition upholding the validity of Ext.P7, however reserving liberty to the petitioner to pursue every remedy available to her under Ext.P8 order or such consequential orders as may be available to her under the provisions of KER.* *This writ petition is thus ordered as above. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, I make no order as to costs and I direct the parties to suffer their respective costs".* Remarks:- • **In this case it is noticed that RPRO was not sent.** • **Recognition was granted to the institution on 31.10.2001 with an intake of 60 students for B.Ed course.** • **This writ petition filed by Junior Hindi Teacher is dismissed by the Hon'ble Court.** **The Committee considered the above court matter and noted the order of the Hon'ble Court.**
7.	SRCAPP1883 B.Ed	**Sarbar Educational Trust, Plot No.535, MaraiMalaiadigal Street, Kangeyanallore Village, Gandhinagar East Post Office, Vellore Taluk & District-632006, Tamilnadu** had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to **Kumaran College of**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

	2 Units Kumaran College of Education, Vellore, Tamilnadu	**Education, Plot/Khasara No.3091/13B2, Melmonavoor Village, Abdullapuram Post Office, Vellore Taluk & District-632010, Tamilnadu.** The recognition was granted to the institution on 21.02.2014. The institution has submitted affidavit as per regulations 2014. Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 17.03.2015. A complaint letter dated 07.07.2015 received from Shri K. Saravanan, 260, TajpuasalaiArcot, Vellore-632501, Tamilnadu on 10.07.2015 along with original affidavit and document. In the affidavit. The complaint received from the complaint was placed before SRC in its 292nd meeting held on 29th to 30th September, 2015. The SRC decided to **"Send the complaint to the TNTEU for comments."** In the meantime, a court notice in WP.No. 32707 of 2015 received from Honb'le High court of judicature at Madras on 24.10.2015. Accordingly, a letter along with brief of the case was sent to the advocate on 13.11.2015. As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the Registrar TNTEU on 17.11.2015 for their comments. Received comments from TNTEU on 27.11.2015. The reply was placed before SRC in its 297th meeting held on 27th to 28th December, 2015 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:- Obtain specific information on the following points: a. Sy.Nos involved. b. Area of the land in reference. c. Does it meet the requirement of the T.E.I. d. Is it clearly earmarked for the B.Ed programme. e. Does the Society / College have clear title to the land in reference. As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 20.01.2016. Another complaint was received from K. Saravanan on 13.01.2016 along with original affidavit enclosing some relevant documents. The matter was placed before SRC in its 299th meeting held on 20-21st January, 2015 and the committee considered the matter and decided that **1. The institution has to submit properly land details. Remind them.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

2. Forward a copy of the supplementary complaint to the Institution for comments.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 04.02.2016.

The institution has submitted a copy of the Court order dated 09.12.2015 in W.P.No.32707 of 2015 and M.P.No.1 of 2015 filed by Kumaran College of Education, Vellore on 19.01.2016. The court order stated as follows:

The petitioner, which is a Teacher Training Institute has come forward to file this writ petition challenging the order dated 15.07.2015, passed by the fourth respondent to show cause as to why appropriate action shall not be initiated based upon the prime-facie findings mentioned therein.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned counsel appearing for the respondents 1 to 4.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that anonymous complaints have been given by the fifth respondent to the respondents 1 and 2, who in turn directed the fourth respondent to look into the matter and take appropriate action. After considering the letter of the fifth respondent dated 07.07.2014, an order was passed by the first respondent on 28.10.2015 treating the complaint as closed and therefore, no further action is required in the matter.

4. The learned counsel for the respondents 1 & 2 submitted that after the letter dated 28.10.2015 another communication has been sent by the second respondent to the respondents 3 and 4 dated 12.11.2015 seeking comments about the said complaints.

5. The learned counsel for the respondents 3 and 4 submitted that prima-facie case is made out on the alleged irregularities. He submitted that the reply given by the petitioner would be considered in a proper perspective while passing the final order. He further submitted that particulars have been sought for by letter dated 08.10.2015 from the petitioner in respect of details of land and buildings under use for offering B.Ed Degree programme, apart from other documents pertaining to the Industrial Training Institute.

6. By way of reply, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that letter of the respondent dated 08.10.2015 has also been replied on

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

23.10.2015 along with the relevant documents.

7. Admittedly, the order impugned is only a show cause notice and the petitioner is stated to have given its reply. Thus, it is for the respondents 3 and 4 to take appropriate decision by considering the relevant materials. While doing so, the scope and applicability or the letter of the first respondent dated 28.10.2015 has to be taken into consideration by the respondents 3 and 4 and also, the communication of the second respondent dated 12.11.2015.

8. Accordingly, the respondents 3 and 4 are directed to pass appropriate orders after considering the above said correspondences and other relevant materials if any, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

9. The writ petition stands disposed of accordingly. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petition is also closed. No costs.

The SRC in its 301st meeting held on 05th -06th February, 2016 considered the court order and ***noted the matter (Since SRC-NCTE is proforma party).***

The institution has submitted its written representation on 17.03.2016 request the authority to ignore the complaints submitted from K. Saravanan.

The SRC in its 309th meeting held on 12th -14th April, 2016 considered the written representation and it has decided that ***"Please ask the institution to specifically reply to the queries raised in SRC letter dated 20.01.2016".***

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 20.05.2016.

Again (Shri K. Saravanan) has submitted complaint along with original affidavit of Rs.20- enclosing, a copy of EC, land document etc. The affidavit stating as follows:

".....Now I enclosed herewith an true copy of the sale deed No: 14882/2012, 14884/2012, parent sale deed No. 46/1996, copy of the encumbrance certificate as proof of fabricated sale deed of Kumaran College of Education. Here I came to mention the following deficiencies also you have to take in to the count to withdrawal of recognition of Kumaran College of Education from the academic year 2015-16.

1. In the true Copy of the sale deed No. 46/1996, page No. 2 row No: 1

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		to 6 says the sale deed executed on 15.03.1996 between 1) K. Thamilarasi, W/O, N. Krishnamoorthy residing at 3/316, maraimalai adigal street, Gandhinagar East, Katpadi Town Extension, Vellore District and 2) C. Arjunan, s/o CHINNAPPA (late) residing at Pillaiyar Koil street, Shenbakkam Village, Vellore District. Page No. 3 row no. 1 to 7 says C. Arjunan was sold his property to K. Thamilarasi Sy.No. 309/13 extent 0.11.1/4 cents (or) 4905 sq.ft) (or)455.68 sq.mts. So K. Thamilarasi purchased Sy.No. 309/13 extent 0.11.1/4 cents (or) 4905 sq.ft (or) 455.68 sq.mts only by means of sale deed 46/1996/ 2. *In the true copy of the sale deed No. 14882/2012 page no. 2, para 1 & 2 says sale deed executed on 13th day of December 2012 (13.12.2012) between 1) K. Thamilarasi,, W/O, N. Krishnamoorthy residing at 535, maraimalai adigal street, Gandhinagar East, Katpadi Taluk, Vellore District and 2) Sarabar Educational Trust represented by its founder and chairman K. Ezhil Mohan Raj S/o N. Krishnamoorthy residing at 535, maraimalai adigal street, Gandhinagar East, Katpadi Taluk, Vellore District in this deed page no. 5 Schedule of Property K. Thamilarasi was sold her entire property Sy.No. 309/13 extent 0.11.1/4 cents (or) 4905 sq.ft (or) 455.68 sq.mtr which she was purchased from C. Arjunan by a sale deed 46/1996. So she doesn't have single cent of land in her hand.* 3. *On the same day 13th day of December, 2012 (13.12.2012) one more sale deed No. 14884/2012, page No. 2, para 1 & 2 was executed between 1) K. Thamilarasi, W/O, N. Krishnamoorthy residing at. 535, maraimalai adigal street, Gandhinagar East, Katpadi Taluk, Vellore District and 2) Sarabar Educational Trust represented by its founder and chairman K. Ezhil Mohan Raj S/o N. Krishnamoorthy residing at 535, Maraimalai adigal street, Gandhinagar East, Katpadi Taluk, Vellore District, in this deed page no:8 Schedule of Property K. Thamilarasi was sold her property Sy.No. 309/13 extetn 0.21 (or) 9156 sq.ft (or) 850.61 sq.mts here she said in the same deed No. 14884/2012 page no. 4 para 2 she selling the property which purchased from C. Arjunan by sale deed dated 21.12.1995 registered as documents NO. 46/ 1996 of Book1, on 15.03.1996 in the office of the District registrar, Vellore. K. Thamilarasi was sold her entire property sy.no. 309/13 extent of 0.11.1/4 cents (or) 4905 sq.ft (or) 455.68 sq.mtr which she was purchased from C. Arjunan by a sale deed 46/ 1996. So she doesn't have single cent of land in her hand then how she can able to sale another 0.21 (or) 9156 sq.ft (or) 850.61 sq.mtr in the same Sy.No. 309/13 shown same sale deed 46/1996 as parent document.* 4. *Hence in view of the above its clearly states that sale deed No. 14884/2012 dated 13.12.2012 was fabricated one. If you want to clarity, you can write to the District Registrar, District Registrar Office, Veppamara Street, Velappadi, Vellore Dt-632004. He will tell*

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

you the truth about the sale deed.

5. *Here the management fails to fulfill the land requirement as per the NCTE regulation 2014 for Kumaran College of Education. So how can they able to show separate land for 1) Tamilga ITC, 2) Tamilaga Industrial School which is running in the same land and building.*
6. *The Kumaran College of Education and the tamilaga ITC institutes are publishing combined advertisement in the daily news papers to admit the students for this academic year 2016-17. So they accept themselves the both institutes are running in the same land and building. I request you don't allow the management to admit the students in Kumaran College of Education in to B.Ed degree program for this academic year 2016-17. Herewith I enclosed the advertisement new paper as proof.*
7. *I was sent a complaint petition on 19.05.2016 to 1) the District Collector, Vellore District Collector Office, Sathuvachari, Vellore-632009. 2) the District Registrar, District Register office, Veppamara Street, Velappadi, Vellore Dt.-632004 to verify the grounds of registered sale deed No. 14884/2012 and also I asked them take necessary action as per law. That petition is under processing with above two officers.*

The above said information is clearly stated that the management was cheated the NCTE and TNTEU to get approval to start new B.Ed degree program in the name of Kumaran College of Education. Hence I request you to stop the admission and withdraw the recognition of Kumaran College of Education from the academic year 2016-17.

The SRC in its 315th meeting held on 17th-18th June, 2016 the deferred the matter.

Meantime, in response to this office letter dated 20.05.2016 the institution has submitted its reply on 21.06.2016.

The Southern Regional Committee in its 320th Meeting held during 16th to 17th November, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-

- **Put up in the next meeting with allegation wise comments. As per the decision of SRC the reply submitted by the institution to the queries raised in SRC letter dated 20.05.2016.**

Note:

The main allegation of the complainant is about fulfillment of land requirement as per NCTE regulations 2014 as the institution is running Tamilga ITC and

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		Tamilaga Industrial school in the same land and building. As per the decision of 320th meeting allegation wise comments was placed before SRC in its 330th meeting held on 12th & 13th Februray, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:- **1. We are all busy with disposal of cases w.r.t the 03.03.2017 dateline.** **2. Put up in April 17.** As per the decision of SRC, the matter was placed before SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th to 12th April 2017 and decided as under: **1. Title is clear. Land area available 2521.44 sq.mts.** **2. LUC/EC.... Are in order.** **3. BP is approved. Built-up area shown is 3951.99 sq.mts.** **4.1 BCC is not approved by competent authority. Built-up area shown is 3932.09 sq.mts.** **4.2 Built-up area required for B.Ed.(2 units) is 2000 sq.mts.** **4.3 In other words, there is a surplus area of 1932 sq.mts.** **5.1 It is not possible to run 2 other colleges in 1932 sq.mts.** **5.2 In any case there is no coursewise earmarking of built-up area. Any overlapping arrangement introduced without approval cannot be recognized by us.** **5.3 The BP and BCC both show the entire built-up area to utilized for B.Ed.** **6.1 The Sale deed is dated 13.12.2012. The Sale Deeds clearly refer to the lands as vacant lands with no construction thereon.** **6.2 But the B.P. is dated 2006 i.e., 6 years prior to the registration of the Sale Deeds.** **7. Date of inspection for BCC is 21.12.2012. The inspection report shows date of completion of construction as 01.12.2007 i.e., 5 years prior to registration of Sale Deed. This contradicts the statements in the Sale Deed that the land was vacant(with no construction thereon) at the time of registration.** **8.1 Two inspection teams of TNTEU have confirmed that two other educational institutions are running at the same premises.** **8.2 The BP/BCC detials described above show that it is not practicable to run 2 other colleges at the same premises with only 1932 sq.mts. built-up area available.** **8.3 The applicant has not denied that they are running 2 other colleges at the same primises. Cleverly, they have stated that the Regulations do not prohibit other colleges running at the same premises.** **9. The position emerging from these enquiries clearly suggest that facts have been manipulated.** **10.1 Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly and ask them to explain the position with greater clarify.** **10.2 Put in May 17 after 3.5.17.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 20.04.2017.

Meantime, a draft counter affidavit received from the advocate Shri. Jaganathan in W.P.No.6700 of 2016 by e-mail on 11.04.2017, same was forwarded for modification and approval on 11.04.2017.

Approved of Counter Affidavit was received from NCTE-Hqrs on 25.04.2017 the same was forwarded to the advocate after attestation and signature.

Now the institution submitted SCN reply along with documents on 08.05.2017. The reply was placed before SRC in its 340th meeting held on 08th to 09th June, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. **The complainant (Sh. Saravanan) has given lots of details to support his allegation.**
2. **He has also reported that he had referred the matter to Collector(Vellore) and Dist. Registrar (Vellore). Ask him to report the response from these authorities.**
3. **Put up in July 17.**

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to Shri. Mr. K. Saravanan on 16.06.2017.

Our letter dated 16.06.2017 was return back undelivered from Shri. Mr. K. Saravanan on 06.07.2017.

Remarks:

1. TNTEU Complaint comments is as follows:-

   "Under the above circumstance, it obviously appears that the said College is not functioning in accordance with the Clause 8(4)(ii) of the NCTE's Regulation, 2014, since both the Kumaran College of Education and two more ITI institutions are functioning in the same building as per the two members inspection committee report followed by the letter dated 23.10.2015 of the said College. However, this subject matter is submitted to the SRC/NCTE to take final decision and based on the final decision of the SRC/NCTE, the pending application of the said College in this University for grant of continuation of provisional application will be taken up for disposal."
2. Counter affidavit was filed and awaited final outcome of the order.
3. Saravanan complaint letter received back undelivered on 06.07.2017.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:- **1. This is a complaint case. We cannot, therefore, inspect under section 17 and use that for derecognition.** **2. But, the facts on record are so discordant that there is a strong suspicion about manipulation of documents.** **3. We cannot also treat this as a Pseudonymous complaint because the letter sent to him has come back undelivered since the complainant is a party to the Court case.** **4. Request the NCTE(HQ) to take this up under section 13 NCTE Act for inspection and subsequent processing thereunder.**
8.	APS01668 D.El.Ed 1 Unit The Rajeev Gandhi Education Society's College, Gadag, Karnataka	**The Rajeev Gandhi Education Society, Ron, Gadaga District, Karnataka** had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to **Rajiv Gandhi Educational Society's College** for **D.Ed, Ron-582209, Gadag District, Karnatak** for Elementary **(D.Ed)** course of two and a half years duration from the academic session 2004-05 with an annual intake of **50** students and was granted recognition on **25.11.2004** with the condition to shift to its own premises within 3 years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in rented premises. The SRC in its 324th meeting held during 07th& 08th December, 2016 considered the show cause notice reply of B.Ed, D.El.Ed and B.P.Ed courses and decided as under:- **1. "Land is mortgaged.** **2. As per the Building Completion Certificate the built-up area is not adequate even for B.Ed (2 units) and D.El.Ed (1 unit)."** **As per the decision of SRC, a withdrawal order was issued to the institution**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		vide order No: F.SRO/NCTE/APS01668/D.El.Ed/KA/2016-17/90765 dated 19.12.2016. **Aggrieved by the withdrawal order of SRC, the institution has preferred an appeal before the appellate authority, NCTE Hqrs.** The appellate authority vide order F.No.89-133/2017 Appeal/9th Meeting-2017/55044 dated 21.06.2017 stated as under:- **"The Committee noted that the appellant was granted recognition for conducting D.Ed course with an annual intake of 50 students from the academic session 2005-06 vide SRC's order dt. 21.12.2005. One of the conditions for the grant of recognition was 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). While no action appears to have been taken to fulfill this condition, on the basis of an affidavit submitted by the appellant with their letter dt. 24.01.2015, the S.R.C. issued a revised recognition order in pursuance of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 on 16.05.2015 for two units of 50 students each (copy not available in the file). The appellant with their letter dt. 29.07.2015 submitted certain documents with reference to the revised recognition issued for B.P.Ed course and in response to the Show Cause Notice issued for that course i.e. B.P.Ed submitted a reply with their letter dt. 24.08.2016. The S.R.C. considering these letters withdrew recognition on the grounds mentioned in the order.** **The Committee noted that the two letters dt. 29.07.2015 and 24.08.2016 sent by the appellant are in reference to the revised recognition order and show cause notice issued in respect of B.P.Ed Course. As mentioned by the appellant, no show cause notice has been issued in respect of D.Ed. Course before withdrawal, which is a requirement as per the proviso to Section 17 (l) of the NCTE Act, 1993.** **The Committee also noted that the building completion certificate for the D.Ed and B.Ed courses submitted by the appellant indicated that it was constructed in the year 2001-02. If the building has been constructed many years back and if no inspection of the premises has taken place, the fact that no encumbrance exists as of now as per EC dt. 15.02.2017 and Bank's certificate dt. 13.02.2017, certifying that no loan is outstanding on the property of Survey No. 681/2 deserves to be taken into account.** **In view of the position stated above the Committee concluded that the matter deserve to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to issue a show cause notice to the appellant and take necessary action to conduct an inspection of premises on payment of fee by the appellant and submission of all relevant documents, if it is established that the appellant has shifted**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

to new premises from the premises at which recognition was granted, and take further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014. IN the meanwhile, the order of withdrawal shall be kept in abeyance.

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 S.R.C. with a direction to issue a show cause notice to the appellant and take necessary action to conduct an inspection of premises on payment of fee by the appellant of submission of all relevant documents, if it is established that the appellant has shifted to new premises from the premises at which recognition was granted, and taken further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014. In the meanwhile, the order of withdrawal shall be kept in abeyance.

The Council hereby remands back the case of Rajiv Gandhi Education Society. College of Education, Ron, Gadag, Karnataka to the SRC INCTE for necessary action as indicated above."

Remarks:-

As per appeal order dated 21.06.2017 the committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to SRC with a direction to:

1. Issue Show Cause Notice to the appellant.
2. Take necessary action to conduct an inspection on payment of fee and submission of all relevant documents by the appellant.

Note:-

The institution has submitted the following documents to NCTE Hqrs and the Hqrs forwarded the documents to this office along with Office Memorandum dated13.04.2017.

1. Photocopy of the Encumbrance Certificate with Sy No: 681/2. The area mentioned in the EC is 5 and acres 34 guntas and as per EC the land is free from the mortgage on 13.02.2017 .
2. Building Completion Certificate with Sy No; 681/2. The total built up area mentioned in the BCCis 3738.47 sq.mtrs and it is approved by Junior Engineer, Town Municipal Council, Ron.
3. Coloured photocopy of the building plan with sy no: 681/2. The total area is mentioned in the building plan is 5 acres and 34 guntas and the total built up area is not cleared in the building plan.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:- **1. Three issues are involved:** **(i) Has there been a 'shift' without our permission? If so, do they have title to it.** **(ii) Is the land(old; or, new in case of shift) mortgaged. What is the status today of the mortgage?** **(iii) Is the built-up area on the land(old; or, new as the case may be) adequate for B.Ed.(2 units) and D.El.Ed.(1 unit).** **2.1 As directed by the Appellate Authority, let us collect fees and cause VT Inspection to ascertain facts.** **2.2 Collect all relevant documents for scrutiny so that correct issues can be referred to the VT for verification.** **3. Issue SCN accordingly.**
9.	SRCAPP2016 30103 M.Ed 1 Unit Al- Ameen College of Education, Bangalore, Karnataka	**Al-Ameen Educational Society, Annipura, Hosur Road, Bangalore South, Bangalore (U)-560027, Karnataka** has submitted an online application for offering M.Ed. course in the name of **Al-AmeenCollege of Education (M.Ed), Annipura Village and Town, Hosur Road, Bangalore South Bangalore (U)-560027, Karnataka** on 02.06.2016 and hard copy of the application was received on 03.06.2016. Letter was addressed to the Secretary to Government, Education Department, Government of Karnataka seeking recommendation in respect of the application received by the SRC-NCTE for recognition of the proposed M.Ed. course, on 22.06.2016. Reminder –I was issued on 01.10.2016. Reminder-II was sent to the Government on 02.11.2016. Recommendation of the State Government was received by this office on 22.09.2016. The online application was scrutinized along with hard copy of the application. The SRC in its 324th meeting held during 07th – 08th December, 2016 considered

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

the scrutiny of the application and decided as under:-

1. *"Land title is clear.*
2. *EC is clear*
3. *LUC is there ; but, undated.*
4. *BP-not approved by competent authority. Does not give details.*
5. *BCC-not in format. Date of inspection / issue not stated. Built- up area is inadequate.*
6. *NOC is not given.*
7. *Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly."*

As per the decision of SRC a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 08.12.2016. The institution has submitted written representation through online on 29.12.2016 and hard copy submitted on 30.12.2016 .

The SRC in its 328th meeting held on 31st January, 2016 considered the show cause notice reply and decided as under:-

1. ***"Reply to SCN is seen.***
2. ***LUC is rectified.***
3. ***BP is rectified.***
4. ***BCC is not rectified.***
5. ***NOC of affiliating body is still not available.***
6. ***Reject."***

As per the decision of SRC a rejection order was issued to the institution through online on vide order No: F.No./NCTE/SRC/SRCAPP201630103/M.Ed/KA/2017-18/4 dated 02.02.2017.

Aggrieved by the withdrawal order of SRC, the institution has preferred an appeal before the appellate authority, NCTE Hqrs.

The appellate authority vide order F.No.89-179/2017 Appeal/10th Meeting-2017/55471 dated 21.06.2017 stated as under:-

"Appeal Committee noted that impugned refusal order dated 01.02.2017 was issued by SRC Bangalore on the ground that appellant institution has not submitted NOC issued by affiliating body. Whereas application seeking recognition for M.Ed programme was submitted on 02.06.2016, the appellant institution submitted N.O.C. issued by affiliating body on 15.02.2017. Clause 5(3) of NCTE Regulation, 2014 stipulates that processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as NOC issued by concerned affiliating body shall be submitted along with

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		application. Clause 7 (1) of the regulations, 2014 further stipulates that "in cause application is not complete, or requisite documents are not attached with the application, the application shall be treated incomplete and rejected. **As the appellant institution did not have in its possession the NOC issued by affiliating body at the time of making application, Appeal Committee decided to confirm the impugned refusal order dated 01.02.2017 issued by SRC Bangalore.** **On perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, Appeal Committee concluded to confirm the impugned refusal order dated 01.02.2017 issued by SRC Bangalore.** **The Council hereby confirms the Order appealed against."** **The Committee considered the order of the appellate authority and noted the matter.**
10.	SRCAPP2702 B.Ed-AI 1 Unit Vivekananda College of Education, Adilabad, Telangana	**C Ramreddy Memorial Educational Society, Plot No. 53/1, Maval, Ramnagar Street, Durganagar Village, Adilabad Post & Taluk, Adilabad District-504001, Telangana** had applied for grant of recognition to **Vivekananda College of Education, Plot No. 53/1, Mavala, Duraganaga Street, Mavala Village, Adilabad Post, Adilabad Taluk & District-504001, Telangana** for offering **B.Ed-AI** 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 29.05.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 04.06.2015. 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 02.07.2015, Reminder-I was sent on 15.02.2016 and Reminder-II on 27.09.2016. Sub-clause (3) of Clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:- ***"(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."***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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:-

- **The institution has submitted land documents, it is not legible.**
- **The institution has not submitted NOC from affiliating body along with application.**

The institution submitted NOC dated 04.09.2015 from Kakatiya University on 14.09.2015 and land documents on 30.09.2015.

The SRC in its 296th meeting held on 15 -16th December 2015, considered the matter and decided to reject the application for delayed submission of NOC.

Accordingly, rejection order was issued to the institution on 04.02.2016.

The SRC minuets 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 NOCs, and decided to reopen and process all such rejected cases by accepting NOCs even now irrespective of their dates of issue."

As per direction of SRC, the application was processed and placed before SRC in its 303rd meeting held on 15th February, 2016 and the Committee decided as under;

1. **Contiguity with existing B.Ed to be verified**
2. **Legible building plan to be submitted**
3. **Cause Composite Inspection**
4. **Ask VT to collect all relevant documents**

As per the decision of SRC, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 20.02.2016 and VT report along with documents received on 24.02.2016.

The SRC in its 305th meeting held on 25th-27th February, 2016 considered the VT Report and all other relevant documents of the institution and decided as under:

1. **Issue LOI for B.Ed-AI (1 Unit)**
2. **For B.Ed (basic unit) and B.Ed-AI combined staff list should be produced in accordance with the norms given in 2014 Regulations.**
3. **FDRs in Joint account should be furnished.**
4. **Only if these are given on or before 3.3.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		As per the decision of SRC, LOI was issued to the institution on 26.02.2016. The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 16.03.2016. The SRC in its 308th meeting held on 28th-31st March, 2016 considered the LOI Reply and decided to issue show cause notice for the following: • **Asst. Professor (Social/Philosophy) is required.** Accordingly, LOI Notice was issued to the institution on 16.05.2016. The institution submitted its reply on 04.06.2016. The SRC in its 317th meeting held on 28th -30th July, 2016, considered the matter and decided as under: • **Clarification seen. Await information on recruitment of Asst. Prof. (Sociology/Philosophy).** An e-mail dated 22.08.2016 was received from Advocate Sri. Ramakanth Reddy, regarding W.P.No. 28021 of 2016 filed by C. Ram Reddy Memorial Educational Society and Vivekananda College of Education for not granting additional intake of 50 students in B.Ed course for the academic year 2016-17. Accordingly, the brief of the case in respect of Vivekananda College of Education, Adilabad was sent to Advocate Sri. Ramakanth Reddy on 23.08.2016. A court notice in W.P. No. 28021 of 2016 dated 22.08.2016 was received from Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh on 07.09.2016. A counter affidavit in W.P. No. 28021 of 2016 was received from Advocate Sri. Ramakanth Reddy on 12.09.2016. As per the decision of SRC in 317th meeting, a letter was sent to the institution on 15.09.2016. Duly signed counter affidavit in respect of W.P. No. 28021 of 2016 filed by C Ram Reddy Memorial Educational Society was sent to the Advocate Sri. Ramakanth Reddy on 16.09.2016. An e-mail dated 21.09.2016 was received from the institution along with a letter dated 21.09.2016 relating to 317th meeting notice reply. An e-mail was received from Advocate Sri. Ramakanth Reddy on 26.09.2016 stating as under: ***"....the matter was heard by the Hon'ble Court today on even date. I placed instructions sent by RD before the Hon'ble Court. After hearing the case, the Hon'ble Court interalia directed the SRC as***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

follows:

Subject to compliance of conditions the respondent is directed to consider the case of the petitioner for the academic year 2016-2017.

Therefore the SRC should consider the case of the petitioner keeping in view compliance of conditions and schedule fixed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in MAA Vaishnodevi Case. Since the Hon'ble Court directed to consider ad not grant.

After considering as above a detailed order has to be passed. One line orders or decision in pieces may result in contempt.

Kindly inform the petitioner by mail to submit hard copy by 27th otherwise SRC should consider the matter based on record between 28th and 30th September, 2016, and pass a reasoned order."

The case was heard by the Hon'ble court on 26.09.2016.

An e-mail dated 26.09.2016 was received from the institution along with approved faculty list.

The SRC in its 321st Meeting held on 28th to 30th September 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. The case is pending for submission of latest approved Faculty list .The applicant has submitted a list by e-mail. This is not acceptable. Faculty list has to be given in original, in the prescribed format, with all photocopies and, with every page authenticated by the Registrar.
2. Advise the applicant accordingly and ask them to submit the faculty list properly.

A letter to the institution was sent on 15.10.2016 conveying the decision of 321st meeting.

The institution submitted representation on 26.10.2016 along with original faculty list. It stated as under:

..."***In continuation of my mail today i.e. at 10.35 AM, It is submitted that, we have received your notice in Rc No.F.SRC/NCTE/SRCAPP/2702/B.Ed-AI/TD/2016-17/88892 Dt. 15/10/2016 in which it is mentioned that,***

1. ***The case is pending for submission of latest approved Faculty list. The applicant submitted by E-mail. This in not acceptable. Faculty list has to be given in original, in prescribed format, with all***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

photocopies and with every page authenticated by the registrar.

2. ***Advise the applicant accordingly and ask them to submit the faculty list property.***

In this regard it is submitted that the faculty list has been submitted that at the first instance all in original, in annexures I,ii & iii which was attested by the Registrar, Kakathiya University, through Speed post at Adilabad post office. The number is EN456314235 IN dt. 11/06/2016. I humbly submit that sir, it can be tracked. The e-mail was only additional. (Ref.1st)

Secondly copy the same was sent on 20/08/2016 by speed post No. EN721708553 IN. (Ref 2nd)

Thirdly the copy sent on 21/09/2016 by speed post bearing No.EN721711668 IN. (Ref 3rd)

Fourthly the same was submitted in person at your office on 28/9/2016. Your inward number is 177473. (Ref 4th)

Fifthly the copy was submitted in person by our correspondent in your office. The inward number is 178161 dated 6/10/2016. (Ref 5th)

Unfortunately and in spite of all these correspondences, now it is being stated that the staff list is only submitted through e-mail.

However the original staff list is here with submitted with signature of Registrar Kakathiya University once again.
Kindly accept the same."

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

- **One Asst. Prof (Perspectives) is required to be appointed.**
- **Issue SCN accordingly.**

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 01.12.2016. Before the issuances of Show cause notice as per website information the institution submitted show cause notice reply on 17.12.2016.

The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th & 05th January, 2017 considered the matter and decided that ***"put up in the next meeting."***

The SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th – 07th February, 2017 considered the

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

matter and decided as under:

1. **We have given them enough time to appoint the Asst. Prof.(Persp.).**
2. **We cannot wait indefinitely.**
3. **Reject the application.**
4. **Return FDRs, if any.**
5. **Close the file.**

Accordingly, rejection order was issued to the institution on 23.02.2017.

Aggrieved by rejection order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal with NCTE-Hqrs.

The Institution submitted its representation along with Appeal order and photocopy of approved faculty list on 05.07.2017. It stated as under:

> ***"It is humbly submitted that sir, the society applied for sanction of Additional Section of B.Ed (2 years Course) as the previous sanctioned Strength was 120 and reduced uniformly to 100 (2 basic section). The application was rejected on the grounds of requirement of one Asst.Professor (Perspectives) in spite of having sufficient Asst. Professors (Perspective) as per NCTE regulation at para 5.2 regarding appointment of teaching staff. More over original staff list submitted several times was not taken into record.***
>
> ***The Society went for appeal. The appeal, was heard by NCTE and set aside the rejection order "as the regulations provide for utilization of faculty in a flexible manner so as to optimize academic expertise available."***
>
> ***I am here with enclosing the order downloaded for your kind perusal and further necessary action as directed by NCTE."***

The NCTE Appellate Authority in its order No. F.No.89-245/E-1422/2017 Appeal/11th Meeting-2017 dated: 24.06.2017 received by this office on 06.07.2017 and it stated as follows:

> ***"....Appeal Committee noted that appellant institution is already recognized for conducting B.Ed and D.El.Ed. programmes with an annual intake of 100 seats each. The B.Ed programme is being conducted in the institution since the year 2001 and D.El.Ed since the year 2008. The online application dated 29.05.2015 was for seeking an additional intake of 50 seats to B.Ed. programme. While processing of the application, a Show Cause Notice (SCN) dated 01.12.2016 was finally issued to the appellant on the ground that "one Asstt. Prof. (Perspective) is required to be appointed.***
> ***AND WHEREAS, Appeal Committee further noted that appellant institution submitted reply which was received in the office of SRC***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

on 17.12.2016. In his reply appellant had drawn reference to many lists of faculty submitted to SRC through Spped post and personally between 20.08.2016 to 06.10.2016. The appellant also assured SRC that 'Management is ready to appoint another Prof. (Perspective) in addition to the staff list already submitted, if given time.

AND WHEREAS, Appeal Committee noted that wording used in the SCN was suggestive i.e. "one Asstt.Professor (Perspective) is required to be appointed". As such SRC should have allowed some more time to the appellant institution in case the list of faculty was short by one faculty. Appellant during the course of appeal also submitted that its communications addressed to SRC and submitted by hand and by post were not taken on record and placed in the relevant file. The list of faculty approved by Dean Academic Audit Kakatiya University was submitted to SRC by the appellant institution (received in the office of SRC on 26.10.2016. This list included seven lectures in the subject 'Perspective of Education whose name appear at serial no, 2,3,4,5,17,18,19. Broadly speaking this list contained 7 faculty in perspective as against the requirement of six. Further the regulation provided for utilization of faculty in a flexible manner so as to optimize academic expertise available. Appeal Committee is therefore of the view that ground of refuse i.e. "appointed of one asst. Prof./Pers." is not substantiated. The impugned refusal order dated 23.02.2017 deserved to be set aside with directions to S.R.C. to process the application further.

AND WHEREAS after perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, document on records and oral argument advanced during the hearing, Appeal Committee concluded to set aside the impugned refusal order dated 23.02.2017 with direction to S.R.C. to process the application further.

Remarks:

- **The Appeal Committee concluded and directed the SRC to process the application.**
- **The institution has not appointed One Asst. Prof (Perspectives). In the 329th SRC meeting, the application was rejected because after giving time the institution not appointed the Asst. Prof. (Persp).**
- **Now, the institution has submitted photocopy of Faculty List on 05.07.2017 which is approved only in the last page.**
- A letter no. F.No.49-1/2016 N&S dated 08.12.2016 received from Dr. Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Under Secretary (Regulations), NCTE Hqrs, Stated as under:

"I am directed to refer to your letter dated 28.11.2016 on the

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		subject noted above and to say that as per provision of the Regulation 2014 new teacher Education Institution shall be located in composite institution and the existing teacher education institution shall continue to function as stand-alone institutions; and gradually move towards becoming composite institutions. Composite institution in this case context refer to institutions offering multiple teacher education programmes. As per the above provisions of the Regulation 2014 the institutions may apply for increase in intake in the same course already recognized provided it does not exceed maximum of two units in case of DPS, D.El.Ed and B.Ed. Any application for increase in intake beyond two permissible units in these three courses is not permissible under the regulation. However, since regulation also provides for gradual movement of stand-alone institution to Composite institutions; any attempt of a Teacher Education Institution to expand vertically, cannot be accepted unless it offers to or more than two courses and becomes a Composite institution. You are advised that whenever a clarification is required on certain issue, it should be sought with a specific detail." **The Committee considered the above matter and decided as under:-** **1. The Appellate Authority has remanded this case with reference to a point about flexible utilization of faculty.** **2.1 But, in this case, the more fundamental objection is about B.Ed. institutions not being allowed to grow vertically beyond 2 units, as per entry 3(3.1) under the NCTE Regulations.** **2.2 In this case, the institution in reference has already B.Ed.(2 units). Their request for B.Ed.-A.I.(1 unit) cannot, therefore, be considered.** **3.1 We may have to reject their application on this ground.** **3.2 Issue SCN accordingly.**
11.	APS09425 D.El.Ed	**Sri Andal Educational Cultural Society, D.No.3-58, Venkateshwara Colony, Hayathnagar, Rangareddy District, Telangana** submitted application for **D.Ed** course of two year duration with an annual intake of 50 students at **Gandhian**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

	1 Unit Gandhian College of Elementary Education, Rangareddy, Telangana	**College of Elementary Education, # 5-67, Kuntloor, Amberpet Road, Hayathnagar, Rangareddy District-500028, Telangana** and was granted recognition on **29.05.2009.** On 25.03.2015, a letter dated 16.03.2015 was received from the Director of School Education, Telangana, Hyderabad regarding grant of renewal of temporary provisional affiliation for the year 2014-15 in respect of certain private Diploma in Elementary Teacher Education institutions including Gandhian College of Elementary Education, Hayathnagar, Ranga Reddy District-500028, in Telangana State. The SRC in its 289th Meeting held on 23rd June 2015, considered the letter dated 16.03.2015 from Director of School Education, Govt. of Telangana, Hyderabad, in respect of certain private Diploma in Elementary Teacher Education (43 colleges) not fulfilling the deficiencies and decided to issue show cause notice for the following: • **1+5 approved staff list is submitted.** As per the decision of SRC, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 16.09.2015. The institution submitted its written representation on 10.11.2015 along with staff list. The SRC in its 294th meeting held on 14-16th Nov, 2015 considered the representation and decided as under: • ***Ask for fresh approved staff list as per 2014 regulations.*** As per website information, the institution submitted written representation on 28.11.2015 along with 1+7 staff list. The SRC in its 295th meeting held on 28th to 30th November and 1st December 2015 considered the matter and decided as follows: • **The staff list is in order. It is accepted. Close the case. Inform the affiliating body.** Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the Director, SCERT, Telangana on 04.02.2016. The institution submitted written representation on 26.02.2016 along with the fee of Rs. 1,50,000/- DD No.258316 dated 26.02.2016 for shifting along with relevant documents and stated as follows: ***In connection to the above subject cited, I, Gunna Rajendra Reddy Correspondent of Sri Andal Educational Cultural Society would like to bring few lines for your kind consideration.*** ***Our Society sponsored one D.Ed college namely Gandhian College of***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Elementary Education at H.No. 5-67, Peddamberpet Road, Kuntloor Village, Hayathnagar Mandal, Rangareddy Dist, Telangana.

NCTE has granted permission vide bearing No13318 dated 29.05.2009 code APSO9425 and till date we are running the college in same premises.

Now we constructed new building in same premises (Same Survey No.108 Part) and we want to shift in that new building.

So please consider the above request and kindly do needful."

The documents were processed and placed before SRC in its 315th meeting held on 17th to 18th June 2016. The committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. **Title is not in doubt because the proposed shift is to a new building in the same premises.**
2. **Inspection Fee has been paid in full.**
3. **BP is not approved by competent authority and BCC is in order.**
4. **Original FDRs and latest Faculty list have to be given.**
5. **Cause Inspection for shifting of D.El.Ed (1 unit).**
6. **Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.**

Accordingly as per the decision of SRC, the inspection intimation was sent to institution on 13.07.2016. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 17.08.2016 and the VT report received on 23.08.2016 along with documents and CD.

The documents were processed and placed before SRC in its 321st meeting held on 28th – 30th September 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. **CD is not opening .Obtain fresh CD.**
2. **BP is not legible.**
3. **Original FDRs not given.**
4. **Original faculty list is not given**
5. **There is no Principal also**
6. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

Before issuance of Show Cause Notice, as per the website information, the institution submitted reply on 04.10.2016.

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

1. **CD now given also does not open.**
2. **BP- not approved by competent authority.**
3. **Faculty list is not in original. Not in format.**
4. **Built up area is adequate.**
5. **They have not cared to remedy the deficiencies even after a SCN.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

6. Withdraw recognition w.e.f from 2016-17.

Accordingly, withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 05.12.2016.

Now, a court order dated 15.03.2017 received on 27.03.2017 from the Hon'ble High Court of Hyderabad in W.P.No.9144 of 2017 filed by Gandhian College of Education run by Sri Andal Educational Cultural Society, Kuntlur Village, Hayathnagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, Telangana.

The Court Order Stated as under:

"Notice before admission.

Sri K.Ramakanth Reddy takes notice for R3 and Sri A.Abhishek Reddy takes notice for R4 and R5 and seek time to file counter.

Post after two weeks."

The SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th & 12th April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. **This case is at a very preliminary stage of notice before admission.**
2. **Send the relevant details to the Lawyer to oppose admission when the case is called again.**

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the Advocate on 21.04.2017.

Aggrieved by rejection order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal with NCTE-Hqrs and the NCTE Appellate Authority in its order No. F.No.89-78/2017 Appeal/8th Meeting-2017 dated: 29.05.2017 received by this office on 05.06.2017 stated as follows:

"...appeal committee noted that appellant institution was granted recognition for conducting D.El.Ed. Programme with an annual intake of 50 seats in May, 2009. Appeal committee further noted that appellant institution submitted a written request to SRC in February, 2016 for shifting. The requisite fee for shifting was paid. As shifting involved change of building in the same promises, title of land was not in question. Appeal committee noted that impugned order withdrawing recognition is mainly on the ground that:

(a) CD does not open.

(b) Building Plan (BP) not approved by competent authority.

(c) Faculty list is not in original. Not in format.

(d) Deficiencies pointed out in SCN have not been rectified.

Appeal committee noted that appellant institution cannot be blamed

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

for a CD which is found broken or is found not compatible to the system in regional committee office. Appeal committee noted that appellant had submitted to SRC a Building Completion Certificate (BCC) in original alongwith application for shifting. The BCC is approved by Asst. Ex. Engineer MRR(PR) Gundlapalhi, Nalgonda. The BCC indicates that Building Plan is approved by Gram Panchayat, Kuntpoor. Building plan and BCC are documents which supplement each other and if BCC is issued by competent government authority mentioning the name of authority approving Building Plan it becomes a acceptable document. The appellant during the course of appeal presentation submitted originally approved copy of faculty and copy of building plan bearing the seal and signature of Asst. Executive Engineer.

In this connection attention is invited to proviso to section 17(1) of the NCTE Act which prescribes that order withdrawing recognition shall come into force only with effect from the end of academic session next following the date of communication of such order. Appeal Committee also had an opportunity to glance through the VT report dated 17.08.2016 which hardly contains any negative point. Appeal Committee, therefore, decided to set aside the impugned order of withdrawal which otherwise also is not justified because recognition from academic session 2016-17 cannot be withdrawn by an order issued on 05.12.2016. Appellant institution is required to submit to SRC within 15 days a copy of originally approved staff list and building plan approved by competent government authority.

On perusal of Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, Appeal Committee concluded to set aside the impugned order of withdrawal which otherwise also is not justifiable because recognition from academic session 2016-17 cannot be withdrawn by an order issued on 05.12.2016. Appellant institution is required to submit to SRC within 15 days a copy of originally approved staff list and building plan approved by competent government authority".

The SRC in its 340th meeting held on 08th & 09th June, 2017 considered the matter and decided to ***"process."***

The institution has submitted the staff list approved by Director, DIET, Telangana as directed by appellate authority on 06.07.2017.

As per decision of SRC the application was processed is as follows:

Sl. No	Deficiencies pointed out by SRC	Remarks

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

1	BP- not approved by competent authority	**Blue print/Notarized copy of Building Plan submitted/ Not submitted :-**	Original submitted
		Name and address of Society/Trust/Institution	**Gandhian College of Education**
		Whether Building Plan is for the proposed institution/ course or also for some other TEI/course	Proposed course
		Plot area/land area	2 Acres 21 Guntas
		Total built-up area	GF - 11943.14 Sq.ft FF - 11943.14 Sq.ft SF - 11943.14 Sq.ft **Total - 35829.42 Sq.ft**
		Survey No/ Plot No/ Khasara No.	108
		Built up area for the	35829.42 Sq.ft or 3328.66
		Date of approval	----------
2	Faculty list is not in original. Not in format	Name and designation of approving authority	Secretary Gram Panchayath
		Faculty list	**Submitted**
		faculty list approved/ not	**Approved**
		Whether approved on	Yes
		No. of faculty as per	1 + 7
		Designation of the	Director, SCERT
		Date of approval	27.11.2015

Now, the institution submitted its written representation along with 1 + 7 original faculty list with photographs approved by the Director, SCERT and original building plan on 06.07.2017.

NOTE:

Land document	**Sy.No.108**	**Extent: 7253.82 Sq.mtrs**
LUC	**Sy.No. 108**	**Extent: Ac. 01.09 gts**
EC	**Sy.No. 108**	**Extent: 8147.43 Sq.mtrs**
BCC	**Sy.No. 108**	**Built up area: 35829.42 Sq.ft or 3328.66 q.mtrs**

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

1. **The BP now presented is in order.**
2. **Built-up area is adequate.**
3. **Faculty list is approved.**

3.1 The position of Asst. Prof. in the Perspectives Group is vacant.

3.2 In Pedagogy, Asst. Prof.(Regional Language) has only M.A. with

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		TPT and not M.Ed. **4. Issue SCN accordingly.** **5. We can consider permitting shifting only after removal of these deficiencies.**
12.	APS00234 B.Ed 2 Units APS07145 M.Ed 1 Unit APS02737 D.El.Ed 1 Unit Malla Reddy College of Teacher Education, Rangareddy, Telangana	**APS00234/B.Ed** **St. Martin's Educational Society, 294, Comsary Bazaar, New Bowenpally, Secunderabad-500011, Telangana** had submitted application for **B.Ed** course of two year duration with an annual intake of 100 students at **Malla Reddy College of Teacher Education, Suraram Cross Road, Quthbullapur, Ranga Reddy District-500055, Telangana** and was granted recognition on 28.02.2003. On 31.12.2014, letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations, 2014 and seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015. The institution submitted the affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students on 06.08.2015. The SRC in its 276th meeting held on 7th-9th 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. Accordingly, a revised order was issued to the institution on 23.09.2015 with an intake of 100 students of 2 basic units of 50 students each The institution submitted written representation on 01.09.2015, along with the fee of Rs. 1,50,000/- DD No.517096 dated 31.08.2015 and documents, it stated as under: ***In response to the letter cited Malla Reddy College of Teacher Education (B.Ed & M.Ed) is requesting you to change the building from Suraram X Roads Qutubullapur Mandal, Rangareddy to Kompally, Quthubullapur Mandal, Rangareddy Dist. I am herewith enclosing the mentioned documents and prescribed format and DD worth of Rs.1,50,000/-*** The SRC in its 314th meeting held on 27th and 28th May, 2016 the committee considered the matter and decided as under: ***1. Cause Inspection.*** ***2. BCC is not approved by competent authority.*** ***3. LUC and FDRs to be collected.***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

APS07145/M.Ed

St. Martin's Educational Society, 294, Comsary Bazaar, New Bowenpally, Secunderabad-500011, Telangana had submitted application for **M.Ed** course of two year duration with an annual intake of 35 students at **Malla Reddy College of Teacher Education, Suraram Cross Road, Quthbullapur, Ranga Reddy District-500055, Telangana** and was granted recognition on 09.08.2007.

The institution submitted representation on 18.10.2010 requesting for common name for both B.Ed and M.Ed along with DD of Rs. 40,000/- bearing no. 010425 dated: 11.10.2010.

The SRC in its 194th meeting held on 21st -22nd July, 2010. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

"Change of name is permitted"

A letter was sent to the institution regarding payment of remaining fee of Rs. 40,000/- for Change of name.

The institution submitted representation on 16.11.2011 along with DD of Rs. 40,000/- bearing no. 011051 dated: 21.10.2011.

Accordingly, Order was issued to the institution on 25.06.2012.

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 the affidavit for offering M.Ed course with an intake of 50 students on 30.01.2015.

Accordingly, a revised order was issued to the institution on 26.05.2015 with an intake of 50 students with a condition that the institution has not maintained revalidated FDRs.

The institution has submitted photo copy of FDR's of 5 & 3 Lakhs on 16.06.2015.

The institution submitted written representation on 01.09.2015 along with the fee of Rs. 1,50,000/- DD No.517096 dated 31.08.2015 and documents, it stated as under:

In response to the letter cited Malla Reddy College of Teacher Education (B.Ed & M.Ed) is requesting you to change the building from Suraram X Roads Qutubullapur Mandal, Rangareddy to Kompally, Quthubullapur Mandal, Rangareddy Dist. I am herewith enclosing the

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

mentioned documents and prescribed format and DD worth of Rs.1,50,000/-

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

1. ***Cause Inspection.***
2. ***BCC is not approved by competent authority.***
3. ***LUC and FDRs to be collected.***

APS02737/D.El.Ed

St. Martin's Educational Society, 294, Comsary Bazaar, New Bowenpally, Secunderabad-500011, Telangana had submitted application for **D.Ed** course of two year duration with an annual intake of 50 students at **Malla Reddy Institute of Elementary Teacher Education, Suraram X Roads, Quthbullapur, Ranga Reddy District-500055, Telangana** and granted recognition on 26.08.2005.

The institution has submitted its written representation on 01.09.2015 along with the fee of Rs. 1,50,000/- DD No.517097 dated 31.08.2015 and some relevant documents and stated as follows:

In response to the letter cited Malla Reddy Institute of Elementary Teacher Education D.El.Ed is requesting you to change the building from Suraram X Roads Qutubullapur Mandal, Ranga reddy to Kompally, Quthubullapur Mandal, Rangareddy Dist, I am herewith enclosing the mentioned documents and prescribed format and DD of Rs.1,50,000.

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

1. ***Cause Inspection.***
2. ***BCC is not approved by competent authority.***
3. ***LUC and FDRs to be collected.***

As per the decision of SRC, VT fixed through online procedure and the inspection of the institution was conducted on 20.08.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 23.08.2016 and 06.09.2016.

The SRC in its 321st meeting held on 28th – 30th September, 2016 considered the VT report and decided as under;

1. **CD is damaged.Obtain fresh CD**
2. **BP is not approved by competent authority.**
3. **Luc not given**
4. **Original FDRs not given**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

5. **Latest approved Faculty Lists not given**
6. **Since the 3 courses are being run by 3 different institutions, ask them to earmark the built-up area on the ground for each course.**
7. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent on 27.10.2016.

The institution submitted show cause notice reply through e mail on 27.10.2016.

The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th & 05th January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. **The land area required is 3600 sq.mts. They have only 3350 sq.mts.**
2. **BCC is not in original; only a photocopy is given.**
3. **Built up area required is 4000 sq.mts. Whereas, they have only 3497 sq.mts.**
4. **Original FDRs are given.**

5.1 For D.El.Ed.(1 unit), B.Ed.(2 units) and M.Ed. (1 unit) they need a faculty of 1+32. They have only 1+24. They need 7 more for B.Ed.

5.2. Obtain revised faculty list accordingly.

Thereafter, we can consider for 'Shifting'.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent on 13.01.2017.

The institution submitted its written representation on 28.04.2017.

The SRC in its 341st meeting held on 15th & 16th June, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. **Their reply does not address the specific deficiencies listed.**

2.1. Land area required is 3500 sq.mts, they have only 3350 sq.mts.

2.2 Built-up area required is 4000 sq.mts, they have only 3497 sq.mts.

2.3 Faculty required is 2+32, they have only 1+24.

3. **Ask them to respond to these deficiencies in particular.**
4. **We can not permit shifting without these deficiencies being rectified.**
5. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

Accordingly, show cause notice was sent to the institution on 29.06.2017.

Now, the institution submitted reply along with documents on 03.07.2017 and

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

stating as under;

Sl. No	Deficiencies pointed out by SRC	Written representation	Remarks
2.1	Land area required is 3500 sq.mts, they have only 3350 sq.mts.	The land area required is 3500 Sq.mtrs. The total land area of the college is 4748 Sq.mtrs. (Two Land Documents 01) 714/2015 02) 605 of 2015 are enclosed herewith)	The institution submitted certified photocopy of two Gift settlement deed. 1) Sy.No. 126 - Ac. 0.20 Gts or 2023.Sq.mtrs 2) Sy.Nos. 123, 124, 125 & 142 - 3000 Sq.yards or 2508 Sq.mtrs
2.2	Built-up area required is 4000 sq.mts, they have only 3497 sq.mts.	Built up area required is 4000 Sq.mtrs. The college has 4003 Sq.mtrs (BP is enclosed herewith)	The institution submitted building plan which shows total land area is 43069 Sq.ft or 4003 Sq.mtrs approved by Executive Officer, Panchayat Secretary.
2.3	Faculty required is 2+32, they have only 1+24.	Faculty required is 2 + 32. Faculty present are 2 + 35. M.Ed : 1 + 9 (Copy enclosed) Original already submitted to your good office) B.Ed : 17 (Principal is common for both M.Ed & B.Ed, original already submitted to your good office. Copy enclosed) D.El.Ed : 1 + 7 (Original list submitted herewith)	The institution submitted photocopy of approved faculty list for M.Ed (1 + 9), B.Ed (1 + 17) same Principal for both M.Ed and B.Ed and original faculty list for D.El.Ed (1 + 7) course.

The Committee considered the Show Cause Notice reply and has decided as under:-

1. **Their reply to the Show Cause Notice is considered.**
2. **Land area is adequate.**
3. **BCC is not approved by competent authority. Ask them to give a**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		proper BCC. **4. Faculty required is 2+32 (1+8 for D.El.Ed. + 1+15 for B.Ed. + 0+9 for M.Ed.)** **4.1 The Faculty list for D.El.Ed. does not show the professional qualifications of anybody.** **4.2 Faculty list for B.Ed.(1+15) and for M.Ed.(0+9) are in order.** **5. Issue SCN for BCC and Faculty list of D.El.Ed.**
13.	SRCAPP376 D.El.Ed 1 Unit CMR Institute of Elementary Teacher Education, Rangareddy, Telangana	**Malla Reddy Educational Society, Plot No.294, Comssary Bazaar Road, New Bowenpally Village, Secunderabad Post, Bowenpally Taluk, Hyderabad City, Ranga Reddy District - 500011, Andhra Pradesh** had submitted an online application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE on 28.09.2010 and physical application on 18.10.2010 for grant of recognition for **D.El.Ed** course of two year duration with an annual intake of 50 students at **CMR Institute of Elementary Teacher Education, Sy No.648 Plot/Street No.563, Gundia Pochampally Village, Dundigal Post, Gundia Pochampally Taluk, Secunderabad Ranga Reddy District-500055,Andhra Pradesh** and was granted recognition on 04.09.2012 from the academic session **2012-2013.** A court notice received from Honb'le High court Andhra Pradesh in WP.No.18704 of 2013 on 26.07.2013. Accordingly, a letter was sent to the Advocate Shri K. Ramakanth Reddy on 06.08.2013. A court order in W.P.M.P No.22869 of 2013 in WP.No.18704 of 2013 dated 02.07.2013 was received from Honb'le High court of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad and the court order stating as follows: *".....therefore, the purported stand taken by the State Government to deny affiliation for the academic year 2013-2014 is prima facie not tenable.* *For the foregoing reasons, there shall be interim Direction".* A letter has been received from Shri. Gopal Reddy, Director, SCERT, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad on 25.2.2014 and 26.2.2014, enclosing a letter from Commissioner and Director of School Education, Andhra Pradesh to Regional Director, SRC, NCTE, Bangalore dated 23.12.2013 to communicate the order passed on the detailed report submitted to NCTE, Bangalore in respect of (41) D.Ed colleges who have made admissions during 2012-13 at their on in violation of admission rules and to take necessary action as per NCTE rules. The SRC in its 268th meeting held on 4th-5th June 2014 considered the letter dated 25.02.2014 & 26.02.2014 from Shri Gopal Reddy, Director, SCERT, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, letter dated 23.12.2013 and decided to issue Show Cause Notice for withdrawal of recognition for the violations of Regulation 8 (12) of 2009 and 3 (3) of the Norms and Standards for D.El.Ed course, 2009, as reported by the affiliating body in respect of 41 D.Ed colleges who have made admissions during 2012-13 at

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

their own in violation of admission rules issued by the State Govt. of A.P and the committee decided to issue show cause notice.

As per the decision of SRC a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 07.08.2014. The institution has submitted a written representation on 27.08.2014 along with some court orders and relevant documents.

The SRC in its 273rd meeting held on 30th September & 01st October, 2014 considered the considered the reply of the institution vide letter dated 27.08.2014, Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh order dated 20.03.2013, 04.03.2014, & 12.06.2014 decided that, the Law is clear on this issue. The Supreme Court has also given specific directions. Once 'recognition' is given by NCTE, the affiliating body shall affiliate. If they have any problem, they have to take it up with NCTE. In this case, the High Court has also reiterated this position. In their reply to our show cause notice, the institution has clarified that all the actions were taken in compliance of the High Court order. The State Government and the SCERT will, therefore, be well advised to comply with the High Court order.

As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the School Education Department on 07.11.2015.

A letter was sent to the Director SCERT on 07.12.2015 regarding continuation of affiliation for the academic year 2015-2016.

The institution has submitted its written representation on 22.07.2015 along with DD of Rs. 1,50.000/- bearing no.516522 dated 21.07.2015, online application for shifting of premises and some documents with requesting to shift the building from Maisammaguda, Gundlapochampally medchal Mandal, Rangareddy to Kompally Medchal Mandal, Rangareddy District.

A letter received from the institution on 10.05.2016 stating as under:

> *"this is kind reminder requesting you to make inspection for shifting CMR Institute of Elementary Teacher Education (D.El.Ed) premises which was submitted to your good on 01.09.2015.*
>
> *The next academic year is going to start very soon. Therefore to avoid impediments in this regard I request you to kindly make the inspections as early as possible.*

Note: The institution has submitted another written representation on 01.09.2015 along with Land documents, BCC, BP and affidavit for Sy No 126 at Kompally in favour of Malla Reddy Educational Society, which is not matching with earlier submitted shifting proposal.

The SRC in its 314th meeting held on 27th -28th May, 2016 considered the matter and it has decided as under:

1. **This is a case of request for shifting.**
2. **Land document given is of a different Society. (It is the same as that**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

given in Sl.No.16).

3. **Issue SCN for withdrawal of recognition.**

As per the decision of SRC, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 07.06.2016. The institution has submitted its written representation on 07.06.2016 along with document.

The SRC in its 320th meeting held on 19th to 20th September 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:

- **The title deed has unattested over writings. Ask them to submit the clear original document or its certified copy**

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 30.09.2016.

The institution submitted written representation on 26.09.2016. its stated as under:

> *"...C.M.R. Institute of Elementary Teacher Education (D.El.Ed) has applied for shifting of its premises from Gundlapochampally to Kompally on 01.09.2015 and enclosed all the required documents for your kind perusal.*
>
> *Whereas in Decision of 320th SRC meeting at SRC NCTE Bangalore Held on 19 & 20th September 2016 has directed us t submit certified copy f land documents.*
>
> *Now I am herewith enclosing the certified copy of Malla Reddy Educational Society land documents (Document No: 6415 of 2015) certified from the component authority for your kind perusal. Kindly consider the case."*

The institution submitted original certified copy of land document submitted.

In meantime, the institution submitted its written representation on 27.10.2016 & 06.12.2016. It's stated as under:

> *"...This is kind reminder requesting you to make inspection for shifting C.M.R Institute of Elementary Teacher Education (D.El.Ed) premise which was submitted to your good on 01.09.2015.*
>
> *The next academic year is going to start very soon. Therefore to avoid any impediments in this regard I request you to kindly make the inspections as early as possible.*
>
> *Herewith enclosing the shifting details of the college once again.".*

The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th – 05th January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. **Title is clear.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

2. **Land area required is 2428 sq.mtrs. They have 3035 sq.mtrs.**
3. **LUC not given.**
4. **Latest EC is required.**
5. **BP is not legible.**
6. **BCC is not approved by competent authority.**
7. **Renewed FDRs are required.**
8. **Latest approved faculty list is not given.**
9. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was sent to the institution on 13.01.2017.

The institution has submitted its Show cause notice reply along with document on 03.02.2017.

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

1. **Their reply to our SCN covers all points except the FDR. They have to give FDRs for Rs. 7 lakhs and 5 lakhs.**
2. **Cause inspection.**
3. **Ask VT to collect the FDRs.**

Inspection of the institution was generated through online mode and inspection fixed between 07.03.2017 to 27.03.20174. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 24.03.2017 & 25.03.2017 and VT report along with documents and original CD received on 28.03.2017.

The SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th & 12th April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. **Title is clear. Land area is adequate.**
2. **LUC is in order.**
3. **EC is in order.**

4.1 **BP is in order. Built-up area shown is 3500 sq.mts.**

4.2 **BP, however, is in photocopy form. Original is required.**

5.1 **BCC is not approved by competent authority.**

5.2 **Type of roofing is not indicated.**

5.3 **Built-up area shown is 3500 sq.mts. This is adequate for B.Ed (2) & D.El.Ed.(1)**

6. **FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with 5 year validity @ 7+5 lakhs for each unit in each course.**

7.1 **Latest approved Faculty lists for both B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. are**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

required.

7.2 B.Ed. Faculty list should be approved by the University and not by SCERT.

7.3 Both lists should have photographs and should be submitted in original.

8. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent on 20.04.2017.

The institution submitted reply along with documents on 28.04.2017.

The SRC in its 341st meeting held on 15th & 16th June, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Their reply to our SCN is specific and categoric.

2. It satisfactorily covers all the points except submission of Faculty list (in original) for D.El.Ed.

3. Permit shifting.

4. Isuue the formal order in writing only after collecting the Faculty list in original and getting the deficiencies therein rectified:-

The certified copy of the original, submitted in 2015, shows the following position:

(i) Principal is qualified.

(ii) There is no faculty in Perspectives. Two Asst. Profs are required.

(iii) In the Pedagogy Group, one Asst. Prof (Maths) and one Asst. Prof (Reg. Lang.) are required.

(iv) Asst. Prof (Phy.Ed.) is required to be appointed.

5.1 Thereafter, issue a new FR giving the new address.

5.2 Issue a copy to the SCERT for their record and reference.

5.3 After that close the file.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 29.06.2017.

Now, the institution submitted reply along with documents on 03.07.2017 and stating as follows;

Sl.	Deficiencies	Written representation	Remarks

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		No	pointed out by SRC		
		2	It satisfactorily covers all the points except submission of Faculty list (in original) for D.El.Ed.	D.El.Ed faculty list in original for D.El.Ed is herewith enclosed.	The institution submitted 1 + 7 original faculty list with photographs approved by the Director, SCERT.
		4	(ii) There is no faculty in Perspectives. Two Asst. Profs are required.	Staff selection committee was constituted by Telangana State SCERT. According to the GO's L.G.O. Rt.No. 39 Education (SE.Trg.1) Department Dated: 18.01.2007. 2. G.O.Ms. No.92 Education (SE.TRG) Department Dated: 16.11.2007. 3. Notification No. F-51-4/2014/NCTE/N&S Dated: 16.12.2014 of the Chairperson, NCTE, Delhi along with a copy of Gazette of India bearing No. 346 dated 01.12.2014. mentioned in the reference of two proceedings. The Staff was approved by the Committee. 1 + 7 pattern is approved by the committee. Same if existing. (Copy of	They have not appointed 2 faculty i.e Asst.Profs in Perspectives.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		proceedings enclosed)	
3	(iii) In the Pedagogy Group, one Asst. Prof (Maths) and one Asst. Prof (Reg. Lang.) are required.	In the Pedagogy Group, one Asst. Prof (Maths) R. Mahender and one Asst. Prof (Reg.Lang) J.Uma Devi are among the approved faculty list.	As stated by the institution the Asst. Prof (Maths) and Asst. Prof (Reg.Lang) name is available in the approved faculty list.
4	(iv) Asst. Prof (Phy.Ed.) is required to be appointed.	Asst. Prof (Phy.Ed) E.Raja Gopal is in the approved list.	As stated by the institution the Asst.Prof. (Phy.Ed) name is available in the approved faculty list.

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

1.1 When the prescribed Faculty strength for D.El.Ed. (2 units) is halved for D.El.Ed.(1 unit), the resultant figures have to be rounded off to the nearest level. For perspectives 1 ½ can be rounded of to 1.

1.2 For Languages 1 ½ can be made into 2 (i.e., one for English and one for Regional language).

1.3 This way, it will work out to 1+8.

1.4 They have only 1+7; which is 1 short.

2.1 They have nobody for Perspectives.That should be filled up.

2.2 They have not indicated the professional qualifications of any faculty Members.

3. Issue SCN accordingly for removal of deficiency so that new R.O. at the new address can be issued.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		4. In the meanwhile, permit shifting.
14.	SRCAPP2468 BSc.B.Ed 2 Units Senthil College of Education, Puducherry	**Senthil Education Society, Plot No.36, Thiyagaraja Street, Puducherry Village & Post, Puducherry Taluk & 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 & 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.** 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. Sub-clause (3) of clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:- ***"(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 was found deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:- **1. The institution has not submitted NOC from the affiliating body along with application.** **2. The application is not duly signed by the applicant on all every pages of the hard copy of the online application.** The matter was placed before SRC for in its 292nd 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: **1. 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 submitted written representation on 19.11.2015.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

The SRC in its 295th meeting held on 28th-30th November and 01st December 2015 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 300th 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 303rd meeting held on 15th 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 305th meeting held on 25th & 26th 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.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		The SRC in its 306th meeting held on 01st – 04th 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-Al-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 317th meeting held on 27th & 28th 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 323rd meeting held on 16th to 18th 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**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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 com 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)) – 1unit***
    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 325th meeting held on 19th to 20th December, 2016 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

1. **The request for B.Ed-Al (1 unit) withdrawal is accepted.**
2. **Refund FDRs, if any.**
3. **Close the case.**
4. **<u>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.</u>**
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-Al 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-Al/PO/2016-17/91061, dt 13.01.2017 communicating the decision of your office to accept our proposal of withdrawal of B.Ed Al (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 <u>http://srcncte.in/granted%20&20withdrawn.htm</u>*
   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.*

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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 329th meeting held on 06th to 07th 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 330th Meeting held on 12th and 13th 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

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

respect of the decision of 330th 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 the 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 (Sl/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.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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 (Sl.No. 96) . Point No.

SRC in its 330th 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.

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 332nd meeting held on 28th 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) to continue..... } 2000 sq.mts. (required)**
   - **(ii) D.El.Ed.(2 units) to stand withdrawn } 2000 sq.mts.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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 333rd meeting held on 24th March, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. The have accepted tht 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).

101

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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 338th meeting held on 01st to 2nd 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.

Now, the institution has submitted again SCN reply on 07.06.2017and stating as under:-

Sl. No	Deficiency pointed out by SRC	Institution written representation	Remarks	
1.	The Faculty list is examined: - It is approved by a nominee	I am enclosing a copy letter along with the enclosures cited (vi) above for ready reference. We have again personally met the Vice-Chancellor & Registrar, Pondicherry University, Puducherry and explained the need for the signature of the Registrar in the staff profile (Annexure III of NCTE) They have replied as follows.	**Faculty list** faculty list approved/ not approved	Original of Faculty list submitted Faculty list approved

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

			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.	i. Since our Senthil College of Education, Puducherry is having affiliation to B.Ed., Course, they approve the additional staff for B.Ed., courses. ii. Since the NCTE permits, the Principal and Academic, administrative & technical staff of one teaching programme can be shared with other teaching programmes in the same college. Norms and standards for B.Ed., Course Appendix (4), Page No. 118. Note given below 5.3. Norms and standards for B.Sc.B.Ed., Course Appendix (13), Page No. 168, Note given below 5.3 iii. As per the Academic calendar of the Pondicherry University, they mention the B.Sc.B.Ed., / B.A.B.Ed., (4 year integrated course) as B.Ed., Integrated Course. (copy enclosed for ready reference) As such the authorities of Pondicherry University have decided to approve the staff list as B.Ed., Programme.	Whether approved on each page or not	Approved
					No. of faculty as per norms of the course	1+16=17
					Designation of the approving authority	Registered by Pondicherry University Puducherry - 605014
					Date of approval	-
		2.	FDRs have been given	We have appointed the following staff in the places mentioned against each.	-	
		3.	They have to give FDRs in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity@ 7+5 lakhs for each unit of each course,		As per our records the institution has submitted the following FDRs	
					Fixed Deposit Receipts	**Original FDRS submitted**

Sl. no in the first staff list	Name of the staff in the first list with Designation	Name of the New staff replaced with Designation
6	Mr. M. Elangovan, Assistant	Mr. V. Palani Assistant

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

including their old running courses of B.Ed.(2 units) and D.El.Ed.(2 units).

	professor in English	Professor in English
15	Mr. A. Nizamuthen, Physical Dierctor	Dr. P. Ananthakumaran Physical Director
16	Mr. S. Janarthanan, Assistant Professor (Performing Arts in Music)	Mr. Rahul K Raveendran Assistant Professor (Performing Arts)
17	Mrs. C. Rajesvary Assistant Professor (Visual/Fine Arts)	Dr. K. Senthilnathan Assistant Professor (Visual/Fine Arts)

The service of staff mentioned in the first list Sl. No. 6, 15, 16 & 17 will be utilised for teaching programmes of the same Senthil College of Education. Therefore their affidavits, namely the new staff are submitted with this letter.

In the circumstances stated above and in view of the observations made bt the SRc meetings Number. 330 to 338 for different institutions, our Senthil College of Education, Puducherry is eligible to get the recognition order starting four year integrated coursed B.Sc.B.Ed (two units) from the academic year 2017-18 onwards. Kindly grant recognition immediately.

Original / Photocopy of the FDR of Rs. 5 lakhs + 7 lakhs	**Original of FDR of Rs. 5.00 Lakhs submitted**	**Original of FDR of Rs. 7.00 Lakhs submitted**
FDR / A/c Number	1. 0010 123 2. 0010 124 3. 0005 365	1. 00 05 36 6 2. 00 10 12 5 3. 00 10 12 6 4. 00 10 15 7
Whether in single or joint A/c	Joint A/c	Joint A/c
Date of issue	1. 24.04.2017 2. 24.04.2017 3. 25.05.2015	1. 25.05.2015 2. 24.04.2017 3. 24.04.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

					20 17 4. 02. 05. 20 17
			Date of Maturity	1. 24.0 4.20 22 2. 24.0 4.20 22 3. 25.0 5.20 20	1. 25. 05. 20 20 2. 24. 04. 20 22 3. 24. 04. 20 22 02.0 6.20 22
			Name of issuing Bank	Indian Bank	India n Bank

Accordingly, as per the direction a modified agenda prepared.

The Committee considered the Show Cause Notice reply and has 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**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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 <u>Faculty list for B.Sc.B.Ed.:</u>

(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 <u>Faculty list for B.Ed.</u>

(i) The list available is very old. Many members would have even superannuated.

(ii) Latest approved list is required.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		6. Issue SCN accordingly.
15.	APS01886 B.Ed 1 Unit Shri Gurushantappa Jawali Memorial Trust Residential College of Education, Gulbarga, Karnataka	**Shri Gurushantappa Jawali Memorial Trust, Gulbarga District, Karnataka** had submitted to an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to **Shri Gurushantappa Jawali Memorial Trust Residential College of Education, Pattan Post, Pattan Taluk, Gulbarga District, Karnataka** for conducting **(B.Ed)** course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students and was granted recognition on 03.01.2006 with condition of Shift to its own premises/ building within three years from the date of recognition on 03.01.2006 (in case the course is started in rented premises). On 09.02.2015, an affidavit from the Principal of the institution dated 02.02.2015 was received regarding adherence to NCTE Regulations, 2014. Revised order was issued to the institution on 18.05.2015 with an intake of 100 students for two basic units of 50 students each. On 06.07.2015 a letter was received from the institution dated 06.07.2015 requesting for one basic unit for B.Ed Course. A Corrigendum was issued to the institution on 09.07.2015 for one unit of B.Ed course. On 27.07.2015 a letter was received from the institution as under:- "I am very much thankful to National Council for Teacher Education Southern Regional Committee Bangalore, for granting revised Recognition to Shri. Gurushantappa Jawali Memorial Trust Residential College of Education, Pattan Taluk, Gulbarg District for conducting 1 Basic Unit from the academic year 2015-16. As per your direction letter to maintain basic infrastrure for one basic Unit, I am herewith submitting, Land & Building documents, Encumbrance certificate, Land Usage Certificate, Building plan, Approved staff list, recognition of revised order F.SRO/NCTE/APSO1886/B.ED/KA/2015/69672 dated: 09.07.2015." The Southern Regional Committee in its 315th meeting held during 17th& 18th June, 2016 considered the letter dated 27.07.2015, and documents of the institution, and decided as under:

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

1. Title deed is in order.
2. EC and LUC are in order.
3. BP and BCC are in order. BP does not give details of built-up area. BCC shows inadequate built-up area. It also shows use of asbestos sheets.
4. Original FDRs and Latest Faculty List are not given.
5. Processing fee not paid.
6. Collect fee and cause inspection for shifting B.Ed (1 unit). It is to be noted that although they are proposing 'shifting', the documents refer to the same location.
7. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents and check on adequacy of built-up area.

A letter for inspection was issued to the institution on 12.07.2016.

The inspection of the institution was conducted on 03.09.2016 and visiting team report was received by this office on 10.09.2016.

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

"1. This is a RPRO shifting case.

2.1 It is not clear where they want to shift.

2.2 Available information indicates that they want to move into a new building at the same location.

3.1 The old building has only asbestos roofing. The BCC very clearly and categorically points this out.

3.2 It is not clear how they got recognition and how they have been functioning all along.

3.3 'Asbestos' is considered to be extremely harmful to health and is totally banned.

4. There is nothing on record to show the present status of the new building. We cannot process this case in this ambiguous back ground.

5.1 Irrespective of other considerations, we have to take severe adverse notice of their callous attitude towards the welfare of students and teachers exposed to the vulnerability of being badly affected by the 'asbestos' roofing. Accordingly, we decide that running the B.Ed. course in the old building should be halted at the completion ofthe 2016-17 academic session. They shall not make any new admissions for 2017-18 unless acceptable alternative arrangements are made available, with prior approval of NCTE, for continuing the B.Ed. course.

5.2 It must be recognized that presence of 'asbestos' even in the

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

neighbourhood of the new building will be objectionable. In other words, immediately on completion of the 2016-17 academic year, the asbestos roofing must be completely dismantled and physically moved out. This would mean that the new building has to be totally self sufficient.

6. **Students in the 2nd year of B.Ed., if they cannot be accommodated as described above, will have to be shifted with the help of the affiliating University, to some other nearby colleges.**
7. **Issue SCN accordingly. Ask for their response urgently. Put up in the meeting on 15 June 17."**

As per the decision of SRC, the Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 30.05.2017.

The institution has submitted Show Cause Notice reply on 08.06.2017.

Sl No	Deficiencies pointed out in the SRC meeting	Reply of the institution
1	This is a RPRO shifting case	This is not a shifting case in any other location, premises and other area and we don't have any opinion about shifting.
2.1	It is not clear where they want to shift	It is shifted in same location, same premises and own land of trust building completely mettle sheet full fledged self sufficient building. (for short term) A letter from the Gram Panchayat Development Officer, Kalburagi dated 26.05.2017 is submitted
2.2	Available information indicates that they want to move into a new building at the same location	As per your observation we want to shift in new building in same location, same premises and own land of trust building as per NCTE and affiliating University direction completely full proof RCC newly constructed building. (construction work under progress)
3.1	The old building has only asbestos roofing. The BCC very clearly and categorically points this out.	The old building has asbestos roofing in early years from 2015-16 academic year. We are conducting course in mettle sheet building in same location, in same Survey number of land of trust in same premises. (for short term up to

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		completion of new building)
3.2	It is not clear how they got recognition and how they have been functioning all along	We got recognition as per NCTE and university norms
3.3	'Asbestos' is considered to be extremely harmful to health and is totally banned.	We agree with your consideration it is harmful to health of students and teacher. So we have provided good and suitable mettle sheet proof building
4	There is nothing on record to show the present status of the new building. We cannot process this case in this ambiguous back ground.	The present status of new building we are started new building as per NCTE new norms and work going under progress.
5.1	Irrespective of other considerations, we have to take severe adverse notice of their callous attitude towards the welfare of students and teachers exposed to the vulnerability of being badly affected by the 'asbestos' roofing. Accordingly, we decide that running the B.Ed. course in the old building should be halted at the completion of the 2016- 17 academic session. They shall not make any new admissions for 2017-18 unless acceptable	The current batch of 2016-17 academic course conducting in new mettle sheet building not in old building asbestos roofing. And the new admission of 2017-18 batch we start in new building in a same location, same premises own land of trust with your permission continued the academic course of 2017-18

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

	alternative arrangements are made available, with prior approval of NCTE, for continuing the B.Ed. course.	
5.2	It must be recognized that presence of 'asbestos' even in the neighbourhood of the new building will be objectionable. In other words, immediately on completion of the 2016-17 academic year, the asbestos roofing must be completely dismantled and physically moved out. This would mean that the new building has to be totally self sufficient.	Already we dismantle and physically move out of asbestos roofing converted into full mettle sheet building and we have self sufficient area to conduct course
6	Students in the 2nd year of B.Ed., if they cannot be accommodated as described above, will have to be shifted with the help of the affiliating University, to some other nearby colleges.	As per your suggestions and described above points we have provided good and suitable class rooms and staff rooms and lab, library and others in favour of student and staff consideration.
7	Issue SCN accordingly. Ask for their response urgently. Put up in the meeting on 15 June 17	As per your 339th meeting of SRC 22-23 may 2017 SCN issue regarding we respond your show cause notice as above shown and relevant supporting documents submitted.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Details of the Document submitted:

Sl. No	Documents submitted	Details of the documents submitted
1	Affidavit	1)Objection of the existing asbestos roofing old building of B.Ed College we completely dismantle roofing of building earlier 2015-16 academic batch and we modified as mettle tin sheet and running course upto completion new RCC building. 2) The student of 2nd year academic 2016-17 batch we provided good Class Rooms, Staff Room, Library, and other self sufficient room for conducting course. 3) The new RCC building work under progress we complete its end of the 2017 year. 4) The current status of new RCC building construction work under continue progress building plan building completion construction permission and tax paid receipt copy enclosed. 5) The old building completely dismantle and moved in new building and the building fully self sufficient to continue 2016-17 2nd year student course. 6) We shall not making any admission without your permission for the year 2017-18 academic batch and after the completion new RCC building we start the process with proper approval from you. 7)The after completion of the new RCC building we send report and relevant documents, building plan (BP), building completion certificate (BCC), land use documents (LUC) and Encumbrance certificate (EC) and others. 8) We completely agree and obey with your 2014

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

				NCTE Norms and Standards Resolution. 9) Hence view of the above facts and documents the reply will be enough for the above said kindly accept as same. 10) The regarding show cause notice reply by institutions as below Chairman and Principal. Hence, this affidavit is sworn this the 6th day of June 2017 at Kalaburagi.	
		2	Building Plan (Photocopy submitted)	Name and address of Society/Trust/Institution	Sri. Gurushantappa Jawali Memorial Trust (R) Rural Residences College of Education
				Plot area/land area	**Not mentioned**
				Total built-up area	G.F 702.00Sqmt F.F 702.00 Sqmt **Total Built up area-1404Sqmt**
				Date of approval	-----
				Name and designation of approving authority	Panchayat Development Officer, Gram Panchayat Town, Kalburagi
				Original blue print of the building plan is not submitted. **As per building plan the built up area is not as per NCTE norms for offering B.Ed course.** **As per the photocopy of the building plan Labs, Multipurpose Hall, Seminar Hall is not available.**	
		3	Building Completion Certificate	Photocopy of the BCC approved by the Gram Panchayath Development Officer, Kalaburgi Taluk dated 26.05.2017 is submitted. As per BCC, the asbestos roofing is modified into full fledged **tin mettle sheet from the academic year 2015-16.**	

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		Building completion certificate approved by the Government Engineer in the prescribed format is not submitted.
4	Photographs of the College building	**Temporary roofing shown in the photographs of the college building. As per Regulations 2014, no temporary roofing is allowed**

Remarks:-

1) Original blue print of the building plan is not submitted.
2) As per building plan the built up area is not as per NCTE norms for offering B.Ed course.
3) As per the photocopy of the building plan Labs, Multipurpose Hall, Seminar Hall is not available.
4) Building completion certificate approved by the Government Engineer in the prescribed format is not submitted.
5) Temporary roofing shown in the photographs of the college building. As per Regulations 2014, no temporary roofing is allowed

The Committee considered the Show Cause Notice reply and has decided as under:-

1. **This is a classic case of violation of all the building norms.**
2. **For 10 years, they have functioned in temporary structures without bothering about proper adherence to the infrastructural requirements as prescribed in the Regulations.**
3. **But for the RPRO exercise, taken up in the context of the Supreme Court driven revision of the 2009 Regulations, this case could not have come to light.**
4. **Even after our intervention in May 17, they have not taken issues seriously. Merely by replacing 'asbestos' roofing by tin-metal roofing they claim to have fulfilled the requirement of providing a permanent structure without any temporary fixtures. This shows**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		their casualness. And, the nonchalant manner of continuing with the highly objectionable asbestos roofing for 10 years shows their callousness. 5. Their response to our SCN is also reflective of their recalcitrance. It will be difficult for any responsible Regulatory body to accept such an arrangement. 6. In their reply, they have unhesitatingly admitted that they are still continuing with the same temporary structures. Even in response to our SCN, they have not given a properly approved BCC. And, there is no indication of any plan to construct a new building. 7.1 In the result, and for the reasons given above, we find their reply unsatisfactory and their response unacceptable. Accordingly, we withdraw the recognition for their B.Ed. (1 unit) course w.e.f. 2016-17. 7.2 Students in the 2nd year of the course will have to be shifted, with the help of the affiliating University, to some other nearby colleges. 7.3 The applicant college shall not make any new admissions in 2017-18. 8.1 Issue Formal orders accordingly. 8.2 Inform the affiliating University with a request for strict enforcement of these decisions.
16.	APS00243	**Millennium College of Education, Sangareddy Revenue Division, Fasalwadi, Medak District, Telangana** was granted recognition for offering

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

	B.Ed 2 Units Millenium College of Education, Medak, Telangana	**B.Ed** course vide order dated **08.04.2003** with condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises three years from the date of recognition (in case the course is started in rented premises). 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 has submitted the affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students on 03.02.2015. The SRC in its 276th meeting held on 7th-9th 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. Accordingly, a revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 31.05.2015 with shifting condition. Now, the institution has submitted its written representation on 20.07.2015 along with shifting fee of Rs.1,50,000/- DD No. 042084 dated 10.07.2015 and relevant documents. Letter stated as follows: ***"....the NCTE Southern Regional committee was asked to submit the adequate accommodation related documents as per NCTE norms 2014.*** ***Madam, our Society was taken own building and own open land of the buildup area in 25688 Sq.ft above area and the open land is Ac.0.30 Gts. The existing RCC Building accommodation is very good when compared to the previous and it is adjacent to the Hyderabad to Medak Main Road and also very near to the bus stand.*** ***Madam kindly consider to permit us to shift the college from Millennium College of Education (B.Ed), Near Andhra Bank, Main Road, Sangareddy, Medak Dist. (rented building) to H.No. 3-57, Sy.No. 26/2, Gummadidala (V), Jinnaram (M), Medak (D), (Own Building), Telangana State-502313. If you consider our request we will be very greatful to you. The processing fee Rs. 1,50,000/- Rupees, DD No. 042084 dated 10.07.2015 Andhra Bank is enclosed I relevant all documents also enclosed, any deficiencies documents we will submit within a week. So, kindly as early possible send to visit team inspection and issue order of change premises."*** The SRC in its 315th meeting held on 17th- 18th June 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

1. **Title Deed is in order.**
2. **Inspection fee has been paid in full.**
3. **BCC, original FDRs and, latest Faculty list are not given.**
5. **LUC and EC are in order.**
6. **Cause Inspection for shifting B.Ed (2 units).**
7. **Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.**

As per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 12.07.2016.

As per the decision of SRC, VT assigned through online procedures. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 09.10.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 13.10.2016.

The SRC in its 341st meeting held on 15th & 16th June, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. **Title deed is a certified photocopy. Sy.No. is 26/ee2. Land area of 3500 sq.mts. is adequate.**
2. **LUC is duly approved. But, the permission given is for 'commercial' purpose and not 'educational'.**
3. **EC is in order. But, the Sy.No. shown (26/D2) does not tally with the Sy.No.(26/ee2) shown in the Gift Deed.**

4.1 **BP is in order. Built-up area shown (2200.5 sq.mts) is adequate.**

4.2 **But, the BP shows use of 'asbestos' roofing. This is not permitted under Regulations.**

5.1 **BCC is in order. Built-up area shown is (2367.7sq.mts). This is wrong because the 167.2 sq.mts. added is of ACC roofing. They should add 2200+185.8 sq.mts(2385.8 sq.ms.) is adequate. But, this will be in excess of what is shown in the BP.**

5.2. **There are 167.7 sq.mts. of ACC roofing in MP Hall which is highly objectionable. They should immediately remove the 'asbestos' presence. This will need to be checked on the spot at their cost.**

6. **FDRs are in order.**
7. **Faculty list is in order. Only Principal is not qualified: does not have 8 years experience in a secondary teacher education institution. Subject of Ph.D. degree is not mentioned.**

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 29.06.2017.

Before issuance of letter, the institution submitted reply along with documents on 27.06.2017.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

The SRC in its 342nd meeting held on 05th & 06th July, 2017 considered the matter and decided to issue show cause notice for the following grounds;

1. **Their reply to our SCN is acceptable on all points except one.**
2. **2.1. The objection about 'asbestos' roofing remains. It is clear that they have sufficient RCC roofing. But, it has to be ensured that the 'asbestos' is removed from the site and not just from the BP.**
   2.2. 'Asbestos' has a very serious health hazard. That is why the Regulations stipulate that they have to be totally removed even if they are in areas beyond what is required for the course in reference.
   2.3. They must physically remove All the 'asbestos' from the entire site and give visual proof thereof.
3. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

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

Now, the institution submitted its show cause notice reply along with documents on 24.07.2017 and stating as under;

Sl. No	Deficiencies pointed out by SRC	Written representation	Remarks
2.3	**They must physically remove All the 'asbestos' from the entire site and give visual proof thereof.**	We have already removed the asbestos sheet. We herewith submit the photos for proof. I request you to kindly accept our request and issue shifting order for B.Ed 2 units.	**The institution submitted photos for proof and letter regarding not having any asbestos sheets in the campus approved by Asst. Engineer, Gram Panchayath, Gummadidala.**

The Committee considered the Show Cause Notice reply and has decided as under:-

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		1. Their reply is satisfactory. **2. 'Asbestos' roofs have all been removed.** **3.1 The new BCC confirms this position.** **3.2 Comparison of the old CD with the new photographs further endorse the position.** **4. Permit shifting.** **5. Issue a new R.O., at the new address, under the 2014 Regulations.**
17.	SRCAPP2016 30099 B.A. B.Ed. BSc.B.Ed 1 Unit Pope John Paul II College of Education, Pondicherry	**Le Conseil D Administration De L Archdiocese De Pondicherry, Villianur Main Road, Reddiarpalayam Taluk, Pondicherry City & District-605010, Pondicherry** had applied for grant of recognition to **Pope John Paul II College of Education, Reddiarpalayam Village, Villianur Main Road, Reddiyarpalayam City, Pondicherry District-605010, Pondicherry** for offering **BA.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed-AI** integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on **31.05.2016**.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on **06.06.2016.** As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016, followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Govt. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application is processed. As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for BA.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed-AI course in the State of Pondicherry. The application was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application. The scrutiny of the application was considered by SRC in its 325th meeting held on 19th – 20th December, 2016, and the Committee decided as under; **1. The application is for Additional intake. Since the status of the basic units themselves is in dispute, this application can not be processed before setting the basic issue.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

2. **In their letter dt. 3.10.2016, they have sought (retrospective) recognition for the 3 integrated courses run by them without NCTE recognition.**

1.1 SRC, has no authority to issue retrospective recognition.

3.2. The three integrated courses in reference - B.SC. B.Ed (Maths), BA.B.Ed(English) and B.Sc. B.Ed (Computer Science) were not in the NCTE list of approved courses before Notification of the 2014 Regulations.

4. Issue Show Cause Notice Accordingly.

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

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

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

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

- **This item is withdrawn from agenda.**

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

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

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

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

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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

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

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

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

Sl. No	Deficiency Pointed out in the SCN	Reply of the institution
1	The application is for Additional intake. Since the status of the basic units	"The kind attention of the Regulation Director, Southern Regional Committee(SRC), National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), Bangalore is drawn to the above-cited decision of SRC, on the content of SCN to refuse recognition

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

			themselves is in dispute, this application cannot be processed before setting the basic issue.	for the Four-year integrated course (Additional Intake) as well as treating the existing three course as unrecognized. Also, we humbly bring to your kind notice that the three Intergrated Courses B.A.Ed., English Literature, B.Sc.Ed., Mathematics and B.Sc.Ed., Computer Science are permitted by NCTE.
		2	In their letter dt. 3.10.2016, they have sought (retrospective) recognition for the 3 integrated courses run by them without NCTE recognition.	2. In this context the following facts are submitted for the consideration of your kind self:- a. At the first instance the recognition was granted by SRC for conducting one year B.Ed., course from the academic session 1997-1998. (copy of Recognition Order dated 10th March 1997 is at **Annexure-1**) Now the permissible admission is 100.
		3	SRC, has no authority to issue retrospective recognition.	b. Thereafter the institution had applied for M.Ed., course and recognition was granted with an annual intake of 15 from the academic session 1997-1998 (copy of Order of SRC Ref.No. F.PO/M.Ed/01/SRO/NCTE/2000-2001/808 dated 7th July 2000 is attached in **Annexure-2**). Now the permissible admission is 50.
			The three integrated courses in reference - B.SC. B.Ed (Maths), BA.B.Ed(Englis) and B.Sc. B.Ed (Computer Science) were	**c.** Then the institution applied for four years Integrated course and recognition was granted from the academic session 1999-2000 (copy of order F/SRO/NCTE/1999-2000/9317 dated 23rd August 1999 of SRC attached – **Annexure 3**) The permissible intake of students is 150 as per the order of NCTE F.PN/SEC/SRO/NCTE/2004-05/3062 dated 10th May 2004 **(Annexure – 4)** **d.** Now the institution has submitted a new

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

				not in the NCTE list of approved courses before Notification of the 2014 Regulations.	application u/s 15 of NCTE Act for grant of additional intake in the four years Integrated Course. The SRC has issued Show Cause Notice prior to refusal while citing the reasons quoted below:- ➢ ***The application is for additional intake. Since the status of basic units themselves is in dispute, this application cannot be processed before setting the basic unit issue.*** ➢ ***In their letter dated 03.10.2016, they have sought retrospective recognition for the 3 integrated courses being run by them without NCTE recognition.*** ➢ ***SRC has no authority to issue retropective recognition.*** ➢ ***<u>The Four-year Integrated Courses in reference B.Sc.B.Ed (Maths), B.A.B.Ed (English) and B.Sc.B.Ed (Computer Science) were not in the NCTE list of approved courses before Notification of the 2014 Regulations.</u>*** **3. The SRC has made a gross error in its decision taken in 325th meeting, as our institution is an existing recognized institution which is conducting three courses duly recognized by SRC. The question of grant of retrospective recognition does not arise in our case since the institution is enjoying the same from the date of recognition order without any break. The institution very well understands the fact that there is no provision in the NCTE Act, 1993 or Regulations issued time to time for grant of recognition from retrospective**	

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

effect. Further, the institution enjoys the recognition till the time Regional Committee withdraws it under Section 17 of NCTE Act 1993.

4. It is also to be pointed out that SRC has permitted our institution to run the B.A.Ed., English Literature, B.Sc.Ed., Mathematics, B.Com.Ed., and B.Sc.Ed., Computer Science as usual until the final decision is taken by SRC. (A copy of SRC letter SRO-97 NCTE-1, dated the 1st April 1997 in **Annexure-5**)

5. It is again reiterated that our institution was granted recognition by SRC for 4 years Integrated course vide its order dated 23rd August 1999 and till date the same has not been withdrawn by SRC. Furthermore, as per the conditions stipulated in the Recognition order, the institution is continuously submitting the Performance Appraisal Report (PAR) to SRC every year without fail.

6. Further, it is also to bring to your kind attention that in one of the Court case filed by our institution in W.P.No. 15488 of 2003, the Regional Director, SRC had submitted a Counter affidavit stating that the SRC in its 62nd meeting held on 18th July 2003 has approved an intake of 150 students from the year 2003-2004.**(Annexure-6)**.

7. We would like to place on record that our institution is a no-profit religious trust that renders its service crossing all the borders of caste and creed. Moreover, our institution is having 2 (f) and 12 (b) of the UGC and also accredited by NAAC with Grade 'A' in the year 2016.

8. Keeping all the facts of the matter as well as provisions of NCTE Act, Rules and Regulations in view it is evident that the decision of SRC is

Sathyam

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		contravention of NCTE Act and Regulations and contrary to the principle of Natural Justice. Your kind self is requested to reconsider the SCN and generously allow the institution to enjoy the already granted recognition, from the implementation of the new norms of NCTE. Hence, considering the long dedicated 30 years service of the institution ***and the future of the students,*** your goodness is requested to grant us the recognition for the aforementioned Integrated Courses.

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

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

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

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

1. **This case cannot be decided at our level. This has to be referred again to NCTE(HQ).**

2.1 **There are 4 courses in reference: B.Ed.(Eng.); B.Sc.Ed.(Maths); B.Sc. Ed.(Comp.Sc.); and, B.Com.Ed.**

2.2 **Our records have no trace of B.Com.Ed.**

2.3 **In 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 SRC had issued recognition order. But, they referred to a 4-year integrated course and not with reference to subject details. Again, no communication/order after 2001 is available.**

2.4 **They refer to submission of Annual Appraisal Reports. No such reports are readily available in our records.**

2.5 **There is a mention of a recognition order dt. 30.5.15. Available records show, this was an order relating to the new 2 – year B.Ed. Probably, the 1-year B.Ed. sanctioned long ago was revised as a 2- year B.Ed. under the 2014 Regulations and a fresh recognition order was issued.**

3. **There is no other document in our files about the other three integrated courses. The revised 2014 Regulations do not refer to courses like B.Ed.-Eng ; B.Sc.Ed. – Computer Sc.; B.Sc.Ed.(Maths); and, B.Com.Ed. If such courses had been sanctioned in the past, they will have to be reckoned with as 'innovative courses'. They will have to be regularized into regular courses following a procedure prescribed by NCTE(HQ); or, they will have**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

to be converted into courses now recognized by the 2014 Regulations.

4. **Send a comprehensive note drawing the chronological developments in this case to the NCTE (HQ. Make it clear that, after 2001, we have issued no orders in this case.**
5. **We cannot sanction A.I. at this stage to any of these courses since that will imply incidental recognition of such courses. We can proceed further only after and only in accordance with further guidelines from NCTE (HQ).**
6. **Process accordingly and put up in May 2017.**

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

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

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

An email dated 06.05.2017 and Hard copy received by this office on 08.05.2017 from Pope John Paul II College of Education and stating as under:-

Sl. No	Deficiency Pointed out in the SCN	Reply of the institution	Details of the documents
1	This case cannot be decided at our level. This has to be referred again to		
2.1	There are 4 courses in reference: B.Ed.(Eng.); B.Sc.Ed.(Maths); B.Sc. Ed.(Comp.Sc.);	Letter from NCTE-SRC (Ref:SRO-97 NCTE/4275 dated 12th March, 1997) Annexure-1)	The institution has submitted photocopy of the Letter SRO-
2.2	Our records have no trace of B.Com.Ed.		

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

			2.3	In 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 SRC had issued recognition order. But, they referred to a 4-year integrated course and not with reference to subject details. Again, no communication/ order after 2001 is available.	SRO-97 NCTE/4275 dated 12th March, 1997 allowed the institution to run the programme as usual until a final decision is taken by SRC. ❖ Intimation about sending of study team from Mysore SRO-97/NCTE/3065 dt.06.11.1997 (Annexure-2) ❖ Pondicherry State Government letter permits to run four-year IC course (No.33092/sect/Edn/E.3/97dt.6.11.1997) (Annexure-3) ❖ Telegram from NCTE-about NCTE Visiting Team visit on 23.06.1999 dt 16.06.1999. (Annexure-4) ❖ First recognition granted by SRC up to 1999-2000 (F/SRO/NCTE/1999-2000/9317 dt.23.06.1999) Annexure -5) ❖ Recognition order from 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2002, 2002-2003, 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 (Annexure-6) ❖ Our letter to SRC, Regional Director dt.06.09.2006- requesting recognition orders for	• Photocopy of the SRO-97/NCTE/3065 dt.06.11.1997 (Annexure-2) is submitted • The institution has submitted Photocopy of Annexure - 3,4,5,6,7, 8,9.	

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		2.4	They refer to submission of Annual Appraisal Reports. No such reports are readily available in our records.	Academic year	Date	Academic year	Date	• The institution has submitted copies of the Courier Proofs (Annexure-10) • Photocopies
				2000-01	04.06.2001	2008-09	28.03.2009	
				2001-02	02.05.2002	2009-10	25.03.2010	
				2002-03	30.1.2003	2010-11	29.03.2011	
				2003-04	27.03.2004	2011-12	29.03.2012	
		2.5	There is a mention of a recognition order dt. 30.5.15. Available records show, this was an order relating to the new 2 – year B.Ed. Probably, the 1-year B.Ed. sanctioned long ago was revised	2004-05 Yes	29.03.2005	2012-13	21.03.2013	
				2005-06	30.03.2006	2013-14	22.03.2014	
				2006-07	29.03.2007	2014-15	27.03.2015	
				2007-08	26.03.2008	2015-16	21.03.2016	
						2016-17	28.03.2017	
		3	There is no other document in our files about the other three integrated courses. The revised 2014 Regulations do not refer to courses like B.Ed.-Eng; B.Sc.Ed.– Computer Sc.; B.Sc.Ed.(Maths); and, B.Com.Ed.	❖ These courses were started before the inception of NCTE. ❖ Allowed by NCTE (Ref.SRO-97 NCTE/4275 dated 12th March, 1997). ❖ Studied by expert team sent by NCTE (SRO-97/NCTE/3065 dt.06.11.1999) ❖ NCTE visit to the institution on 23.06.1999. (Telegram from				As stated by the institution.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

				NCTE dt.16.06.1999) ❖ First order of Recognition up to 1999-2000. (F/SRO/NCTE/1999-2000/9317 dt.23.06.1999)	
			If such courses had been sanctioned in the past, they will have to be reckoned with as 'innovative courses'. They will have to be regularized into regular courses following a procedure prescribed by NCTE(HQ); or, they will have to	These courses can be reckoned with as 'Innovative Courses' as per your suggestion.	
		4	Send a comprehensive note drawing the chronological developments in this case to the NCTE (HQ. Make it clear that, after 2001, we have issued no orders in this	❖ Our response to SCN submitted to SRC-NCTE dated 12th January 2017 (Acknowledged by NCTE, No.184293, dt, 13.01.2017 is a chronological note regarding the case. (Please find the list of annexure for the same taken from our letter cited enclosed) (Annexure-11)	
		5	We cannot sanction A.I. at this stage to any of these courses since that will imply incidental recognition of such courses. We can proceed further	Additional one unit may be granted – under the discretion of SRC, since the said items were clarifies with necessary profs.	

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

6	Process accordingly and put up in May 2017.	We are already in the month of May 2017.	

We would like to kind to bring to your kind attention that, the Pondicherry University sent a letter stating that.

"your are required to sent the copy of the NCTE recognition order for the four-year B.Ed Integrated course... At least under new Regulation NCTE (2014)... immediately for releasing the result of the students of the above course". (Annexure-12)

As on now, the future of the students is at stake, they cannot write their arrears if any, and also they cannot sit for the final examination due in the month of May 2017. Particularly the final year students (Fourth year) are very much affected as they will not be able to apply for the higher studies. Some of the final year students are already selected as teachers through the campus interview, find it difficult to join the duty when the schools are open.

Most of our students are coming from financially poor families. The poor parents are anxious and worried about the future of their children.

There is no other college in Pondicherry state that offers Four-year Integrated B.Ed Course. We are unable to admit students who apply for this four-year integrated course. The grant of Revised Recognition order for the Four-year integrated course will be boon to the poor parents and children who wish to join this four-year integrated course.

We request your good self to consider the deplorable condition of all our 600 students and their parents, and relieve them from worries and anxieties by granting the required Revised Recognition order.

The institution has submitted representation on 11.05.2017 and stating as under:-

On 04.05.017 we sent letter to your good self requesting for Revised Regulation order as per 2014 norms. That letter also gives some points for clarification of the observations made in 334th meeting of SRC-30th to 31st march, 201.7

May we request your good self to accept the correction as follows:

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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

An email was received by this office on 11.05.2017 and Hard copy received on 12.05.2017 regarding second clarification for the SCN issued on 21.12.2016 to Pope John Paul II College of Education, Pondicherry.

A letter dated 10.05.2017 received by this office on 15.05.2017 from Shri.Dr. Kiran Bedi Lieutenant Governor Raj Nivas, Puducherry and stating as under:-

" In continuation of the telephonic conversation had with you on 08.05.2017 evening regarding recognition of the four-year integrated course (BSc., B.Ed) offered by Pope John Paul II College of Education, I Understand that the college principal has given additional particulars for considering their application for grant of recognition. Copy of the letter is enclosed.

The process of examining the explanation submitted by the college may kindly be expedited in the interest of the students, whose future is at stake".

An email was received on 16.05.2017 and a letter dated 16.05.2017 received by this office on 19.05.2017 from Shri. Mukesh Kumar, under secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi and stating as under:-

I am directed to invite your kind attention to your letter No. letter No.SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP201630099/PU/2017/91630 dated 07.02.2017 and the NCTE Hq. letter No.49-03/2016/NCTE/N&S/51537 dated 20.03.2017. Reply of which is still awaited.

In this connection it is to further inform you that the institution vide letter dated 9th May, 2017 has represented that the college has the NCTE recognition from 2000-2001. It also submitted self-affidavit to come under NCTE new Regulation 2014. But it received a show cause notice NCTE, SRC for which clarification was given (copy enclosed). It was discussed in 334 SRC Meeting for which also an explanation was submitted copy enclosed. Due to the want of recognition the University withheld the result and not allowed the students to sit for examinations due in May, 2017 (a copy of the letter dated 09.05.2017 received from the institution is

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		enclosed). ***The matter has been further examined in the NCTE Hq. and it has been observed that as per provisions under NCTE Act, 1993, the recognition of the institution continues till NCTE withdraws it under section 147 of the NCTE Act. Moreover, the then Regional Director, SRC-Sh. M.Vasudev had filed an Affidavit in W.P.o.15488 and 15489 of 2003 (clause 9(b) stating that the SRC in its 62nd meeting held on 18.07.2003 has approved an intake of 150 students from the year 2003-04. The institution had also enclosed the copies of earlier conditional recognition orders issued by SRC.*** ***In View of the above the Regional Direction, SRC is requested to clarify the following:-*** ***(i) Whether the recognition of the institution has been withdrawn by SRC after filling of the Affidavit by the RD-SRC in W.P.15488 and 15489 of 2003.*** ***Reply may be sent by return e-mail/fax.*** Reply sent through e-office on 17.05.2017. A letter dated 13.05.2017 received by this office on 18.05.2017 from Shri. S.P Veerappan, Ex-Vice president, Bharatiya Janata Party, Pondicherry and stating as under:- ***"I would like to inform you sir, that Mr. R.Perumal, Secretary, retired employees union of Pondicherry University has sent one letter dt.04.03.2017 with 325th meeting of SRC held on 19th to 20th December 2016 minutes copy of NCTE regarding 4 year integrated course for which Pondicherry University has granted Affiliation without recognition– moreover more irregularity is going on.*** ***Take suitable action against erring officials for public interest without delay. Copy of this letter to CBI".*** A letter was addressed to the Members Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi on 31.05.2017 An email was received by this office on 25.05.2017 from Shri. R. Sridharan, P.S to L.G, Rajnivas, Puducherry enclosing a copy of D.O letter of Hon'ble Lt. Governor, Puducherry.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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

An email was sent to Shri. Mukesh Kumar, under secretary, NCTE Hqrs on 07.06.2017.

The SRC in its 340th meeting held on 08th to 09th June, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decide as under:-

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

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

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

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

2. ***However, this action of SRC is seen to be clearly against the directions contained in the NCTE Hqtrs. Letter file no.3-6/PS/CP/NCTE/2000/1995 dated 14.06.2000 issued by the then Chairperson of the NCTE (which was also issued to SRC) stating inter alia that as per the Chapter 4 of the NCTE Act, an institution can either be recognised or conditionally recognised or refused recognition. There is not provision of grant of recognition on year-to year basis in the NCTE Act.***
3. ***And whereas as per the above said direction/instruction from the Chairperson NCTE, the conditional recognition on year to year basis***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		granted to the institution as stated above in para-1 is against the direction of the NCTE Hqrs. The action of the SRC of giving year on year recognition is illegal in the light of the instructions of NCTE Hqrs. Since this letter was issued in the year 2000 all subsequent acts of the SRC in violation of such orders would be illegal, not only in the light of such directions but also in the light of a plain reading of the extant provisions of the NCTE Act. ***4. And whereas looking at the records provided by SRC and the institution concerned it is observed that RD SRC has filed an affidavit to the Hon'ble High Court of Madras with reference of W.P No. 15488 of 2003 and 15489 of 2003 in which it is stated that the petitioner institution has got the approval from the year 2003-04 and therefore, the student shall be permitted to take examination from the year 2003-04 and not before the date of recognition.*** ***5. And whereas SRC NCTE may be clarified that the act of the SRC after 2000 of issuing year to – year recognition was not in conformity with the direction of the NCTE Hqrs and therefore it may be treated illegal. Moreover as per the guidelines issued by the NCTE Hqrs. Dated 26.05.2000 it is stated that recognition in respect of those institution which fail to meet/comply with the norms for the concerned teacher education course within the given time frame may be withdrawn by invoking Section 17 of the NCTE Act.*** ***6. Considering the totality of facts & circumstances, and the letter of the NCTE Act, the NCTE Regulation, letter of the then Chairperson NCTE dated 14.06.2000 and 26.05.2000, and also affidavit filed by RD SRC to the Hon'ble High Court of Madras with reference to W.P No.15488 of 2003 and 15489 of 2003 in which it is stated that the petition institution has got the approval from the year 2003-2004 and therefore the student shall be permitted to take examination from the year 2003-04, the SRC is communicated this clarification that the institution stands recognized from the academic session 2003-2004 onwards, especially since there is no withdrawal of recognition of the institution for BA B.Ed/B.Sc B.Ed 4 year integrated programme as informed by RD SRC vide file no.NCTE-Reg1022/1/2017-Regulation Section-SRC/93301 dated 17.05.2017".*** The SRC in its 341st meeting held on 15th to 16th June, 2017 and the Committee considered the clarification from NCTE Hqrs and decided as under:- **1. The clarification from NCTE(HQ) is not clear enough for further action.** **2. They have stated that, since there was no withdrawal of**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

recognition of the 'institution' for a 4 – year integrated programme, the institution stands recognized from the academic year 2003-2004 onwards. (The annual recognition was for 2004-2005 and not 2003-2004).

3. It is important here to recognize the position that the recognition then granted by the SRC was an ' annual recognition'. The sequence of events prevailing was grant of annual recognition → submission of annual PAR →submission of a request for renewal of the annual recognition → renewal of the annual recognition..

4. In this case, the renewal of recognition had a time-limit of 31.3.2005. It had also a specific stipulation that the institution shall submit an annual PAR before the expiry of recognition. And, there was a requirement of a request for renewal of the annual recognition which would not be considered in the absence of fulfillment of the stipulated conditions.

5. There was no submission of PAR. There was no request for renewal of the recognition. There was no order of SRC for renewal of the 'annual' recognition. In other words, the 'annual' recognition for 2004-2005 perished at the end of the academic year.

6. That the applicant institution assumed it to be a case of recognition in perpetuity, cannot alter this stark factual position.

7. To invoke issues like ' future of students being at stake' is to distort this factual position. The Hon. Supreme Court has clearly directed that institutions should not be allowed to resort to such emotional blackmailing. They should function as responsible institutions to prevent development of such situations. And, the students involved are not young children who cannot distinguish what is right and what is wrong. They cannot enter into institutions and/or courses without verifying their credentials and then wait about their future. This instruction of the Supreme Court will be equally applicable to this case also.

8. That being so, the NCTE(HQ) may be requested to reconsider the case and give us revised guidance.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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

An email was received from the institution on 16.06.2017 and hard copy received on 21.06.2017 regarding requesting for issuing the order

A letter was received from Pondicherry University on 22.06.2017.

A letter was received from the institution regarding grant of permission for additional intake in B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed on 28.06.2017. Again a letter received from the institution on

NCTE Hqrs letter received by this office through e-mail on 12.07.2017, from Dr. Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Under Secretary, NCTE Hqrs, New Delhi and stating as under:-

I am directed to refer to the Minutes of 341st meeting held from 15 to 16 June 2017 and the clarification issued to SRC by the NCTE Hqtrs. Letter dated 14.06.2017 regarding Pope John Paul II College of Education Pondicherry. The said minutes have been carefully perused.

2. ***Taking the above decision of SRC and the factual position obtained from RD, SRC and the institution concerned, the following points are noteworthy:***

   i. ***The recognition granted to the institution by SRC was conditional for the year 2004-2005 and the last date of submitted PAR by the institution to SRC was 31.03.2005. As per information furnished by SRC, the institution did not submit PAR to SRC office whereas the institution asserts that they have submitted PAR to SRC and SRC did not take any cognizance of it.***

   ii. ***The then RD SRC had filed an affidavit before the High Court Madras in the case of W .P. No. 15488 of 2003 and 15489 of 2003 in which it was stated that the petitioner institution has got the approval from the year 2003-2004 and therefore, the students shall be permitted to take examination from the year 2003-2004.***

   iii. ***It appears to be correct in the light of the direction of NCTE Hqtrs. issued to all Regional Committees vide letter file no. 3-6/Panchayath Secretary/CP/NCTE/2000/1995 dated 14.06.2000 by the then Chairperson of the NCTE stating that an institution can either be***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		recognition or conditionally recognized or refused recognition. There is no provision of grant of recognition on year-to-year basis in the NCTE Act.
		iv. The Chairperson NCTE's letter dated 26.05.2000 (guidelines issued to all Regional Committee) states that recognition in respect of those institution which fail to meet/comply with the norms for the concerned teacher education course within the given time frame may be withdrawn by invoking Section 17 of the NCTE Act.
		v. It is also stated that as per Section 17 (i) of the NCTE Act where the Regional Committee, on its own motion or on representation received from ant person, is satisfied that a recognized institution has contravened any of the provisions of this Act, or the rules, regulations, orders made or issued thereunder, or any condition subject to which recognition under sub-section (3) of section 14 or permission under sub-section (3) of section 15 was granted, it may withdraw recognition of such recognized institution, for reasons to be recorded in writing: provided that no such order against the recognized institution shall be passed unless a reasonable opportunity of making representation against the proposed order has been given to such recognized institution.
		vi. The above facts including the RD SRC's letter file no. NCTE-Reg1022/1/2017-Regulation Section-SRC/93301 dated 17.05.2017 show that the Regional Committee did not withdraw the recognition of the institution. The regional Committee is seen to not have proceeded formally for withdrawing recognition through issue of any show cause notice to the institution and thereby not taking any action against the institution for discontinuing the programme. It appears that the guidelines of the NCTE HQtrs. Issued to the Regional Committee vide letter dated 26.03.2000 have been disobeyed. Moreover it is observed that the spirit of the NCTE Act 1993 as mentioned in section 17(1) has been not taken into cognizance by SRC NCTE.
		vii. The conditional recognition granted for 2004-05 academic session is illegal as per the affidavit already filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras stating that the institution is recognized from 2003-2004. The Regional Committee could have reviewed this matter under section 17(1) of the NCTE Act in case any infarction of law or extent

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		regulations were brought to its notice. *viii. A per para 2 (ii) above it is obvious that the institution is recognized from 2003-2004 onwards as per affidavit filed by the then RD SRC before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras and the RD SRC's letter dated 17.05.2017 makes is clear that the recognition has not been withdrawn specifically.* *Hence SRC NCTE is advised to take action according to the express directions given through our earlier letter dated File No. 49-3/2016/NCTE/N&S/54617, dated 14.06.2017.* *ix. SRC NCTE is also asked to clarify the following points:* *a) Whether the guidelines dated 26.05.2000 issued by the then Chairperson NCTE were adhered to by the SRC in terms of shopping the practice of granting recognition on yearly basis and whether there are other institutions which are liable to suffer on account of not obeying the express directions contained in letter dated 26.05.2000.* **The Committee considered the above matter and has asked SRO to put up in the next meeting scheduled on 17 August, 2017.**

18.	APS02786 D.El.Ed 1 Unit APS00232 B.Ed 2 Units Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College & Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Adilabad, Telangana	**APS00232/B.Ed (2 units)**	**APS02786/D.Ed (1 unit)**
		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). On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification new Regulations 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revise norms and standards	**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.** 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

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

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

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 presmises 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/Institut	04 (Annexure V)

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		building were sufficient as per the norms prevailing at the time of granting recognition. *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.* *Now the Director of School Education Telangana, Hyderabad is insisting on shifting permission order at the new address.* *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.* *We also request you to cause shifting inspection at an earliest and give us shifting orders".* The SRC in its 293rd meeting held on 29th-31st October, 2015 considered the written representation from the institution vide letter dated 28.10.2015 and decided as under: • **Process for causing shifting inspection.** • **In the meanwhile request the 2 Affiliating Bodies to renew affiliation.** As per the decision of SRC, the documents submitted by the institution on 01.06.2016 were processed and	ion	The matter was placed before SRC in its 302nd Meeting held on 09th-11th February, 2016. The Committee considered the letter from the Director School Education Department, Telangana State and decided that ***"What with the 3rd 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 placed before SRC in its 309th Meeting held on 12th-14th 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: • **Shifting of college premises without the permission of SRC NCTE.** 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.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

placed before SRC in its 318th meeting.	

The SRC in its 318th meeting held on 08th & 09th August, 2016 considered both B.Ed (APS00232) & D.Ed (APS02786) shifting case and show cause notice reply and decided as under:

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 322nd meeting held on 20th & 21st 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 as follows:

Sl. No	Deficiencies pointed out by SRC	Written representation	Remarks
1	LUC and EC – not given	Copy of land utility certificate and EC	**The institution has submitted Photocopy of LUC.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

			is submitted for the remark.	Name of the Society/ Trust/ Institution	Not Mentioned
				Survey/Plot/Khasara No. and location	a) 104/C/2, 105/E/2 at Buruguda Village b) 45 at Godvelli Village
				Extent of diverted land	a) Acres 2.25 b) Acres 2.00
				Purpose of diversion	Non – Agricultural Purpose
				Date of issue	a) 13.11.2013 b) 03.12.2013
				Name and designation of approving authority	Prashant . J. Patil, RDO/Sub-Collector
				The institution has submitted the Photocopy of EC.	
				Name of the Society/Trust/Institution	Mother Therissa Educational Society
				Survey/Plot/Khasara Nos. and location	a) 104/C2, 105/E2 at Burguda Village b) 45 at Godvelli Village
				Search for the period	a) 21.05.2001 to 19.08.2016 b) 25.05.2001 to 19.08.2016
				Extent of land	a) Acres 1.130 b) 80 Guntas
				Any mortgage as per EC	Sy.No. 45 is Mortgaged
				Date of issue	20.08.2016
				Name and designation of issuing authority	Sub-Registrar
		2	BP & BCC are in order. Built up	It is agreed by your kindness that BP	**The institution has submitted Photocopy of BCC.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

			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.	and BCC are in order, the built up area shown in BCC is adequate, but BCC show larger area than what is approved in building plan. Accordingly, modified and approved original BP is submitted as required.	Name and address of Society / Trust / Institution	Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed College, Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute, Buruguda, Asfiabad, Adilabad District-504293
					Survey/Plot/ Khasara Nos. and location	104/C/2, 105/E/2 & 45 at Buruguda Village
					Total Built up area for the proposed course and/or for existing course	GF – 1534.04 Sq.mts FF – 1534.04 Sq.mts SF – 767.02 Sq.mts **Total – 3835.01 Sq.mts**
					Type of Roofing	RCC
					Purpose for which building is being used/proposed to be used	Teacher Education.
					Date of issue	26.06.2016
					Name and designation of approving authority	D.Susheel Kumar, Executive Engineer
					The institution has submitted Photocopy of BP	
					Name and address of Society/Trust/Institution	Dr.Rajendra Prasad College of Education & Srinidhi Teachers Training Institute, Sy.No. 45, 104/C/2, 105/E/2, Asifabad, Andhra Pradesh

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

				Whether Building Plan is for the proposed institution/ course or also for some other TEI/course	Not Mentioned
				Plot area/land area	**21245.59 Sq.mts**
				Total built-up area	GF – 1534.04 Sq.mts FF – 1534.04 Sq.mts SF – 1534.04 Sq.mts **Total – 4602.14 Sq.mts**
				Built up area for the proposed and existing teacher education courses	**4602.14 Sq.mts**
				Date of approval	**Not Approved**
				Name and designation of approving authority	
	3	Faculty list is not in original; and; not approved	Copy of the faculty list duly approved.	**The institution has submitted photocopy of Faculty List.**	
				Faculty list approved/not approved	Approved
				Whether approved on each page or not	Yes
				No. of faculty as per norms of the course	16 Members
				Designation of the approving authority	Registrar, Kakatiya University
				Date of approval	Not Mentioned
	4	FDRs- not given	Attested copies of	**The institution has submitted photocopy of**	

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

				the FDRs are submitted.	FDRs.	
						5.00 Lakhs Endowment Fund	7.00 Lakhs Reserved Fund
					Submitted in Original	Photocopy Submitted	Photocopy Submitted
					FDR/ Ac number	a) 337825 b) 337880	a) 337836 b) 337879
					Name of the Bank	Andhra Bank	Andhra Bank
					Whether in Single or Joint A/c	Joint A/c	Joint A/c
					Duration of FDR	36 months	36 months
					Date of Issue	a) 26.06.2015 b) 09.07.2015	a) 29.06.2015 b) 09.07.2015
					Date of Maturity	a) 26.06.2017 b) 09.07.2017	a) 29.06.2018 b) 09.07.2018

Remarks:

1. **Copy of BP is for Dr. Rajendraprasad College of Education & Srinidhi Teacher Training Institute. BP is not approved by the Competent Authority.**
2. **Original FDR are not given. Photocopy is submitted.**
3. **Approved Photocopy of faculty list is not in the format and original not submitted also not mentioned whether they are full time are part time. (Type of approval).**
4. **A certificate issued by Tahsildhar dated 04.02.2015 stated that Sy.no. 104/L/2 extension 1.13, 105/E/2 extension 2.12 and Sy.No. 45 extension2.00 acres situated at Buruguda, Godavelli Villages of Asifiabad Mandal. This is for Bank Loan purpose only.**

The Committee considered the Show Cause Notice reply and has decided as under:-

1. **Their reply is not wholly satisfactory.**
2. **The BP is not approved by competent authority.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		3. The EC does not specify whether the ref. to the Bank Loan is <u>for mortgaging</u> or is <u>for redemption</u>. This must be clarified. **4. The faculty lists are approved. But only photocopies are given. Originals are required.** **4.1 <u>Faculty list for B.Ed.(2 units):</u>** **(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 <u>Faculty list for D.El.Ed.(1 unit):</u>** **(i) Only 1+7 are there against a requirement of 1+8.** **(ii) One Asst. Prof.(Persp.) is required.** **(iii) Asst. Prof.(Sc.), Asst. Prof.(Maths), Asst. Prof.(Eng.) and, Telugu Pandit do not have M.Ed.** **5. Issue SCN accordingly.**
19.	SRCAPP2016 30129 M.Ed 1 Unit Government College of Education, Vellore, Tamilnadu	**Government College of Education, Gandhi Nagar, No.1, West Gandhi Nagar, Katpadi Taluk, Vellore City & District-632006, Tamil Nadu** applied for grant of recognition to **Government College of Education, Kalinjur Village, Gandhi Nagar, Vellore Taluk, Kalinjur City, Vellore District-632006, 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 **21.06.2016,**The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on **06.07.2016.** 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 is processed. As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for M.Ed course in the State of

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Tamil Nadu.

As per the direction, the application has been scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and documents are as under:

The SRC in its 327th meeting held on 19th – 20th February, 2017 the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. **NOC given.**
2. **NAAC certificate given.**
3. **Title is clear.**
4. **LUC is there.**
5. **EC is in order.**
6. **BP is in order. However, it does not show the Sy. Nos.**
7. **BCC – not in format. Approved by Government Engineer. Sy. Nos. not shown.**
8. **Cause inspection.**
9. **Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.**

As per the decision of SRC, inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode during 20.02.2017 to 12.03.2017.

Inspection of the institution was cancelled by the system in online mode due to non-acceptance of visit by one or both the VT members within 10 days from the date of intimation.

An e-mail dated 25.02.2017 received by the office on 03.03.2017 from Alok Sharma and stating as under:-

"I have received an instruction from NCTE Hq Delhi, on my VT member dashboard, to inspect Government College of education, Vallure (SRCAPP201630129).

I have send my acceptance & I requested you to kindly send me details of other VT members and necessary documents".

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 06.03.2017 to 26.03.2017.

An email received by this office on 05.04.2017 from VT member Shri. Rakesh Sharma.

The SRC in its 336th meeting held on 19th – 20th April, 2017 the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. **This seems to be a jinxed case. This is the 3rd or 4th time such a disruption is occurring.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

2. **Anyway, there is now no discretion at our level. If one VT is not able to go, then, a new VT has to be generated on-line.**
3. **Let us do that since one member of the VT has expressed inability to go. But, unfortunately, this college will miss the 2017-18 academic year.**
4. **Process for a new V.T.**

Inspection of the institution was intimated to the institution through on-line mode during 07.03.2017 to 27.03.2017.

Inspection of the institution was conducted on 20th – 21st May, 2017 and the hard copy of the VT Report was received on 23.05.2017.

The matter was placed before SRC in its 340th held on 08th to 09th June, 2017 and the Committee considered the VT report along with records of the case and decided as under:-

1. **Title is there. Govt. Land.**
2. **EC is not required.**
3. **BP is a photocopy in A4 sheet. Not legible. Blue print not given.**
4. **BCC is not in format.**
5. **BP & BCC do not show the Sy. Nos.**
6. **Sy. Nos. in LUC & EC do not tally with Sy. Nos. in the title deed at all.**
7. **NOC is in order.**
8. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 15.06.2017. The institution submitted reply on 13.07.2017 and stating as under:-

Sl. No	Deficiency pointed out by SRC	Institution written representation	Remarks	
1.	BP is a photocopy in A4 sheet. Not legible.	Three Photocopies of building plans submitted	Blue print/Notarized copy of Building Plan submitted/ Not submitted :-	Three Photocopies of building plans submitted
			Name and address of Society/Trust/In	Not mentioned

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

			Blue print not given.		stitution	
					Whether Building Plan is for the proposed institution/ course or also for some other TEI/course	Not mentioned
					Plot area/land area	Ground floor 409 Sqmtrs
					Total built-up area	Area: 1. Ground Floor — 1806.65 Sq .mtrs; 2. First Floor — 838.00 Sq. mtrs; 3. Ground floor — 409 mtrs; Total — 2644.65
					Survey No/ Plot No/ Khasara No.	1. sy. no. 295/2, 295/3A, 295/3B 2. sy. no. 295/2, 295/3A, 295/3B 3. sy. No. 294/1, 294/2, 294/4, 294/5
					Built up area for the proposed and existing teacher education courses	Not mentioned
					Date of approval	05.07.2017
					Name and designation of approving authority	Executive Engineer PWD, Technical Education Division

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		2.	**BP & BCC do not show the Sy. Nos**	Building Completion certificate issued by Executive Engineer (PWD)	Notarized copy of the Building Completion Certificate submitted /not submitted	A copy of Building Completion Certificate
					Name and address of Society/Trust/institution	Government College of Education, Katpadi, Vellore
					Survey/Plot/ Khasara Nos. and location	Sy. No. 294/1, 294/2, 294/4, 294/5, 295/2, 295/3A, 295/3B, 298/1 & 298/2, Kalinjur, Vellore Corporation.
					Built up area for the proposed course and/or for existing course	Ground Floor: 4400.84 Sq.ft
					Type of Roofing	RCC
					Purpose for which building is being used/proposed to be used	M.Ed Course
					Date of issue	08.07.2017
					Name and designation of approving authority	Executive Engnieering PWD, Technical Education Division, TPGIT Campus, Vellore
			Sy. Nos. in LUC & EC do not tally with Sy. Nos. in the title deed at	Regarding the survey no. in LUC and EC, we want to inform you that the survey nos have been mentioned wrongly. So we have applied for LUC by submitting the Government order to Thalsildhar office. Accordingly to the Government	LUC not submitted	

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

			all.	deed, the survery nos. mentioned in the document (Which is termed as 'purambokku') that has been highlighted in page no. 3 & 4 belong to the B.Ed College.	

Remarks:

- **Details of earmarked/plinth area not mentioned in the 3 photocopies of Building Plans.**
- **Land Use Certificate not submitted.**

The Committee considered the Show Cause Notice reply and has decided as under:-

1. **NOC is given.**
2. **NAAC certificate given.**
3. **BP & BCC are approved. Built-up area is adequate.**
4. **FDRs are not required.**
5. **More than 10 years of B.Ed. experience is there.**
6. **Collect the corrected LUC for record.**
7. **Issue LOI for M.Ed.(1 unit)**

20.	APS00278 B.Ed (1 unit) D.El.Ed. (2 units) AVM College of	**AVM College of Education, Nalgonda Revenue Division, Nakrekal, Moosi Road, Nalgonda District-508211, Telangana** had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition for Secondary (B.Ed) course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 (Hundred) Students. The institution was granted recognition on **24.12.2003** with an intake of 100 students and 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).

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

	Education, Nalgonda, Telangana	Registrar, Osmania University furnished information pertaining to the affiliated Teacher Education Centre institutions offering the course n own/permanent/temporary leased buildings vide letter dt. 4th May, 2009. The SRC in its 176th Meeting held on 27th-28th May, 2009 considered the matter and decided to issue show cause notice. As per the decision of SRC, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 02.07.2009. The SRC in its 178th Meeting held on 13th-14th July, 2009 the Committee observed from record of the institution that the institution was accorded recognition in the rented premises and they had not yet shifted to the permanent premises/building In view of non-shifting of colleges to permanent building, the Committee decided to issue show cause notice under section 17 of NCTE Act and obtain shifting fees and other documents for causing inspection for shifting. Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 02.09.2009. **Reply to the show cause notice not received.** 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 revise norms and standards before 31.10.2015. On 10.02.2015, the institution submitted the affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students. The SRC in its 276th meeting held on 7th-9th 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. Accordingly, a revised recognition order was issued to the institution on **12.05.2015** with an annual intake of two basic units of 50 students each with a condition that the institution has not shifted to its own premises as stipulated in its Formal Recognition order dated 24.12.2003. A written representation was received from the institution on 30.07.2015 along with relevant documents and stating as follows: ***" I am reply to the order No. FSRO/NCTE/APS00278/B.Ed/2014-2015/64376 dated 12.05.2015 I am herewith complying the conditions to fulfil the norms for shifting the premises in accordance with clause (I) & (II) the following are the documents.***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

1. ***Land & Building documents.***
2. ***Encumbrance Certificate.***
3. ***Land use certificate.***
4. ***Building plan.***
5. ***Approved staff list.***

I further state that we have submitting the DD of Rs. 40,000/- dated 03.10.2009 drawn on SBH, Nakrekal branch as prescribed inspection fee.

The institution has submitted a letter on 30.10.2015 and 31.10.2015 regarding approval for one unit for B.Ed from 2015-2016.

The SRC in its 315th meeting held on 17th – 18th June 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:

1. **Title deed is in order.**
2. **Inspection fee has not been paid at all. They claim to have paid ₹ 40,000/-. Ask them to produce our receipt since there is no evidence in our file of such a payment. In any case, they have to pay ₹ 1,10,000/- more.**
3. **Of the documents given, LUC and EC are in order.**
4. **BP is not approved by competent authority. BCC, original FDRs and latest Faculty List are not given.**
5. **Collect the fee and cause inspection for shifting B.Ed (2 units).**
6. **Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.**

As per the decision of SRC, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members on 12.07.2016. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 13.08.2016 and VT report along with Original D.D. of Rs. 1,10,000/- bearing no. 905295, documents and CD received on 18.08.2016.

The SRC in its 323rd meeting held on 16th – 18th November, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. Title is there.
2. LUC is in order.
3. EC is there.
4. BP is in order.
5. BCC is in order.
6. Built-up-area is adequate only for one unit of B.Ed. They want only one unit.
7. **Original FDRs not given.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

8. **Faculty list not given.**
9. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent to the institution on 05.12.2016.

Institution submitted its reply along with relevant documents on 21.12.2016 and stating as under;

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No</th><th>Deficiencies pointed out by SRC</th><th>Written representation</th><th>Remarks</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Original FDRs not given</td><td>It is submitted that the Xerox copies of the FDRs was submitted to the visiting team members at the time of inspection. As per your instructions I am herewith submitting the following said original FDRs for your kind consideration.
<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No</th><th>FDR No</th><th>Date</th><th>Amount</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>292443</td><td>04.12.2012</td><td>Rs. 5,00,000/-</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>048432 5</td><td>16.07.2009</td><td>Rs. 3,00,000/-</td></tr>
</table></td><td>The institution submitted original FDRs of Rs. 5 lakhs and Rs. 3 lakhs in Joint A/c for the period of 5 years.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Faculty list not given</td><td>It is submitted that at the time of inspection the faculty list was submitted to the visiting team members. Now as per your directions again we are submitting the faculty list in your prescribed format.</td><td>The institution submitted 1 + 9 photocopy of faculty list which is not approved by the affiliating body. They have enclosed letter on</td></tr>
</table>

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

			approval of teaching staff received from Mahatma Gandhi University.

NOTE:

The SRC in its 342nd meeting held on 05th & 06th July, 2017 accept the request of the institution for one basic unit instead of two basic units and decided to reduce the intake from 2 units to 1 unit.
Accordingly, as per decision of SRC one unit order is being sent.

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

1. This is a RPRO case for shifting.
2. They have a D.El.Ed.(1 unit) case.
3. Instead of shifting, they bought the same leased land. Therefore, there is no need now to shift.
4. Built-up is 4000+ sq.mts. as against 3500 sq.mts. required.
5. The request for reduction of units from 2 to 1 is accepted 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 2nd 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

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

in the 2nd 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.

6. This arrangement wil 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.

6.1 Faculty list of 1+9 for B.Ed. is given. It is not approved by the affiliating University.

6.2 Since their intake strength is reduced from 2 to 1 and since from 2015-16, they have been admitting only 50 students, a Faculty strength of 1+9 from 2017-18 is acceptable.

6.3 (i) Principal does not have Ph.D.

(ii) No Faculty is there in the Perspective Group.

(iii) In the Pedagogy Group, there is no Asst. Prof. for Maths.

(iv) In the Pedagogy Group there is an Asst. Prof.(Comm.) who is not qualified since Commerce is not a recognized school subject.

7.1 Faculty list for D.El.Ed.

(i) They have only 1+7 Faculty as against requirement of 1+8.

(ii) In the Pedagogy Group there is no Lecturer for Social Science.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		(iii) In the Pedagogy Group the Lecturer(Telugu) does not have M.Ed. **(iv) Latest approved Faculty list should be obtained.** **8. Issue SCN accordingly.**
21.	APS00272 B.Ed 2 Units APS02905 D.El.Ed 1 Unit Crescent College of Education, Karimnagar, Telangana	**Crescent College of Education, Karimnagar Revenue Division, #2-8-237, Mukarrampura, Karimnagar District-505001, Telagana** had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to **Crescent College of Education, Karimnagar Revenue Division, #2-8-237, Mukarrampura, Karimnagar District-505001, Telangana** for **B.Ed** course one year from the academic session 2002-2003. The recognition was granted to the institution **on 27.05.2003** with an annual intake **100** students from the academic session **2002-2003** 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 rented premises). The SRC in its 178th meeting held on 13th-14th July, 2009 considered the list of institutions were accorded recognition in the rented premises and they had not yet shifted to the permanent building and it has decided to issue show cause notice under section 17 of NCTE Act and obtain shifting fees and other documents for causing inspection for shifting. Accordingly, a letter was issued to the institution on 01.09.2009. The institution has submitted its written representation along with DD of Rs.40.000/- bearing no.318575 dated 17.09.2009 on 01.10.2009. Inspection intimation was sent to institution on 25.01.2011. Accordingly, shifting inspection of the institution was carried out on 12.02.2011. As per VT remarks the management is also running D.Ed course in the same building. The SRC in its 206th meeting held on 09th -10th June, 2010 considered the VT report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and it was decided to serve show cause notice for the following: • **As per VT report, the total area earmarked for B.Ed & D.Ed is 2630 sq.mts, which is grossly inadequate for running all the two courses; as per the NCTE norms, the total built-up area requirement is a minimum of 3000 sq.meters.** • **VCD is not available.** • **The land is on private lease deed in individual name, which is not in accordance with NCTE regulations. As on date, the institution has not shifted to own land.** • **Details of the other programmes run by the management in the**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		same building be submitted. • **Bye-Laws of the Society are to be submitted by the management.** • **Approved building plan from Govt. authority is to be submitted.** • **The institute has not submitted the Land usage certificate from a competent Govt. approved authority.** • **Non-Encumbrance certificate from the competent authority is not submitted.** • **The Khasara No.2-8-323 as indicated in land documents is not matching with the Building Completion Certificate, affidavit and building plan. Building plan is for Sy.No. 2-8-275 and also not approved by the competent authority.** As per the decision of SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 07.07.2011. The institution has submitted its written representation on 08.08.2011 and 12.09.2011 and requested to provide a copy of the VTR to enable to reply to the show cause notice. The SRC in its 211th meeting held on 21st-23rd September, 2011 considered the request of the institution and it has decided to send the VT reports to the institution for providing explanation for the show cause notice and directed the management to reply within 30 days notice along with necessary certificates/documents in order to take a final decision in the matter; failing which action will be taken including the withdrawal of recognition, based on the records available, with no further notice. Accordingly, a letter was sent to the institution on 14.11.2011. The institution has not replied letter dated 14.11.2011. **Further there is no action taken in this file.** The institution has submitted its willingness affidavit on 06.02.2015 as per regulations 2014. **Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 11.05.2015 with a condition that the institution has not shifted to its own premises as stipulated in its Formal Recognition order dated 27.05.2003.** An e-mail dated 17.08.2015 was received from Satavahana University, Karimnagar, Telangana on 17.08.2015 (hardcopy received on 20.08.2015) regarding clarification for extending affiliation for the academic year 2015-16 along with a copy of letter issued to institution. The letter stated as follows: ***".....enclosing the letters addressed to the respective colleges wherein the observation of committee is mentioned. In this regard you are requested to go through the observations made by the committee and suggest us clarification to take further course of action with regard to extension of affiliation to the above mentioned***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

6 B.Ed colleges Since last date to furnish their list of colleges to the convener Ed.CTE is 20th August 2015".

Accordingly, a letter was sent to Satavahana University on 18.08.2015.

The institution has submitted its written representation regarding permitting change of premises on 07.09.2015 for both B.Ed and D.Ed as per application of shifting of premises along with DD of Rs.1,50.000/- and relevant documents.

On 08.02.2016 a letter is received from the Director of School Education Government of Telangana Hyderabad vide letter No.Rc.No.99/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 following list of 76 colleges including **Crescent College of Education, Karimnagar Revenue Division, #2-8-237, Mukarrampura, Karimnagar District-505001, 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)
5	Not possessing land in the name of the society/Institution	04 (Annexure V)

The matter was placed before SRC in its 302nd Meeting held on 09th-11th February, 2016 considered the letter from the Director School Education Department, Telangana State and decided that ***"What with the 3 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".***

Again as per the decision of SRC, the matter was placed before SRC in its 309th Meeting held on 12th-14th April, 2016 and the committee considered in respect of

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

(76 colleges) regarding not fulfilling the deficiencies and it has decided to issue show cause notice for the following to **Crescent College of Education, Karimnagar Reveenue Division, #2-8-237, Mukarrampura, Karimnagar District-505001, Telagana**

- **Functioning in leased premises even after the stipulated period.**

Accordingly, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 13.05.2016. The institution has submitted its written representation on 30.05.2016.

The SRC in its 318th meeting held on 08th – 09th August, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:

1. The complaint was that the college continued to function in leased premises beyond the time given. They have replied to show that they have been pursuing action to shift. Ultimately now, a VT has also gone for inspection.
2. Upon receipt of the VT inspection report, process for further consideration.
3. Apprise the Director (School Education), Telangana of these developments.
4. Inform the affiliating authority viz., Director (SCERT).

Accordingly, a letter sent to Satavahana University regarding the decision of SRC 318th meeting on 15.09.2016.

The inspection of the institution was conducted on 01.10.2016 and the VT report along with documents and Original CD was received on 06.10.2016.The institution submitted BCC, BP and EC on 14.10.2016.

The SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th – 12th April, 2017, considered the matter and decided as under:

1. ***Title is clear. Land area is adequate.***
2. ***LUC/EC are in order.***
3. ***BP is in order. Built-up area shown (3602 sq.mts.) is adequate.***
4.1 ***BCC is given. Not approved by Govt. Engineer. Built-up area of Ground Floor (1801 sq.mts) + First Floor (1801 sq.mts.) is adequate.***
4.2 ***VT has reported second floor is under construction. This is not clear. Ask the College to explain the correct factual position.***
5. ***VT has reported that the D.El.Ed. course is not running for want of enrolment. Ask the College to explain why the recognition should not be withdrawn.***
6. ***Latest approved Faculty list is required.***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

7. ***FDRs are required in original in joint account, on 5 year validity @ 7+5 lakhs for each unit of each course.***
8. ***Issue SCN accordingly for shifting permission.***

Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 20.04.2017. The institution submitted its reply on 24.04.2017 along with documents.

The SRC in its 340th meeting held on 08th – 09th June, 2017, considered the matter and decided as under:

1. **FDRs are required in original, in joint account with R.D. with a 5-year validity @7+5 lakhs per programme.**
2. All documents are in order.
3. Land area and built-up area are adequate.
4. Second Floor construction is complete.
5. D.El.Ed. is now running.

6.1 The Faculty list of D.El.Ed. is not in original; Only a photocopy is given.

6.2 Only the last page is authenticated by the Director. Other pages are not properly authenticated.

6.3 Lect. (Maths) is not there.

6.4 Lect.(Zoology) is shown as Lec.(Scl.Sc.); he should be shown as Lect.(Sc.)

7.1 Faculty list of B.Ed. is authenticated by the Registrar only in the last page. Other pages are not properly authenticated.

7.2 2 Asst. Profs. (at least one of them in Psychology) are required in Perspectives .

7.3 Asst. Prof. (Phy.Sc.) has less than 55% marks.

7.4 2 Asst. Profs. (MFA) are there. One of them has to be changed to Asst. Prof. (Perf. Arts).

7.5 3 Asst. Profs. (Maths/Bio.Sc./Scl.Sc.) are repeated in D.El.Ed. also. This is not allowed. These are seen as vacancies in B.Ed.

8. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent on 15.06.2017.

Now, the institution submitted its reply along with documents and written representation for change of address in shifting order is stating as under;

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Sl. No	Deficiency pointed out in the notice	Institution written representation	Remarks
1	FDRs are required in original, in joint account with R.D. with a 5-year validity @7+5 lakhs per programme.	Now we are submitting new FDRs.	The institution submitted original FDRs of Rs. 7 lakhs (2 nos) and Rs. 5 lakhs (2 nos) for both B.Ed and D.El.Ed courses.
6.1	The Faculty list of D.El.Ed. is not in original; Only a photocopy is given.	Now we are submitting original approved faculty list of D.El.Ed	The institution submitted photocopy of 1 + 7 faculty list approved by original seal and signature of the Director, SCERT.
6.2	Only the last page is authenticated by the Director. Other pages are not properly authenticated.	Now we are submitting the approved faculty list which is authenticated all pages by the Director, SCERT, Telangana.	Submitted.
6.3	Lect. (Maths) is not there	Principal (Ahamdulla Baig M.Sc (Maths), M.Ed) itself lect. In Maths.	----------
6.4	Lect.(Zoology) is shown as Lec.(Scl.Sc.); he should be shown as Lect.(Sc.)	Kudidi Udayasri M.Sc (Zoology) M.Ed is lect. In Science Lect. In Social Science read as lect. In Science. There is another lect. For Social Studies "Cheekoti Balaiah"	As stated by the institution.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		M.A (Public Administration) M.Ed.	
7.1	Faculty list of B.Ed. is authenticated by the Registrar only in the last page. Other pages are not properly authenticated.	Now we are submitting approved faculty list of B.Ed authenticated all pages by the Registrar.	The institution submitted 1 + 6 and 9 original faculty list which is approved the the Registrar, Satavahana University.
7.2	2 Asst. Profs. (at least one of them in Psychology) are required in Perspectives .	Asst. Profs. "Dayaker Pulgam" M.A (Psychology) M.Ed is now ratified as a Asst. Prof. in Perspectives.	Submitted
7.3	Asst. Prof. (Phy.Sc.) has less than 55% marks.	Asst. Prof. "Ranjith Kumar C" M.Sc (Physics) M.Ed is now ratified as Asst. Prof. in Physical Science.	Submitted
7.4	2 Asst. Profs. (MFA) are there. One of them has to be changed to Asst. Prof. (Perf. Arts).	Asst.Prof. "Satish Kumar" M.A (Performing Arts) is now ratified as a Asst. Prof. in Performing Arts.	Submitted
7.5	3 Asst. Profs. (Maths/Bio.Sc./Scl. Sc.) are repeated in D.El.Ed. also. This is not allowed. These are seen as vacancies in B.Ed.	Now 3 Asst. Profs. Vacancies in B.Ed are filled by other faculty members. 1) "Ravi Bodige" M.Sc (Maths), M.Ed 2) "S.Srinivas" M.Sc (Zoology),	Submitted

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		M.Ed 3) "L Praveen Reddy" M.A (Public Administration), M.Ed	

"....I am herewith submitting that we applied for the shifting of our Crescent College of Education (B.Ed) APS00272 and Crescent Elementary Teacher Training Institution (D.El.Ed) APSO2905 college premises to new address on 07.09.2015 your inward number "157898" at that time our new premises was in Karimnagar District. After the bifurcation and amendment of new districts by the Govt. of Telangana now our new premises belongs to Peddapalli District.

New Premises - Old Address	*New Premises – New Address*
H.No. 2-8-44/4, Qudratnagar, Faran Street, Peddapally, Karimnagar District, Telangana State 505172.	*H.No. 2-8-44/4, Qudratnagar, Faran Street, Peddapally, Peddapally District, Telangana State 505172.*

Hence, I kindly request you to consider this matter and change the address."

The Committee considered the Show Cause Notice reply and has decided as under:-

1. Faculty list of B.Ed.
   (i) Principal has no Ph.D.
2. Faculty list of D.El.Ed.
   (i) Lect.(Maths) is not there.
   (ii) It will not be correct to show the Principal as a Lecturer in Maths.
3. FDRs are in order.
4. Permit Shifting.

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		5. Issue of a new FR at the new address under the 2014 Regulations can be considered only when the 2 deficiencies pointed out above have been rectified. **6. Review the status and put up in Sept. 2017.**
22.	APS02678 B.Ed 1 unit Katipally Ravinder Reddy College of Education, Nizamabad, Telangana.	**Kattipally Ravinder Reddy Education Society, Nizamabad, Andhra Pradesh** submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to **Katipally Ravinder Reddy College of Education, 6-2-157/28, Subhash Nagar, Nizamabad-503002, Andhra Pradesh** for **B.Ed** course of **one year** duration from the academic session **2004-05** with an annual intake of **100** students. The recognition was granted to the institution on **23.03.2005** with a condition that the institution shall shift to its own premises /building within three years for the date of recognition (in case the course is started in rented premises). The institution submitted its willingness affidavit on 02.02.2015 as per regulations 2014. Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 11.05.2015 with a condition that the institution has not shifted to its own premises as stipulated in its formal recognition order dated 23.03.2005. The institution has not submitted reply till date. NCTE Hqrs has forwarded a written representation submitted by the institution regarding requesting for time was considered by SRC in its 292nd meeting held on 29th & 30th September, 2015 and the Committee decided as under: **1. Oct.15 is the last date commonly for all institutions to file documents. We cannot go beyond that exception for any particular institution.** **2. Inform them accordingly and put up again in early Nov 15.** Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 12.11.2015. The SRC in its 294th meeting held on 14th – 16th November, 2015 considered the list of colleges not submitted documents for shifting in compliance to the condition laid down in revised recognition order for 2015-2016 and it has decided to issue show cause notice for the following deficiency: • **The institution has not submitted documents for shifting as mentioned in the revised recognition order as per the regulation 2014.**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Show cause notice was not sent to the institution.

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

1. **This is a shifting case.**
2. **We had issued SCN for documents for shifting.**
3. **There is nothing on file to show whether the SCN was issued/served.**
4. **Issue SCN again.**

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 09.02.2017.

Now, the institution submitted its written representation on 13.03.2017 and stating as follows;

".....the management received your office letter dt 09.02.2017 as referred above in reference and submitting the following reply.

The management did not receive any type of notice till 16.02.2017 except the above referred notice which was received on 17.02.2017 in evening time.

The concern Engineer who is looking after our file for proposed construction of building for B.Ed course is not available now and his presence is expected by the end of May, 2017 hence we are unable to submit all the details now along with explanation/reply. Under these circumstances, we are requesting you sir, to extend the time to submit our explanation/reply to the above referred show cause notice dt 09.02.2017. We undertake to submit the detailed reply by the end of May 2017 or in June 2017 as circumstances are beyond our control. It is first time we are requesting you sir to extend the time limit to submit the explanation to the above referred notice dt 09.02.2017.
Therefore, once again the Management is requesting your authority, to extend the time limit to submit explanation with all details by the May 2017 or in June 2017 as the circumstances are beyond our control, otherwise we will sustain irreparable loss and injury. Your authority got ample powers to extend the time limit also, to submit the reply to the said show cause notice dt 09.02.2017 as we are seeking the time for first, to submit the explanation for the said show cause notice and do the needful in the matter."

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

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

		1. They wanted time till June 17. It is already August 2017. **2. Put up in the next meeting on 17 August, 2017.**
23.	APS07139 B.Ed 2 Units APS09412 D.Ed 1 Unit Sri Vasavi Raja Prathap College of Education, Mahabubnagar, Telangana	**APS09412/D.Ed** **Rajavaram Educational Society, Mahabubnagar District, Andhra Pradesh** submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to **Sri Vasavi Raja Prathap College of Elementary School Education, H.No. 1-10-85/3/C, S.S. Gutta, Christian Pally, New Town, Mahabubnagar Distirct-509001, Andhra Pradesh** for offering **D.Ed** course of two year duration. The recognition was granted to the institution on **05.11.2008** with an annual intake of 50 students. The institution submitted its written representation along with DD of Rs.1,50.000/- bearing no.152866 dated 23.05.2015 (taken into account) on 01.06.2015 and relevant documents regarding application form for shifting of premises for D.Ed College on 01.06.2015. As per the decision of SRC, a letter along with replies of the institutions are sent to the Director, SCERT on 02.11.2015. The Government of Telangana School Education Department submitted its written representation dated 21.11.2015 received by SRC on 27.11.2015. The SRC in its 295th meeting held on 28th -30th November & 1st December, 2015 considered the letter dated 21.11.2015 from Government of Telangana School Education Department and it has decided as under: 1. ***SCERT has clarified the revised certificates as genuine for 18 TEI's close the complaint case relating to these 18 TEI's*** 2. ***For the 4 TEISs that have not cared to produce any revised genuine certificate, withdraw recognition w.e.f 2015-16.*** Before issuance of withdrawal order, the institution submitted its written representation on 10.12.2015 along with documents. The matter was placed before SRC in its 296th meeting held on 15th to 16th December, 2015 and decided as under; • **Ask SCERT to respond** Accordingly letter was sent to the SCERT on 29.01.2016. Now, the institution has submitted written representation on 27.05.2016 and state follows; ***"....With reference to the above cited subject to SRC 296th meeting held on 15th to 16th Dec, 2015 "ask SCERT to respond" to submit the detailed***

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

report.

Therefore, the SCERT TS has sent mail & hard copy and also submitting the copy."

The SRC in its 315th meeting held on 17th & 18th June, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;

- **In this case, a decision was taken to withdraw recognition because of a complaint received from the SCERT about fake 'Fire Safety Certificate'. The SCERT has now accepted the reply given by the college and closed the complaint-case. In the event, the decision taken earlier to withdraw recognition is reviewed and the recognition is restored. Consequently, this case is cleared for consideration towards causing shifting inspection. Since the related case of B.Ed (2 units), run by the same management has been separately cleared for a similar inspection, both the courses can be covered by a composite inspection.**

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC a letter was sent to the institution on 12.07.2016.

APS07139/B.Ed

Rajavaram Educational Society, Mahabubnagar District, Telangana submitted an application to the SRC of NCTE for grant of recognition to **Sri Vasavi Raja Prathap College of Education, H.No. 1-10-85/8/F, Opp Taj Function Hall, New Town, Mahabubnagar-509001, Andhra Pradesh.** The recognition to the institution was granted vide order dated **22.06.2007.**

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 the affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students on 19.03.2015.
The SRC in its 276th meeting held on 7th-9th 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.

Accordingly, a revised order was issued to the institution on 06.05.2015 (two units) with a condition that the institution has not maintained/revalidated FDRs.

The institution submitted its written representation on 01.06.2015 along with the fee of Rs. 1,50,000/- DD No. 152865 dt. 23.05.2015 and some relevant documents and stated as follows:

"…..I submit few line for your kind consideration that Sri Vasavi Raja

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Prathap College of Education, Shifting for old premises to New premises i.e from Newton, Shashabgutta, Mahabubnagar To in Sy No.130/B, 131/A, Pillamari Road, Doddalonipally, Boyapally Sivar, Mahabubnagar Mandal & District, In this regard as per rules and regulations 2014 stipulated by NCTE. We are herewith submitting application for shifting of premises with all necessary documents submitting and paid Rs. 1,50,000 through DD No. 0152865 dated 23.05.2015 Vijaya Bank, Mahabubnagar as per NCTE 2014 norms for B.Ed colleges build up area increased 500 Sq mts for B.Ed college new norms sufficient premises. So please grant me permission to shift our premises."

The SRC in its 315th Meeting held on 17th and 18th June 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:

1. **Title deed and EC are in order.**
2. **Inspection fee has been paid in full.**
3. **BP is not approved by competent authority.**
4. **BCC, LUC, original FDRs and, latest Faculty List are not given.**
5. **Cause Composite inspection for shifting B.Ed (2 units) and D.El.Ed (1 unit).**
6. **Ask VT to collect all relevant documents and check built-up area in particular.**

As per the decision of SRC, letter for inspection was sent on 12.07.2016 and the inspection of the institution was conducted on 26.09.2016. VT report along with documents and CD received on 30.09.2016.

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

1. **Original FDRs not given.**
2. **Faculty list not given.**
3. **CD is defective. Obtain a fresh CD showing details of the interior and the nature of flooring done.**
4. **Issue SCN accordingly.**

As per decision of SRC, show cause notice was sent on 16.11.2016.

The institution submitted show cause notice reply along with relevant documents on 13.12.2016.

The SRC in its 336th SRC meeting held on 19th & 20th April, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. **This case covers both D.El.Ed. and B.Ed.**
2. **This case involves 'shifting' at the request of the applicant.**
3. **Composite inspection was conducted. Process the VT**

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Inspection Report for B.Ed. & D.El.Ed.

4.1 Faculty list should be the latest approved Faculty list.

4.2 The University is reported to have said, they will approve the Faculty list after award of recognition by SRC. We must clarify that this is not a case of 'fresh recognition'; this is only a case of 'shifting'. Therefore, University may issue the Faculty list without insisting on a fresh recognition order.

5. FDRs are required in original in Joint account, with 5 – year validity, @ 7+5 lakhs for each unit of each course.

6. Process accordingly.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution and University on 26.04.2017.

As per SRC decision VT report was processed as under;

Name and address of the institution (as per initial application)	Sri Vasavi Raja Parham College of Education and Sri Vasavi Raja Prathap College of Elementary School Education, H.No. 1-10-85/8/F, Opp Taj Function Hall, New Town, Mahabubnagar – 50900, Telangana
Name and address of the Society	Rajavaram Educational Society, Mahabubnagar District, Telangana.
Date of Inspection for shifting	26.09.2016
Address of the institution as per VT Report (New Location)	Sri Vasavi Raja Prathap College of Education and Elementary School Education, Sy.No. 130/B, 131/A Pillamarri Road, Dodalonipally (V), H/o Boyapally, Mahabubnagar (M & Dist), 5-139, Pillamarri Road, Dodalonipallu (V), H/o Boyapally, Mahabubnagar (M & Dist).

Details of courses as per the VT Report

Sl. No	Name of the Course	Intake

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman