

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COMMITTEE
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
BANGALORE

Minutes of the 352nd Meeting of SRC held at the Conference Hall of
NCTE, Bangalore on 04th – 05th January, 2018.

The following persons attended the Meeting:-

- | | | |
|---|---|----------|
| 1. Sri. S. Sathyam | - | Chairman |
| 2. Dr. M.P. Vijaya Kumar | - | Member |
| 3. Ms. Angelin Golda
Regional Director (I/c) | - | Convenor |

The following members did not attend the Meeting:

- Prof. K. Dorasami, Prof. Sandeep Ponnala, Prof. M.S. Lalithamma and the Representatives of the Govts. of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu- Pondicherry, Karnataka, Kerala, A& N.

Consideration of Court cases, Appeal case, Vt report: (Volume-1)

1.	SRCAPP2016 30157 M.P.Ed 1Unit Mother Terasa College of Physical Education, Pudukottai, Tamil Nadu	<p>Mother Terasa College of Physical Education, Veerapatti Village, Mettusalai, Illuppur Taluk, Veerapatti City, Pudukottai District-622102, Tamil Nadu</p> <p>Mother Teresa Educational Charitable Trust, Veerapatti Village, Mettusalai Street, Illuppur Taluk, Pudukkottai City & District-622102, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Mother Terasa College of Physical Education, Veerapatti Village, Mettusalai, Illuppur Taluk, Veerapatti City, Pudukottai District-622102, Tamil Nadu for offering M.P.Ed course of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.08.2016, followed by Reminder I on 12.10.2016 and Reminder II on 11.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Govt. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.P.Ed course in the State of Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application has been scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and documents were placed before SRC in its 327th meeting held during 19th to 20th January, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NOC not given. 2. Photocopy of title deed is given. Title is clear. We need a photocopy certified by the Sub-Registrar. Land area is adequate. 3. LUC is in order. 4. EC is in order. 5. BP is approved. Built-up area shown is 3364.31 sq.mts. 6. BCC is not approved by competent authority. Built up area shown is 3010 sq.mts. 7. FDRs not given. 8. Cause composite inspection. 9. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents. <p>As per the decision of SRC, inspection of the institution for M.P.Ed course was scheduled through online mode during 01.02.2017 to 21.02.2017. Two VT members have been given their acceptance for the visit.</p> <p>Hard copy of Visiting Team report was received on 22.02.2017, The SRC in its 331st meeting held on 22nd, February, 2017 directly considered the VT Report and decided as under:-</p>
----	---	---

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have B.P.Ed. operating since 2008 (1 unit) 2. NOC is given. 3. Land area is inadequate: available is 6.3 acres as against a requirement of 8 acres. 4. Built-up area required is 2700 sq.mts; available is 3010 sq.mts. 5. FDRs in original are required for verification. 6. Issue SCN for rejection. <p>Before issuance of Show Cause Notice, in the meantime based on the website information of the SRC decision; the institution has submitted a reply on 07.03.2017 (hard copy) along with LUC, Affidavit & original FDRs.</p> <p>The SRC in its 333rd meeting held on 24th March, 2017 considered the reply and documents and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their reply relating to land area and FDRs are seen. 2. FDRs @7+5 lakhs per programme, per unit, are required. 3. The NOC given is only for B.P.Ed., not for M.P.Ed. 4. Issue Show Cause Notice for rejection. <p>Before issuance of SCN, based on the website information of the SRC decision, the institution has submitted representation through e-mail on 04.04.2017 and hard copy received on 04.04.2017.</p> <p>The reply was placed before SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th to 12th April, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The NOC is from the State Govt. and not from the affiliating body. 2. Reject the application. 3. Return FDRs, if any. 4. Close the file. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Rejection order was issued to the institution on 20.04.2017</p> <p>An e-mail dated 19.06.2017 received by R. C. Chopra Section Officer NCTE, regarding Brief and records of Regulatory files No.91-13th on 20.06.2016.</p> <p>A letter was addressed to R. C. Chopra Section Officer NCTE along with Original File/records on 21.06.2017.</p> <p>The Appellate Authority vide No.89-317/E-2576/2017 Appeal/13th meeting - 2017 dated 21.08.2017 was received by this office on 29.08.2017 and the committee concluded that:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“AND WHEREAS the impugned refusal order dated 20.04.2017 on the ground that NOC is from the State Government and not from the affiliating body is therefore, substantiated. Recommendation of State Government is obtained by Regional Committee under clause 7(4) of the regulations whereas under clause 5(3) the onus of obtaining and submitting NOC issue by affiliating body rests with the</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>applicant institution. Appeal Committee, noting that NOC was not submitted by appellatant institution, decided to confirm the refusal order dated 20.04.2017.</i></p> <p><i>AND WHEREAS after perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, the documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Committee concluded that the SRC was justified in refusing recognition and therefore, the appeal deserved to be rejected and the order of the SRC is confirmed."</i></p> <p>The same was placed before SRC in its 345th meeting held on 21st to 22nd September, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided to "noted the matter"</p> <p>An e-mail received from Advocate Shri. M.T.Arunan on 12.09.2017. A letter addressed to the Advocate Shri. M.T.Arunan regarding W.P.No. 23935 of 2017 filed by Mother Teresa College of Physical Education, Pudukottai Dist. Tamil Nadu on 12.09.2017.</p> <p>The institution submitted its written representation on 21.09.2017 along with a copy of court order dated 14.09.2017.</p> <p>A court order dated 14.09.2017 received by this office on 27.09.2017 in the High Court of Judicature at Madras in W.P.No. 23935 of 2017 filed by Mother Teresa College of Physical Education, Pudukottai Dist. Tamil Nadu and stating as under:-</p> <p>5. <i>"It is seen that the petitioner in pursuant to the order passed by the first respondent has sent a communication on 22.08.2017 informing that they have obtained the No Objection Certificate from the affiliating body apart obtained the same from the Government. If the petitioner has obtained the No Objection Certificate from the state Government and the affiliating body as well, I do not think that there will be any difficulty to the second respondent to re-consider the issue once again based on the said No Objection Certificate given by the affiliating body, since such was the only reason stated to reject the request of the petitioner.</i></p> <p>6. <i>Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned orders are set aside. Consequently, the matter is remitted back to the second respondent (SRC-NCTE) for passing fresh order, after considering the No Objection Certificate issued by the affiliating body as well. Such exercise shall be done by the second respondent within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.</i></p> <p>The same was placed before SRC in its 346th meeting held on 24th to 25th October, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. We had rejected their application for non-submission of NOC.1.2 The Appellate Authority had confirmed our order.1.3 But, the H.C quashed our order; and directed us to consider the NOC submitted subsequently by them.2.1 It will be difficult for us to accept this directive. We had rejected many many
--	--

	<p>cases for non-submission of NOC within the stipulated date. Giving a different approach to this case will be unfair to all those cases.</p> <p>2.2 We should, therefore, go up in appeal.</p> <p>As per the legal Guidelines of NCTE vide dated 02.05.2017 para xiii states that:-</p> <p><i>"In cases where the directions are against the NCTE Rules, Regulations, Norms and Standards, an action shall be taken to file an appeal against such directions:</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>a. For filing of Appeals before Supreme Court of India, approval of Chairperson, NCTE is required.</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>b. For filing of appeals before the High Courts and other Courts approval of Member Secretary, NCTE is required".</i></p> <p>Approval has to be obtained from Member Secretary, NCTE-Hqrs before filing the appeal. Accordingly the request for grant of permission to file an appeal was sent to Member Secretary on 31.10.2017.</p> <p>Meantime, the institution filed caveat petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras was received by this office on 03.11.2017.</p> <p>As directed, a letter and through e-mail was sent to the Advocate, Shri J. harikrishna, on 03.11.2017 regarding requested to obtain all the documents from advocate, Shri M.T. Arunan immediately to prepare the document to file an appeal.</p> <p>A letter was sent to Advocate, Shri J. harikrishna, on 08.11.2017 along with copy of Court order of Mother Teresa Educational Charitable Trust, Pudukottai District in W.P.No. 23935 of 2017 and WMP No. 25210 of 2017 dated 14.09.2017 in the Hon'ble High court of Madras.</p> <p>An e-mail was sent to the Advocate, Shri J. harikrishna, on 09.11.2017 enclosing a copy of NCTE –Hqrs letter dated 07.09.2015 and Appeal order dated 21.08.2017 of Mother Teresa Educational Charitable Trust, Pudukottai District.</p> <p>As directed, a letter was sent to the institution on 09.11.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail was received from Advocate, Shri J. harikrishna, on 09.11.2017 stating that <i>"yesterday shri M.T.Arunan has given the subject matter of the bundle to me VIZ, writ affidavit, writ petition, direction petition and additional typed set. On perusal the main typed set of papers has not furnished. I was told by Shri. M.T. Arunan that on receipt of the papers from the registry of high court, Madras and other side immediately he forwarded the entire papers along with the typed set of papers to SRC and the same is get from the SRC. Hence please to send the typed set of papers at the earliest enable me to go through and prepare the grounds of appeal as the same is necessary to prepare the grounds of appeal and to be filed as typed set of papers in writ appeal. On perusal no counter has been filed on our side."</i></p>
--	---

	<p>A letter dated 08.11.2017 received from Advocate, K. Ramesh Kumar, by this office on 14.11.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>Please take notice that my client M/s. Mother Teresa Educational Chartiable Trust, rep. by its Mangaing Trustee, R.C. Udhayakumar, Veerapatti Village, Mettusalai street, illuppur Taluk, Pudukottai District had instructed me to issue this notice as pre-contempt for Non-compliance of the order made in W.P.No. 23935 of 2017, dated 14.09.2017.</i>2. <i>My client states that they wanted to established the post Graduate Degree in Physical Education course to the college run by the Trust and therefore they filed an application before the Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, NCTE, Bangalore on 30.06.2016 through online for conducting the course for Master of physical education (M.P.Ed.) 2 years duration programme for the academic year 2017-18.</i>3. <i>My client states that they have uploaded all the requirements for getting permission to start the P.G. course along with the payment of application fee a sum of Rs. 1,50,000/-. On receipt of such application the Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, NCTE has issued a notice dated 27.01.2017 for inspection to the College. On the information 2 Member Committee has inspected their college and filed report also.</i>4. <i>My client further states that based on the website information there was a some deficiency from the Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, NCTE, Bangalore. For which my client has given reply on 07.03.2017 along with LUC, Affidavit and original fixed deposit receipt by rectifying the deficiency pointed out by you. In the meantime, the State Government granted No Objection Certificate to my client trust for to start M.P.Ed. course from the academic year 2017-18. Immediately my client has forwarded the same to you, however your order in F.No.SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP201630157/M.P.Ed./TN/2017-18/92898, dated 20.04.2017, rejected the application on the ground that the college has obtained the NOC from the State Government and not from the Affiliated body. As against the said rejection order, my client prepared an appeal before the National Council for Teacher Education, New Delhi on 25.04.2017.</i>5. <i>My client further states that while filing an appeal they have enclosed the NOC issued by the State Government to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE to start M.P.Ed. course and further the Tamil Nadu Physical Education and Sports University clarified that the University is an affiliated body and it will only recommend to the Government to issue the "No Objection Certificate" on 12.04.2017.</i>6. <i>My client further states that pending Appeal on 02.06.2017 the Tamil Nadu Physical Education and Sports University has granted NOC for the petitioner Trust for start M.P. Ed. Course. However the Appellate Authority (i.e.) the</i>
--	--

	<p><i>NCTE, New Delhi passed the order dated 21.08.2017 by rejecting the appeal and confirmed the order of the Regional Director, Southern Regional Committee, NCTE, Bangalore. That said orders has been challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras by way of filing a writ petition in W.P. No. 23935 of 2017 and after hearing the arguments on both sides this Hon'ble Court pleased to allowed the writ petition and remitted back to you for passing fresh orders after considering the NOC given by the affiliating body within a period of two weeks.</i></p> <p><i>7. My client further states that immediately after receipt of copy of the order, they have communicated to you on 21.09.2017 itself. Unfortunately you have not taken any steps till today. The Hon'ble Court gave a specific direction to reconsider the issue within a period of two weeks, after taking note of the NOC issued by the Affiliating Body as well as State Government. However, till date you have not come forward to give a recognition. Thus you have not complied with the order of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras dated 14.09.2017.</i></p> <p><i>8. Since you are duty bound to make passing fresh order based on the NOC given by the University and you should give recognition to my client as per the order of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras you are voluantly,</i></p> <p><i>9. wilfully and deliberately retrained yourself from complying with the orders of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras and therefore your non-compliance of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court is not only an act of willful disobedience, but it is contemptible.</i></p> <p><i>10. Therefore, you are requested to based on the NOC given by the Affiliating University you should give recognition to my client immediately, failing which appropriate legal action will be taken against you under the Contempt of Courts Act.</i></p> <p><i>In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I hereby call upon you to comply with the order made in W.P.No.23935 of 2017 dated 14.09.2017 for giving recognition to my client namely M/s. Mother Teresa Educational Charitable Trust, rep. by its Managing Trustee R.C Udhayakumar within a period of one week from the date of receipt of this Notice, failing which my client has no other option except to file a petition for Contempt of Court against you.</i></p> <p>An e-mail was sent to the Advocate, Shri J. Harikrishna, on 14.11.2017 regarding letter dated 08.11.2017 received on 14.11.2017 form petitioner's advocate Shri. K. Ramesh Kumar in respect of W.P.No. 23935 of 2017 filed by mother Teresa Educational Charitable Trust, Tamil Nadu. The same was forwarded to our legal counsel through e-mail on 14.11.2017</p> <p>The Matter was placed before SRC in its 347th meeting held on 16th to 17th November, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p>
--	---

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This case has already been decided by SRC. SRO was asked to file an appeal. 2. In the context of the impugned court order, the applicant college has also been informed of our decision. 3. With reference to the Legal Notice now received from the college about initiating contempt proceedings ask our lawyer to file the appeal before the contempt case is called by the court. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the advocate on 17.11.2017. An e-mail sent to the advocate on 20.11.2017 stating that “pre contempt notice e-mail, we have to issue reply for the Pre contempt Notice to the Advocate for the Mother Teresa College. Please confirm me the same for issuing for the reply”.</p> <p>In response to the office e-mail date 20.11.2017 the advocate has submitted reply. An e-mail received from advocate on 20.11.2017 stating that “<i>your letter dated 17.11.201 F.SRO/NCTE/CC/2016-17/95648. Where in informed that certain documents are enclosed on perusal no original envelope has enclosed IE Sl.Nos 3 & 4 needs office copy with signature for filing not photocopy</i>”. Reply sent to the advocate on 21.11.2017 along with documents.</p> <p>A letter was addressed to the advocate, Shri K. Ramesh Kumar, on 20.11.2017 regarding order of the High Court, Madras dated 14.09.2017 made in W.P.No. 23935 of 2017 in the matter of Mother Teresa Educational Charitable Trust, Pudukottai District, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>An e-mail received from advocate, Shri J. Harikrishna on 20.11.2017 and 21.11.2017 along with copy of NCTE-Hqrs letter dated 21.11.2017 and draft Counter affidavit.</p> <p>A letter was addressed to the advocate, Shri J. Harikrishna on 21.11.2017 along with duly signed writ appeal, Delay Condonation Affidavit and stay Affidavit in W.P.No. 23935 of 2017 filed by Mother Teresa Education Charitable Trust, Pudukottai District.</p> <p>An e-mail was received from advocate, Shri J. Harikrishna on 01.12.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>“In continuation of my e-mail dated 30.11.2017 as informed I preferred an appeal on 30.11.2017 as against the order dated 14.09.2017 in W.P.NO. 23935 of 2017- Mother Teresa Educational Charitable Trust, Veerapatti Village, Metttusalai Street, Illupur Taluk, Pudukottai District along with the delay Condonation Affidavit and stay Affidavit and Petitions after duly serving the Counsel for the cavetor for the institution. The first delay condonation of 33 days application will numbered and listed for the hearing before the concerned Division Bench headed by two Honourable judges and thereafter main Writ appeal will be numbered along with stay application. I will intimated you the further developments and also if the registry pointed any clarification also will be intimated. As informed in earlier my e-mail 09.11.2017 the institution may preferred a contempt petition before the High court, Madras for compliance of the order dated 14.09.2017. Please instruct the counsel who ever receiving or taking the notice to inform immediately to SRC”.</i></p>
--	--

		<p>An e-mail received from advocate Shri J. Harikrishna on 07.12.2017 stating that <i>“This is to inform you that the above CMP No. 21279 of 2017 delay condonation of 35 days in preferring the writ appeal as against the order dated 14.09.2017 in W.P.No. 23935 of 2017 Mother Teresa College of Education able Trust has listed on 07.12.2017 (tomorrow) for hearing before the II division Bench consisting of Honourable Shri. Justice Hulvadi G.Ramesh and Honourable Shri. Justice. RMT Reekaraman. I will intimate you the developments after the proceedings”.</i></p> <p>A letter dated 07.12.2017 from advocate, Shri J. Harikrishna on 12.12.2017 along with copy of court order and advocate bills and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“As informed through e-mail correspondence, on behalf of our organization I preferred a writ Appeal against the order dated 14.09.2017 in W.P.No. 239335 of 2017 Mother Teresa Educational Charitable Trust cited under subject No.1 on 30.11.2017 along with delay condonation and stay application. The delay of 35 days in preferring an appeal was numbered as CMP NO. 21279 of 2017 on 05.12.2017 which cited under subject No.2 and listed on 07.12.2017 before the Division Bench consisting of his Lorship Shri. Huluvidi G. Ramesh and his Lordship Shri. Justice RMT Teekaramn, High Court Madras. Upon hearing of the arguments on the both sides their Lorships was pleased to condone the delay the on 35 days in preferring the writ appeal and directed the registry to number the main writ appeal if it is in order and to list the matter on 12.12.2017 for hearing. I will intimate you the further developments”.</i></p> <p>An e-mail was received from advocate, Shri J. Harikrishna on 22.12.2017 along with court Judgment 13.12.2017 in W.P.No. 1685 of 2017 and C.M.P.NO. 21688 of 2017 in the Hon’ble High Court of Madras filed by the institution and Opinion</p> <p>Court Judgment stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“5. the learned Counsel appearing for the appellants would submit that the mandatory requirements under Regulation 5 (3) of the Regulations of the National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and procedures) Regulations 2014 (NCTE Regulations 2014) have not been compiled by the respondent-Institution while submitted the application seeking recognition.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6. We can understand even if the application has been filed belated. But, it appears that the respondent institution has done it in time. For the belated issuance of no objection Certificate, the respondent –institution should not be blamed and it cannot be attributed to the institution. It also appears that even such No Objection Certificate was, thereafter, filed in time. It is not an illegality, but, only an irregularity, which has been set right subsequently. The learned single judge, looking into the respondent-intuition along with the No Objection Certificate issued by the University. Therefore, we do not find any scope to interfere with the order passed by the learned single judge. Accordingly, the writ appeal is dismissed. The appellants are hereby directed to reconsider the application of the respondent –</p>
--	--	--

		<p>institution seeking recognition of the course as per the orders of the learned of the learned single judge, within a period of six weeks from today. No. costs. The connected Miscellaneous is closed”.</p> <p>An e-mail was received from Advocate on 26.12.2017 along with Opinion in W.A.No. 1685 of 2017 and stating that <i>“Please find the enclosed herewith attaching opinion for necessary action. Please note that already one week has gone and remaining time is five weeks. As per the order NCTE-SRC-BLR to reconsider within with regards”</i>.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above Court matter & decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Court order is noted. 2. Lawyers advice is seen and accepted . 3. Let us go to the Supreme Court. 4. Take further action accordingly in consultation with the HQ.
2	<p>SRCAPP2074 B.Ed Thavaraga College of Education, Dharmapuri, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>Thavaraga College of Education, Plot/Khasara No. 179/1C3C7, 179/8(1C3C3), 179/2C, Plot No. 179/1C3C7, 179/8(1C3C3), 179/2C, Street No. KRP Road, Dhuvaragapuri Village, KRP Dam Post Office, Krishnagiri Taluk, Dharmapuri District, Pin-635101, Tamilnadu</p> <p>Venkataram Educational Trust, Plot No. 300/1, Street/Road. KRP Dam Road, Dhuvaragapuri Village, KRP Dam Post Office, Krishnagiri Taluk, Dharmapuri District, Pin-635101, Tamilnadu had applied for grant of recognition to Thavaraga College of Education, Plot/Khasara No. 179/1C3C7, 179/8(1C3C3), 179/2C, Plot No. 179/1C3C7, 179/8(1C3C3), 179/2C, Street No. KRP Road, Dhuvaragapuri Village, KRP Dam Post, Dharmapuri District, Pin-635101, Tamilnadu for B.Ed course for one year duration under Section 14(1) of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE online on 30.12.2012. The institution has submitted hard copy of the application on 04.01.2013 along with processing fees paid through challan dt.31.12.2012 for Rs.50100/-.</p> <p>Para 7[1-A(i)] and 7[1-A(ii)] of extant NCTE Regulations published in the Gazette of India on 31st August 2009, as amended from time to time, the application shall be summarily rejected under one or more of the following circumstances:</p> <p>Para 7[1-A(i)]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <i>The processing fee, as provided under rule 9 of the National</i> (b) <i>Council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 is not furnished on or before the date of submission of online application;</i> (c) <i>Hard copy in triplicate of the online application is not dispatched within 7 days of the submission of the online application;</i> (d) <i>Copy of the registered land documents issued by the competent authority indicating that the society/institution applying for the course possessed land on the date of application is not dispatched within 7 days of the submission of the online application.</i>

		<p>Para 7[1-A(ii)] <i>The Regional Committee shall, after recording reasons for rejection under the circumstances referred to in clause (i) above, return the application to the applicant and refund the processing fees within 30 days of the online submission of the application.</i></p> <p>Further, 8(7)(i) of NCTE Regulations reads as under:</p> <p><i>No institution shall be granted recognition under these Regulations unless the institution or society sponsoring the institution is in possession of required land on the date of application. The land free from all encumbrances could be either on ownership basis or on lease from Government or Government institutions for a period of not less than 30 years. In cases where under relevant State or Union Territory laws the maximum permissible lease period is less than 30 years, the State Government or Union Territory Administration law shall prevail. However, no building shall be taken on lease for running any teacher training course.</i></p> <p>In this application the following has been observed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-line application was submitted on 30.12.2012 and challan was remitted on 31.12.2012. Hence, the society has not remitted the processing fee as provided under rule 9 of the National Council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 is not furnished on or before the date of submission of online application, as required under sub-regulation 7(1-A)(i)(a) of NCTE Regulations 2009. <p>The SRC in its 240th meeting held on 09th –11th March, 2013 reviewed the duly scrutinized above new application received by Southern Regional Office, NCTE for the Session 2013-14. Accordingly, the above application, which suffer from basic infirmities, is summarily rejected as per 7 [1–A (i)] of NCTE Regulations 2009.</p> <p>Accordingly, rejection letter was issued to the institution on 27.04.2013.</p> <p>The institution has submitted a Hon'ble High Court of Madras, court direction in W.P.No.9783 of 2013 (SRCAPP2074 of Venkatakram Educational Trust)) and 9784 of 2013 (SRCAPP1842 SKA Educational Trust) order as follows:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“these petitions coming on for orders upon perusing the petitions and the respective affidavits filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of M/s.R.Suresh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner in each of the petitions, the court made the following order:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“there shall be an order of injunction in line with the similar orders passed by this court earlier.”</p> <p>A letter was sent to Shri K. Ramakrishna Reddy to defend the case on 17.05.2013.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>In the meantime, the institution has submitted its written representation on 20.05.2013 requesting to process the application.</p> <p>A court notice has received in the office of SRC on 28.05.2013 to appear before personally or by advocate on 04.06.2013 at 10.30 AM.</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was sent to Shri.K. Ramakanth Reddy along with enclosed signed counter affidavit on 20.06.2013.</p> <p>Reply was not received from the Advocate so far.</p> <p>The institution also preferred an appeal to NCTE, Hqrs and the Appellate Authority vide order no. F.No.89-422/Appeal 2013/14th Meeting- 2013 – A77084 dated 30.10.2013 received in the office of SRC on 08.11.2013 has stated as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“after perusal of the documents, memorandum of appeal, affidavit, and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Council concluded that the appeal deserved to be remanded to SRC with instructions to consider the application of the institution and process further as per regulations.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>NOW THEREFORE, the Council hereby remands back the case for necessary action as indicated above”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 255th meeting held on 13-15th November, 2013 considered the Appellate authority order dated 30/10/2013, and decided to process the application further as per the Regulations.</p> <p>Accordingly, the application was scrutinized and a copy of application was sent to State Government for recommendation on 22.01.2013 followed by reminder on 17/01/2014. The deficiency letter was issued to the institution on 17/01/2014. The institution has replied to the deficiency letter on 17/02/2014.</p> <p>The SRC in its 264th meeting held on 1st-3rd March 2014, considered the Appellate authority order dated 30.10.2013, reply to deficiency letter from the institution vide letter dated 17-02-2014 and all other relevant documents and decided to cause inspection under section 14 (1) of 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.</p> <p>Accordingly, inspection of the institution was fixed between 25th -29th March 2014. The inspection intimation was sent to institution on 13.03.2014. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 29.03.2014 and the VT report received in the office of SRC on 01.04.2014.</p> <p>The VT Report was placed before SRC in its 277th meeting held on 20th to 22nd</p>
--	--	---

	<p>January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LOI for 2 basic units of B.Ed. <p>As per decision of SRC, A (LOI) Letter Of Intent was issued to the institution on 27.01.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted LOI reply on 27.02.2015 along with relevant document. The same was placed before SRC in its 283rd meeting held on 02nd to 03rd March, 2015 considered matter and decided as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Show cause notice for principal's qualification (i.e., does not have M.Ed as certified by University.) <p>The institution submitted its written representation on 03.03.2015 regarding to submission of M.Ed certificate of principal.</p> <p>The SRC in its 283 Meeting of SRC held on 02nd to 03rd march, 2015 considered matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. FR for B.Ed(2units) w.e.f 2015-20162. They must conform to the new faculty norms & standards before 31.10.2015.3. Ask them to ensure full conformance with the new norms and standards before 31.10.2015. <p>As per the decision of SRC, formal recognition was issued to the institution on 03.03.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted a letter dated 22.07.2015 received by this office on 22.07.2015 along with FDR's. Reply sent to institution on 22.07.2015 along with original FDR's.</p> <p>The institution submitted letter dated 07.0.2015 received by this office on 28.08.2017 along with inspection fees of Rs.50000.</p> <p>A court order dated 07.08.2017 received by this office on 27.09.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p>In both these writ petitions the respective writ petitioners sought for recognition to conduct B.Ed., degree course in respect of the academic year 2013-2014. After due notice the matters re listed today, for further hearing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the prayer sought for in these writ petitions have become in fructuous, since, the petitioners/institutions have got recognition in respect of the subsequent years.3. Recording the above submission and endorsement made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, these writ petitions are dismissed as in fructuous. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.
--	--

		The Committee considered and noted the above Court matter.
3	AOS00596 APS00541 B.Ed 2 Units DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Bijapur, Karnataka	<p>DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Afzalpur Takke, Bijapur - 506102, Karnataka.</p> <p>DBHPS Dr.B.D. Jatti College of Education, Afzalpur Takke, Bijapur - 506102, Karnataka was granted recognition by SRC for offering B.Ed. course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dated 10.07.2000.</p> <p>A Complaint was received on 18.11.2009 from the Secretary, Hindi Prachar Mandali, Bijapur, Karnataka addressed to the Chairperson, NCTE, New Delhi regarding misappropriation of funds and Mal-administration of DBHPS institutions in Karnataka. The Complaint was forwarded to SRC from NCTE, Delhi on 10.12.2009.</p> <p>The allegations made against DBHPS institutions by the complainant is as under:-</p> <p>“1. Further, I would like to bring to your kind notice that the student intake is only 100 as per NCTE norms. But in the following colleges they have admitted more than 100 students by taking huge money from other than South India. 1. Dharwad120, 2. Bijapur-150, 3. Belgaum and mysore also excess of students in the attendance they are studying.</p> <p>2. If NCTE will visit it will be proved through the attendance register, accounts register and how much money collected from the students. It is noticed Sabha people under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti collecting 40,000 Rs. And accounting only 20 and 15 thousand rupees. So this matter is very serious and visiting team may be sent for investigation and remedy.</p> <p>3. In all colleges disqualified lecturers persons are appointed as lecturers with fake degrees by taking huge amount from the students by Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti and Dr. Dilip Singh.</p> <p>4. All the Principals are under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti only not any other officer and even vice chancellor of Sabha Mr. Chinnayan also. Dr. Malimath is the president chancellor of the Sabha but he became of mouth piece of Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti, Mr. Malimath being the Karnataka person and close person of Mr. Neeral Katti and he is not carrying anything of the Sabha in the Capacity of the President.”</p> <p>Further, this office was in receipt of another letter dated 19.8.2009 from Sri. Om Narain, Lecturer of Hari Bawa Inter college Gawan, Badaun District, Uttar Pradesh regarding malpractices in B.Ed. College of Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka. The above letter has been forwarded by NCTE, Hqrs. on 16.11.2009.</p> <p>The complainant had stated that the annual intake in B.Ed. classes has been fixed at 100 students and the following colleges are admitting more than 100 students and</p>

		<p>adjusting these excess students against the leftover vacant seats for the preceding years i.e., 2007-2008 and 2008-09:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Afzalpur, Takke Athani Road, Bijapur-586101, Karnataka. 2. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Jilla Hospital Rasta(District Hospital road), Belgaum-590001. 3. Vishveshwara Siksha College, K.R. Mohalla, Bani Vilas Road, Mysore-570004. <p>Further, the complainant had stated that these students neither attend the classes nor go to teaching schools, even then they get more than 80% marks and has requested to investigate in the matter and punish the defaulters.</p> <p>The SRC in its 188th meeting held on 28-29 January, 2010 considered the matter and decided to cause inspection to the institution after obtaining the details of infrastructural and instructional facilities in the Questionnaire format.</p> <p>Accordingly, letter was issued to all 5 DBHPS institutions on 8.3.2010/5.3.2010 to submit explanation along with 10 documents to submit as per Questionnaire within 21 days from the date of receipt of the letter.</p> <p>The institution submitted its written representation on 30.03.2010.</p> <p>SRC in its 191st meeting held on 20-21 April 2010 considered the written representation submitted on 30.03.2010 and decided to cause inspection under section 17. Accordingly, inspection was carried out on 03.06.2010 and the SRC in its 193rd meeting held on 21-22 June, 2010 considered the report and decided to withdraw recognition.</p> <p>Accordingly, inspection was carried out on 03.06.2010 and the Committee considered the Report and decided to withdraw recognition for B.Ed. course for the following reasons :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per VT Report and as admitted/countersigned by the institution, the total built-up-area of the building comes to 6208 sq.ft. which is far short of the NCTE norms of 16,000 sq.ft. • Shiksha Snatak course is also being run in the same building. • Psychology lab. materials needs to be strengthened. There is no Language learning lab. • In 2008-09 and 2009-10 academic year , institutions have made admissions of 120 and 121 respectively which is more than the intake sanctioned and thus violated NCTE norms. <p>Withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 02.08.2010.</p> <p>Further, this office was in receipt of a copy of the complaint dated 23.11.2010 from aggrieved students which has been addressed to Sri.Kapil Sibal, Ministry of HRD, New Delhi regarding trade of marks cards and certificate in respect of Hindi Distance Education.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>In the complaint it has been stated that the Centers of DBHP in remote villages are collecting 40 to 50 thousand rupees and granting certificates to various degrees like MA, M.Phil and Ph.D and also they are conducting exams twice in a year.</p> <p>The eligibility for taking such exams are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 10+2+ Hindi Praveen of Equivalent Exam are eligible to take M.A.Exam• 10+2+ Hindi Praveen /Equivalent +Shikshak Training are eligible to take even M.Ed Exam. <p>Further, only Karnataka Government has given its recognition to these degrees for admissions only they are collecting very huge amounts around 50 to 60 thousands rupees from the students to the student and swindling the collected amount without any benefit to students. No classes, no lecturers and no practical classes are being held at any of the centres.</p> <p>The Secretary of the DBHPS, Chennai has issued a pamphlet stating that a sum of Rs.500/- per students will be paid to the pracharak who encourages the students to get admission to these courses and has requested to take action immediately to stop this fraud.</p> <p>The complainant had stated that last year the NCTE conducted investigation in Karnataka about the genuineness of marks cards and certificates issued by DBHPS and found so many loop holes. Such as the exams conducted elsewhere and where as the name of the centres mentioned in the marks cards and certificate are quite different.</p> <p>Further, SRC, NCTE has not given any recognition to Hindi course run through Distance Education mode. The recognition accorded to 5 DBHPS institutions run in Karnataka has been withdrawn during 02.08.2010 for B.Ed course based on the complaint.</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was issued to the institution on 10.02.2011.</p> <p>In the meantime, aggrieved by the Withdrawal order, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE, Hqrs and after considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the council reached the conclusion that there was adequate ground to accept the appeal and reverse the SRC's order dated 2.8.2010 with the direction to the SRC for issuance of showcase notice and for further action thereafter. Accordingly, the appeal was accepted and the order of the SRC dated 2.8.2010 reversed vide HQ order No.89-1010/2010-Appeal A29354 dated 23.12.2010.</p> <p>The institution had preferred an appeal to NCTE, Hqrs and the appellant authority has reversed the withdrawal order of SRC vide order dated 23.12.2010 with a direction to the SRC for issuance of show cause notice.</p> <p>The SRC in its 200th meeting held on 20-21 January 2011 considered the Appellate authority order dated 23.12.2010 VT report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and it was decided to issue show cause notice. Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 11.03.2011 for the following reasons:</p>
--	---

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As per VT Report and as admitted/countersigned by the institution, the total built-up-area of the building comes to 6208 sq.ft. which is far short of the NCTE norms of 16,000 sq.ft. 2. Shiksha Snatak course is also being run in the same building. 3. Psychology lab. materials needs to be strengthened. There is no Language learning lab. 4. In 2008-09 and 2009-10 academic year , institutions have made admissions of 120 and 121 respectively which is more than the intake sanctioned and thus violated NCTE norms. <p>Now, with the references to the above notice issued by SRC, NCTE dated 11.03.2011 the same was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 (EDN- RES). The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka after considering the matter has ordered the Stay on all further proceedings by SRC. They have also submitted a copy of the order in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 dated 07.04.2011 of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka.</p> <p>Further, the institution has submitted its written representation on 21.02.2011 for the letter dated 10.02.2011, wherein the institution had stated that they have no remarks/comments to offer in this behalf as the letter does not have anything to complain against the college, it specifically mentions Hindi Distance Education, which is not at all concerned with this college.</p> <p>The SRC in its 204th meeting held on 27th and 28th April, 2011 considered the above matter and decided to get the stay vacated.</p> <p>The institution had filed a writ petition against the Showcause Notice issued to the institution vide W.P.No.13832-37/2011 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha(5 institutions) in Karnataka and others.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, the advocate was requested to vacate the interim stay granted to the institutions vide this office letters dated 11.5.2011, 5.12.2011, 16.4.2012, 4.9.2012 and 6.1.2013.</p> <p>A letter dated 13.2.2013 is received by this office on 30.4.2013 from Ashok Haranahalli Associates regarding W.P.No.13832-37/2011 of Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha and others wherein 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi, 2nd respondent is the SRC, NCTE, 3rd respondent is Union of India, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs represented by its Secretary, No.87, Parliament House, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110004 and 4th respondent is the Union of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Dept. of Higher Education, represented by its Secretary, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi-110115.</p> <p>The writ petition is filed by Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka Branch, No.113/114, S.C. Road, Sheshadripuram, Bangalore-560020 in respect of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DBHPS Lal Bahadur Shastri College of Education, Bangalore 2. DBHPS Rajiv Gandhi College of Education, Dharwad 3. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Bijapur
--	--	---

		<p>4. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Belgaum and 5. DBHPS Basaveshwara College of Education, Mysore.</p> <p>The writ petition was filed questioning the orders dated 23.12.2010 passed by the 1st respondent-NCTE remanding the matter back to the 2nd respondent, and the consequential show-cause notices dated 11.3.2011 issued by the 2nd respondent-SRC.</p> <p>Letter of Ashok Haranahalli Associates states that “the above matter came up for consideration before the Hon’ble High Court on 13.2.2013 for preliminary hearing in ‘B’ group. After hearing the matter, the Hon’ble Court quashed the impugned orders and notices and remanded the matter to the 1st respondent – NCTE to consider the issue whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction over the petitioner institutions, which are established under Central Legislation and also to consider the case of the petitioners. I have applied for the certified copy of the final order, and the same will be sent to you on its receipt.”</p> <p>Further, the advocate has opined that “In my opinion the writ petitions were premature and as issuance of showcause notices cannot be questioned in the normal course. The learned Single Judge is also not correct in directing the NCTE to decide the issue whether NCTE has got supervision over petitioner institutions when the petitioner institutions are running the teacher training courses after obtaining recognition from NCTE. Further, NCTE Act prevails over all other Acts governing the field. Therefore, in my opinion this is a fit case for filing a Writ Appeal.”</p> <p>This office has not yet received certified copy of the order from Hon’ble Court and not even from the institutions. Since the 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi and the direction of Hon’ble Court is for 1st respondent to consider the above issue.</p> <p>The SRC in its 245th meeting held during 19th – 21st May, 2013 considered the matter and decided to inform the Lawyer to file an Appeal against the Court order, by highlighting the grant of recognition by SRCNCTE, Bangalore to DBHS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Afzalpur Takke, Bijapur, Karnataka for offering B.Ed (APS00596) & B.Ed (APS00541) course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dt. 10.07.2000.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed to the Advocate with a request to file an appeal against the order of Hon’ble Court dated 13.02.2013. In the meanwhile, a letter dated 2.8.2013 is received on 20.8.2013 from M/s. Haranahalli and Patil, Advocates stating that “In the above matter by the order dated 13.2.2013, the learned single judge of the Hon’ble High Court has quashed the order passed by the SRC withdrawing recognition granted to the petitioner institutions and the order passed by the appellate authority confirming the said orders. However, the learned single judge has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority to decide to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the Petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner – institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>In my opinion, since the Learned Single Judge has not decided the issue of applicability of the NCTE Act and has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority, this is not a fit case for filing an appeal. However, the appellate authority/NCTE still wants to file an appeal, you are requested to send the copy of the writ petition along with certified copy of the final order so as to enable us to prepare the appeal papers.”</p> <p><i>The SRC in its 252nd meeting held on 13-14 September 2013 considered the matter, letter from the Advocate dated 2-8-2013 and also Hon'ble High Court direction vide order dated 13-02-2013 remanding the matter to the Appellate authority to decided to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner-institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.</i></p> <p>Since the case has been remanded to the Appellate authority (i.e., the NCTE) to examine the jurisdictional issued raised and to clarify the legal position, it is decided by the Committee to request the NCTE (H'qrs) to take further action accordingly.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter is addressed to the NCTE, New Delhi on 29.10.2013 with a request to take further action.</p> <p>A letter F. No. 91-17th Mtg. 2013-Appeal dated 12.11.2013 is received by SRC from the Section Officer, NCTE, New Delhi requesting to send the original records pertaining to DBHPs Dr. B.D.Jatti College of Education, Afzalur Takke, Bijapur-506102, Karnataka B.Ed along with comments of this office for necessary action.</p> <p>The original file was sent to the NCTE-Hqrs on 20.11.2013.</p> <p>The institution preferred an appeal to NCTE Hqrs and the NCTE Appellate Authority in its order F.No. 89-1009, 1010, 1012, 1013 and 1014/2010-Appeal/12th Meeting 2014 dated 26.11.2014 order stated as follows:</p> <p><i>“The appeal pertaining to cases filed by Dakshin Hindi Prachar Sabha, Belgaum, Karnataka in pursuance of the Court's order dated 13.02.2013 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the W.P.No.13831-13837/2011 was discussed in the 10th meeting of the Appeal Committee and Committee noted the legal opinion obtained by NCTE . The legal opinion is in conformity that the powers vested with the Dakshin Hindi Parachar Sabha through an Act to determine and maintain standards for teacher education and to regulate the same. Further the NCTE Act, 1993 is 'subsequent' and the “special legislation” and therefore, the provisions of NCTE Act will apply to Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha in relation to teacher training courses being conducted by it.</i></p> <p><i>The High Court order dated 13.02.2013 while referring the case or adjudication to the Appellat</i> <i>Appellate authority had advised that appellate authority shall give an opportunity to the petitioner's, before passing an order, to have their say in the matter.</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>Appeal Committee, therefore, concluded that the above five appellants may be asked to appear before the Appeal Committee with their written submissions. Accordingly notice noted 30.09.2014 was issued to Secretary, Dakshin Baharath Hindi Prachar Sabha (DBHPS). S/Sh. Deen Bandhu, Special officer and Dr. Satish Kumar Pandey, Principal, Basaweshawara College of Education appeared before the Committee on 20.10.2014. The representatives of DBHPS submitted the written consent to the effect that the Sabha is in the ambit of NCTE Act and its regulations issued from time to time.</i></p> <p><i>Attention of NCTE is however, drawn the verdict dated 13.02.2013 of the High Court of Karnataka in the WP.Case no.13832-13837/2011. As per verdict given by the Hon'ble Court the impugned order dated 02.08.2010 derecognising the institutions was render 'Non Est' and also the consequential order dated 23.12.2010 of Appellate Authority to look into grievances of the petitioners as to whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction when necessarily the petitioner (DBHPS) is a statutory body. Hon'ble Court ha desired that Appellate Authority has to adjudicate in the matter by giving an opportunity to the petitioners before passing any order. After seeking legal opinion and holding deliberations. Appeal Committee formed a view that the institutions imparting teacher education, in whatever dialect, are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act and the representatives of DBHPS have also agreed that all teacher education courses being conducted by DBHPS are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act. A report in this regard is required to be submitted in the Hon'ble Court by the NCTE".</i></p> <p>In view of the above, the decision of the Appeal Committee is hereby communicated.</p> <p>This issue with the approval of the competent authority.</p> <p>The SRC in its 277th meeting held during 20th -22nd January, 2015, considered the matter, Appellate authority order dated 20.10.2014, and decided advised to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Request NCTE (H'qrs) to communicate the appellate order to the Court. 2.Await Court orders. <p>As per decision of SRC, a letter sent to NCTE Hqrs on 11.02.2015.</p> <p>In the mean time, the institution has submitted an affidavit on 22.01.2015 as per the new regulations 2014 and the revised order was issued to the institution on 29.05.2015. The institution has submitted reply to the revised order on 30.05.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 321st meeting held during 28th – 30th September, 2016 considered the revised order reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Title is clear. 2. LUC is not approved by competent authority. 3. EC is given.
--	--

	<p>4. BP is in order.</p> <p>5. BCC is in order. Built up area is adequate.</p> <p>6. Original FDRs not given.</p> <p>7. Approved faculty list is there. Faculty list not as per Regulations. Asst. Prof (Phy.Edn) and Asst. Prof (FA) required.</p> <p>8. Fee not paid.</p> <p>9. Collect fee and cause inspection.</p> <p>10. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents and check on the deficiencies listed.”</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 16.11.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 343rd meeting held during 1st – 2nd August, 2017 considered the decision of 321st meeting and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“These are RPRO cases. In view of the latest instructions, no inspection is required in these.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">But, these also involve ‘shifting’. Therefore, VT Inspection will be required. The SRO’s request is noted and permission is given for organizing VT Inspection in these cases.”</p> <p>In the meantime a court notice was received by this office on 02.08.2017 from the Hon’ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P.No. 106596/2017 filed by Dakshina Bharata Hindi Prachara Sabha V/s (1)The Union of India (2) The State of Karnataka (3) NCTE New Delhi (4) NCTE Bangalore & others before the Hon’ble High Court of Karnataka Bench at Dharwad.</p> <p>Brief of the facts:-</p> <p>The Peitioner’s Institution is established by the 1st Respondent under an act of Parliament with an objective of promote Hindi Teaching as a National Language. The Petitioner’s Institution has established several constituent Colleges and is issue in Degree / Diplomas in various courses. The 1st Respondent in 1997 directed all Universities and State Governments to recognize the degree in Diplomas issued by the Petitioner and its constituent Colleges for the purpose of employment in Central and State Government.</p> <p>Consequent on establishment of NCTE as a Competent Authority to determine minimum qualifications for appointment to the post of teachers in Primary, Secondary and High Schools. 2014 Regulations were issued prescribing the minimum qualifications for the post of Assistant Teacher. 2002 C & R Rules were issued by the 2nd Respondent prescribing qualification for the post of Assistant Teacher in various subjects of Primary and Secondary High Schools by the 2nd Respondent. It also declared Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course as equivalent to the B.Ed Degree for the purpose of appointment to the post of Language Assistant Hindi. Without noticing, it is only the 3rd Respondent, who has the authority to declare equivalency for the purpose of qualification to the post of Assistant Teacher in Schools.</p>
--	---

		<p>This Hon'ble Court by an order dated 30.07.2015 proceeded to quash the entire C & R Rules issued by the 2nd Respondent on the ground that they are in contravention of the NCTE Regulations subsequently by the impugned order dated 18.04.2017, the 2nd Respondent proceeded to withdraw all the notifications that were issued declaring equivalency of degree and diploma courses conducted by the Petitioner's Institution for the purpose of selection and appointment to the post of Language-Hindi. Without inviting the Petitioner and its constituent colleges. Hence, this Writ Petition.</p> <p>The petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) To call for records relating to issue of the impugned order bearing No. ED25 LBP 2017 issued by the 2nd Respondent. ii) To direct the 3rd Respondent to consider declaring Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution and its constituent Colleges as equal to that of B.Ed Degree for the limited purpose of qualification to the post of Language Assistant Hindi in terms of Regulations 6 of the 2014 Regulation. iii) To direct the 3rd Respondent to recognize the Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course Certificates obtained by the teachers, who have already appointed to the post of Language Assistant Hindi and Direct the 2nd Respondent to continue their services as Assistant Teachers Language Hindi. iv) To pass such other orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case. <p>1st Respondent (The Union of India), 2nd Respondent (The State of Karnataka), 3rd Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education, Hqrs, New Delhi), 4th Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education).</p> <p>As the court case filed by DBHPS Petitioners to equivalency of B.Ed Course, a copy of the WP filed by the institution and the letter of SRC is mailed to the Hq for necessary action vide this office letter No. F.SRO/NCTE/DBHPS/CC/KA/B.Ed/2017/94310 dated 09.08.2017. A reminder was issued to Under Secretary (legal)on 03.10.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail was received from NCTE Hqrs Legal section on 31.10.2017. Accordingly, a letter was issued to the Under Secretary (legal section and to Advocate, Shri. M.B.Kanavi along with a letter dated 31.10.2017 received by NCT, Hqrs and brief of the case on 28.11.2017</p> <p>On 12.12.2017, a letter dated 08.12.2017 is received by this office from the advocate, Shri M.B.Kanavi, in w.p.no. 106596/2017 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha is as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“With reference to the above I write to state that, I am in receipt of the Parawise Comments in respect of the Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha College of Education at Dharwad, Belagum, Mysore and Bangalore.”</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The Parawise Comments send to me are the meeting proceedings in respect of the deficiencies of these colleges. However, the issue involved in the writ petition is entirely different. The petitioner is seeking a direction to the Third Respondent for declaring Hindi Shikshana Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution as equal to that of B.Ed Degree course. Hence, it is requested to send the parawise comments on these issues after getting the clarifications from the Head Quarters.</p> <p>Further, kindly make it a point to send all the supporting documents in support of our contention in all the cases. Since I am repeatedly sending letters seeking documents in support of our contentions.</p> <p>Accordingly, an e-mail was sent to Under Secretary, (Legal) on 20.12.2017.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above Court matter & decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The details of the petition are noted. 2.1. This office is not mandated to go into issues relating to equivalence of courses/degrees/certificates. DBHPS should approach the NCTE (HQ) for that. 2.2. The Communications addressed to this office in this connection have already been forwarded to NCTE (HQ) for appropriate further action. 3. No inspection is required in this B.Ed case. 4.1. Process the documents as an RPRO case. 4.2. Give priority to new application cases. RPRO cases can be taken up after 15 March ie., after we clear the new cases before expiry of the time-limit prescribed by the Supreme Court for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19.
4	<p>AOS00600 APS00550 B.Ed 1 Unit DBHPS Basaveswara College of Education, Mysore, Karnataka</p>	<p>DBHPS Basaveswara College of Education, 'Hindi Bhavan' V.V. Road, K.R.Mohalla, Mysore – 570 004, Karnataka</p> <p>DBHPS Basaveshwara College of Education, 'Hindi Bhavan' V.V. Road, K.R.Mohalla, Mysore – 570 004, Karnataka was granted recognition by SRC for offering B.Ed. course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dated 10.07.2000.</p> <p>A Complaint was received on 18.11.2009 from the Secretary, Hindi Prachar Mandali, Bijapur, Karnataka addressed to the Chairperson, NCTE, New Delhi regarding misappropriation of funds and Mal-administration of DBHPS institutions in Karnataka. The Complaint was forwarded to SRC from NCTE, Delhi on 10.12.2009.</p> <p>The allegations made against DBHPS institutions by the complainant is as under:-</p> <p><i>"1. Further, I would like to bring to your kind notice that the student intake is only 100 as per NCTE norms. But in the following colleges they have admitted more than 100 students by taking huge money from other than South India. 1. Dharwad120, 2. Bijapur-150, 3. Belgaum and mysore also excess of students in the attendance they are studying.</i></p>

		<p><i>2. If NCTE will visit it will be proved through the attendance register, accounts register and how much money collected from the students. It is noticed Sabha people under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti collecting 40,000 Rs. And accounting only 20 and 15 thousand rupees. So this matter is very serious and visiting team may sent for investigation and remedy.</i></p> <p><i>3. In all colleges disqualified lecturers persons are appointed as lecturers with fake degrees by taking huge amount from the students by Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti and Dr. Dilip Singh.</i></p> <p><i>4. All the Principals are under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti only not any other officer and even vice chancellor of Sabha Mr. Chinnayan also. Dr. Malimath is the president chancellor of the Sabha but he became of mouth piece of Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti, Mr. Malimath being the Karnataka person and close person of Mr. Neeral Katti and he is not carrying anything of the Sabha in the Capacity of the President."</i></p> <p>Further, this office was in receipt of another letter dated 19.8.2009 from Sri. Om Narain, Lecturer of Hari Bawa Inter college Gawan, Badaun District, Uttar Pradesh regarding malpractices in B.Ed. College of Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka. The above letter has been forwarded by NCTE, Hqrs. on 16.11.2009.</p> <p><i>The complainant had stated that the annual intake in B.Ed. classes has been fixed at 100 students and the following colleges are admitting more than 100 students and adjusting these excess students against the leftover vacant seats for the preceding years i.e., 2007-2008 and 2008-09:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Afzalpur, Takke Athani Road, Bijapur-586101, Karnataka.</i> <i>2. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Jilla Hospital Rasta(District Hospital road), Belgaum-590001.</i> <i>3. Vishveshwara Siksha College, K.R. Mohalla, Bani Vilas Road, Mysore-570004.</i> <p>Further, the complainant had stated that these students neither attend the classes nor go to teaching schools, even then they get more than 80% marks and has requested to investigate in the matter and punish the defaulters.</p> <p>The SRC in its 188th meeting held on 28-29 January, 2010 considered the matter and decided to cause inspection to the institution after obtaining the details of infrastructural and instructional facilities in the Questionnaire format.</p> <p>Accordingly, letter was issued to all 5 DBHPS institutions on 8.3.2010/5.3.2010 to submit explanation along with 10 documents to submit as per Questionnaire within 21 days from the date of receipt of the letter.</p> <p>The institution submitted its written representation on 30.03.2010. SRC in its 191st meeting held on 20-21 April 2010 considered the written representation submitted on</p>
--	--	---

		<p>30.03.2010 and decided to cause inspection under section 17 of NCTE Act.</p> <p>Accordingly, inspection was carried out on 04.06.2010.</p> <p>The SRC in its 193rd meeting held on 21-22 June, 2010 considered the VT report and decided to withdraw the recognition for the following reasons:-</p> <p>As per the VTR, and examination of other relevant documents, it was observed that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The built-up-area is only 4368.2 sq.ft., which is far short of the NCTE norms of 16,000 sq.ft. 2. Sports 3. facilities, Games facilities are not available. 4. Library is having only 800 books related to Education, which are grossly inadequate. <p>Under the above grounds, the Committee decided to withdraw the recognition for B.Ed. course with immediate effect. <i>But, it was made clear that the institution is debarred from making any further admission subsequent to the date of issue of this order. The State Government/ affiliating University were informed accordingly.</i></p> <p>Accordingly withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 27.09.2010.</p> <p>Further, this office was in receipt of a copy of the complaint dated 23.11.2010 from aggrieved students which has been addressed to Sri.Kapil Sibal, Ministry of HRD, New Delhi regarding trade of marks cards and certificate in respect of Hindi Distance Education.</p> <p>In the complaint it has been stated that the Centers of DBHP in remote villages are collecting 40 to 50 thousand rupees and granting certificates to various degrees like MA, M.Phil and Ph.D and also they are conducting exams twice in a year.</p> <p><i>The eligibility for taking such exams are as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10+2+ Hindi Praveen of Equivalent Exam are eligible to take M.A.Exam • 10+2+ Hindi Praveen /Equivalent +Shikshak Training are eligible to take even M.Ed Exam. <p><i>Further, only Karnataka Government has given its recognition to these degrees for admissions only they are collecting very huge amounts around 50 to 60 thousands rupees from the students to the student and swindling the collected amount without any benefit to students. No classes, no lecturers and no practical classes are being held at any of the centres.</i></p> <p><i>The Secretary of the DBHPS, Chennai has issued a pamphlet stating that a sum of Rs.500/- per students will be paid to the pracharak who encourages the students to get admission to these courses and has requested to take action immediately to stop this fraud</i></p> <p>The complainant had stated that last year the NCTE conducted investigation in Karnataka about the genuineness of marks cards and certificates issued by DBHPS and</p>
--	--	--

	<p>found so many loop holes. Such as the exams conducted elsewhere and whereas the name of the centres mentioned in the marks cards and certificate are quite different.</p> <p>Further, SRC, NCTE had not given any recognition to Hindi course run through Distance Education mode. The recognition accorded to 5 DBHPS institutions run in Karnataka has been withdrawn during 02.08.2010 for B.Ed course based on the complaint.</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was issued to the institution on 10.02.2011.</p> <p>Aggrieved by the Withdrawal order, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE, Hqrs and after considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the council reached the conclusion that there was adequate ground to accept the appeal and reverse the SRC's order dated 27.9.2010 with the direction to the SRC for issuance of showcause notice and for further action thereafter.</p> <p>Accordingly, the appeal was accepted and the order of the SRC dated 27.9.2010 reversed vide HQ order No.89-1010/2010-Appeal A29342 dated 23.12.2010.</p> <p>The SRC in its 200th meeting held on 20-21 January 2011 considered the appellate authority order dated 23.12.2010. VT report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and it was decided to issue show cause notice. Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 11.03.2011 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The built-up-area is only 4368.2 sq.ft., which is far short of the NCTE norms of 16,000 sq.ft.2. Sports facilities, Games facilities are not available.3. Library is having only 800 books related to Education, which are grossly inadequate. <p>Now, with the reference to the above notice issued by SRC, NCTE dated 11.03.2011 the same was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 (EDN- RES). The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka after considering the matter has ordered the Stay on all further proceedings by SRC. They have also submitted a copy of the order in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 dated 07.04.2011 of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka.</p> <p>Further, the institution has submitted its written representation on 07.03.2011 for the letter dated 10.02.2011, wherein the institution had stated that they have no remarks/comments to offer in this behalf as the letter does not have anything to complain against the college, it specifically mentions Hindi Distance Education, which is not at all concerned with this college.</p> <p>The SRC in its 204th meeting held on 27th and 28th April, 2011 considered the above matter and decided to get the stay vacated.</p> <p>The institution had filed a writ petition against the Showcause Notice issued to the institution vide W.P.No.13832-37/2011 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha(5 institutions) in Karnataka and others.</p>
--	--

		<p>As per the decision of SRC, the advocate was requested to vacate the interim stay granted to the institutions vide this office letters dated 11.5.2011, 5.12.2011, 16.4.2012, 4.9.2012 and 6.1.2013.</p> <p>A letter dated 13.2.2013 is received by this office on 30.4.2013 from Ashok Haranahalli Associates regarding W.P.No.13832-37/2011 of Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha and others wherein 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi, 2nd respondent is the SRC, NCTE, 3rd respondent is Union of India, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs represented by its Secretary, No.87, Parliament House, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110004 and 4th respondent is the Union of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Dept. of Higher Education, represented by its Secretary, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi-110115.</p> <p>The writ petition is filed by Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka Branch, No.113/114, S.C. Road, Sheshadripuram, Bangalore-560020 in respect of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DBHPS Lal Bahadur Shastri College of Education, Bangalore 2. DBHPS Rajiv Gandhi College of Education, Dharwad 3. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Bijapur 4. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Belgaum and 5. DBHPS Basaveshwara College of Education, Mysore. <p>The writ petition was filed questioning the orders dated 23.12.2010 passed by the 1st respondent-NCTE remanding the matter back to the 2nd respondent, and the consequential show-cause notices dated 11.3.2011 issued by the 2nd respondent-SRC.</p> <p>Letter of Ashok Haranahalli Associates dated 13.2.2013 stated that “the above matter came up for consideration before the Hon’ble High Court on 13.2.2013 for preliminary hearing in ‘B’ group. After hearing the matter, the Hon’ble Court quashed the impugned orders and notices and remanded the matter to the 1st respondent – NCTE to consider the issue whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction over the petitioner institutions, which are established under Central Legislation and also to consider the case of the petitioners. I have applied for the certified copy of the final order, and the same will be sent to you on its receipt.”</p> <p>Further, the advocate has opined that <i>“In my opinion the writ petitions were premature and as issuance of showcause notices cannot be questioned in the normal course. The learned Single Judge is also not correct in directing the NCTE to decide the issue whether NCTE has got supervision over petitioner institutions when the petitioner institutions are running the teacher training courses after obtaining recognition from NCTE. Further, NCTE Act prevails over all other Acts governing the field. Therefore, in my opinion this is a fit case for filing a Writ Appeal.”</i></p> <p>This office had not received certified copy of the order from Hon’ble Court and also from the institutions. Since the 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi and the direction of Hon’ble Court is for 1st respondent to consider the above issue.</p>
--	--	---

The SRC in its 245th meeting held during 19th – 21st May, 2013 considered the above matter and decided to inform the Lawyer to file an Appeal against the Court order, by highlighting the grant of recognition by SRCNCTE, Bangalore to DBHPS Basaveswara College of Education, Hindi Bhavan, V.V. Road, K.R. Mohalla, MYSORE-570 004, Karnataka for offering B.Ed (AOS0600) & B.Ed (APS0550) course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dt. 10.07.2000.

Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed to the Advocate with a request to file an appeal against the order of Hon'ble Court dated 13.02.2013.

In the meanwhile, a letter dated 2.8.2013 is received on 20.8.2013 from M/s. Haranahalli and Patil, Advocates stating that "In the above matter by the order dated 13.2.2013, the learned single judge of the Hon'ble High Court has quashed the order passed by the SRC withdrawing recognition granted to the petitioner institutions and the order passed by the appellate authority confirming the said orders. However, the learned single judge has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority to decide to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the Petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner – institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.

In my opinion, since the Learned Single Judge has not decided the issue of applicability of the NCTE Act and has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority, this is not a fit case for filing an appeal. However, the appellate authority/NCTE still wants to file an appeal, you are requested to send the copy of the writ petition along with certified copy of the final order so as to enable us to prepare the appeal papers."

The advocates' letter dated 13.2.2013 and 2.8.2013 are contrary to each other. In the letter dated 13.2.2013, the advocate has opined that this is a fit case for filing an appeal. In the letter dated 2.8.2013, he has stated that this is not a fit case for filing an appeal and has requested to send a copy of the writ petition along with certified cop of the final order.

The SRC in its 252nd meeting held during 13th – 14th September, 2013 considered the matter, letter from the Advocate dated 2-8-2013 and also Hon'ble High Court direction vide order dated 13-02-2013 remanding the matter to the Appellate authority to decided to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner-institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.

Since the case has been remanded to the Appellate authority (i.e., the NCTE) to examine the jurisdictional issued raised and to clarify the legal position, it is decided by the Committee to request the NCTE (H'qrs) to take further action accordingly.

		<p>Aggrieved by the Withdrawal order, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE, Hqrs, the appeal was accepted and the order of the SRC dated 2.8.2010 reversed vide HQ order No.89-1010/2010-Appeal A29354 dated 23.12.2010.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter is addressed to the NCTE, New Delhi on 29.10.2013 with a request to take further action.</p> <p>The original file was sent to the NCTE-Hqrs on 20.11.2013.</p> <p>Now, the appellate authority (NCTE-Hqrs) was submitted its decision in its 12th meeting held on 20.10.2014 received by SRC on 08.12.2014 and the committee decided as under:-</p> <p><i>“The appeal pertaining to cases filed by Dakshin Hindi Prachar Sabha, Belgaum, Karnataka in pursuance of the Court's order dated 13.02.2013 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the W.P.No.13831-13837/2011 was discussed in the 10th meeting of the Appeal Committee and Committee noted the legal opinion obtained by NCTE . The legal opinion is in conformity that the powers vested with the Dakshin Hindi Parachar Sabha through an Act to determine and maintain standards for teacher education and to regulate the same. Further the NCTE Act, 1993 is 'subsequent' and the “special legislation” and therefore, the provisions of NCTE Act will apply to Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha in relation to teacher training courses being conducted by it.</i></p> <p><i>The High Court order dated 13.02.2013 while referring the case or adjudication to the Appellate authority had advised that appellate authority shall give an opportunity to the petitioner's, before passing an order, to have their say in the matter.</i></p> <p><i>Appeal Committee, therefore, concluded that the above five appellants may be asked to appear before the Appeal Committee with their written submissions. Accordingly notice noted 30.09.2014 was issued to Secretary, Dakshin Baharath Hindi Prachar Sabha (DBHPS). S/Sh. Deen Bandhu, Special officer and Dr. Satish Kumar Pandey, Principal, Basaweshawara College of Education appeared before the Committee on 20.10.2014. The representatives of DBHPS submitted the written consent to the effect that the Sabha is in the ambit of NCTE Act and its regulations issued from time to time.</i></p> <p><i>Attention of NCTE is however, drawn the verdict dated 13.02.2013 of the High Court of Karnataka in the WP.Case no.13832-13837/2011. As per verdict given by the Hon'ble Court the impugned order dated 02.08.2010 derecognising the institutions was render 'Non Est' and also the consequential order dated 23.12.2010 of Appellate Authority to look into grievances of the petitioners as to whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction when necessarily the petitioner (DBHPS) is a statutory body. Hon'ble Court ha desired that Appellate Authority has to adjudicate in the matter by giving an opportunity to the petitioners before passing any order. After seeking legal opinion and holding deliberations. Appeal</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p>Committee formed a view that the institutions imparting teacher education, in whatever dialect, are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act and the representatives of DBHPS have also agreed that all teacher education courses being conducted by DBHPS are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act. A report in this regard is required to be submitted in the Hon'ble Court by the NCTE".</p> <p>In view of the above, the decision of the Appeal Committee is hereby communicated.</p> <p>This issue with the approval of the competent authority.</p> <p>The SRC in its 277th meeting held during considered the matter, Appellate authority order dated 20.10.2014, decided ad advised Southern Regional Office to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request NCTE (H'qrs) to communicate the appellate order to the Court. 2. Await Court orders. <p>As per decision of SRC, a letter sent to NCTE Hqrs on 11.02.2015.</p> <p>In the meantime, the institution has submitted an affidavit on 22.01.2015 as per the new regulations 2014 and the revised order was issued to the institution on 29.05.2015. The institution has submitted reply to the revised order on 31.05.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 321st meeting held during 28th – 30th September, 2016 considered the revised order reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Title is clear. Land area is not clear. 2. LUC is not approved by competent authority. 3. EC is given. 4. BP is in order. 5. BCC is in order. Built up area is adequate. 6. Original FDRs not given. 7. Approved faculty list- not given. 8. Fee not paid. 9. Collect fee and cause inspection. 10. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents and check on the deficiencies listed." <p>Accordingly as per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 16.11.2016. But the inspection was not conducted.</p> <p>The SRC in its 343rd meeting held during 1st- 2nd August, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "These are RPRO cases. In view of the latest instructions, no inspection is required in these. 2. But, these also involve 'shifting'. Therefore, VT Inspection will be required.
--	--	---

		<p style="text-align: center;">3. The SRO's request is noted and permission is given for organizing VT Inspection in these case."</p> <p>In the meantime a court notice was received by this office on 02.08.2017 from the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P.No. 106596/2017 filed by Dakshina Bharata Hindi Prachara Sabha V/s (1)The Union of India (2) The State of Karnataka (3) NCTE New Delhi (4) NCTE Bangalore & others before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka Bench at Dharwad.</p> <p>Brief of the facts:-</p> <p>The Peitioner's Institution is established by the 1st Respondent under an act of Parliament with an objective of promote Hindi Teaching as a National Language. The Petitioner's Institution has established several constituent Colleges and is issue in Degree / Diplomas in various courses. The 1st Respondent in 1997 directed all Universities and State Governments to recognize the degree in Diplomas issued by the Petitioner and its constituent Colleges for the purpose of employment in Central and State Government.</p> <p>Consequent on establishment of NCTE as a Competent Authority to determine minimum qualifications for appointment to the post of teachers in Primary, Secondary and High Schools. 2014 Regulations were issued prescribing the minimum qualifications for the post of Assistant Teacher. 2002 C & R Rules were issued by the 2nd Respondent prescribing qualification for the post of Assistant Teacher in various subjects of Primary and Secondary High Schools by the 2nd Respondent. It also declared Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course as equivalent to the B.Ed Degree for the purpose of appointment to the post of Language Assistant Hindi. Without noticing, it is only the 3rd Respondent, who has the authority to declare equivalency for the purpose of qualification to the post of Assistant Teacher in Schools.</p> <p>This Hon'ble Court by an order dated 30.07.2015 proceeded to quash the entire C & R Rules issued by the 2nd Respondent on the ground that they are in contravention of the NCTE Regulations subsequently by the impugned order dated 18.04.2017, the 2nd Respondent proceeded to withdraw all the notifications that were issued declaring equivalency of degree and diploma courses conducted by the Petitioner's Institution for the purpose of selection and appointment to the post of Language-Hindi. Without inviting the Petitioner and its constituent colleges. Hence, this Writ Petition.</p> <p>The petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) To call for records relating to issue of the impugned order bearing No. ED25 LBP 2017 issued by the 2nd Respondent. ii) To direct the 3rd Respondent to consider declaring Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution and its constituent Colleges as equal to that of B.Ed Degree for the limited purpose of qualification to the post of Language Assistant Hindi in terms of Regulations 6 of the 2014 Regulation.
--	--	---

	<p>iii) To direct the 3rd Respondent to recognize the Hidni Shiksha Snathak Court Certificates obtained by the teachers, who have already appointed to the post of Language Assistant Hindi and Direct the 2nd Respondent to continue their services as Assistant Teachers Language Hindi.</p> <p>iv) To pass such other orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.</p> <p>1st Respondent (The Union of India), 2nd Respondent (The State of Karnataka), 3rd Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education, Hqrs, New Delhi), 4th Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education).</p> <p>As the court case filed by DBHPS Petitioners to equivalency of B.Ed Course, a copy of the WP filed by the institution and the letter of SRC in mailed to the Hq for necessary action vide this office letter No. F.SRO/NCTE/DBHPS/CC/KA/B.Ed/2017/94310 dated 09.08.2017. A reminder was issued to Under Secretary (legal)on 03.10.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail was received from NCTE Hqrs Legal section on 31.10.2017. Accordingly, a letter was issued to the Under Secretary (legal section and to Advocate, Shri. M.B.Kanavi along with a letter dated 31.10.2017 received by NCT, Hqrs and brief of the case on 28.11.2017</p> <p>On 12.12.2017, a letter dated 08.12.2017 is received by this office from the advocate, Shri M.B.Kanavi, in w.p.no. 106596/2017 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha is as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“With reference to the above I writ to state that, I am in receipt of the Parawise Comments in respect of the Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha College of Education at Dharwad, Belagaum, Mysore and Bangalore.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Parawise Comments send to me are the meeting proceedings in respect of the deficiencies of these colleges. However, the issue involved in the writ petition is entirely different. The petitioner is seeking a direction to the Third Respondent for declaring Hindi Shikshana Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution as equal to that of B.Ed Degree course. Hence, it is requested to send the parawise comments on these issues after getting the clarifications from the Head Quarters.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Further, kindly make it a point to send all the supporting documents in support of our contention in all the cases. Since I am repeatedly sending letters seeking documents in support of our contentions.</p> <p>Accordingly, an e-mail was sent to Under Secretary, (Legal) on 20.12.2017.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above Court matter & decided as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. The details of the petition are noted.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2.1. This office is not mandated to go into issues relating to equivalence of</p>
--	---

		<p>courses/degrees/certificates. DBHPS should approach the NCTE (HQ) for that.</p> <p>2.2. The Communications addressed to this office in this connection have already been forwarded to NCTE (HQ) for appropriate further action.</p> <p>3. No inspection is required in this B.Ed case.</p> <p>4.1. Process the documents as an RPRO case.</p> <p>4.2. Give priority to new application cases. RPRO cases can be taken up after 15 March ie., after we clear the new cases before expiry of the time-limit prescribed by the Supreme Court for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19.</p>
5	<p>AOS00598 APS00546 B.Ed 2 Units DBHPS Rajiv Gandhi College of Education, Dharwad, Karnataka</p>	<p>DBHPS Rajiv Gandhi College of Education, D.C. Compound, Dharwad – 580001, Karnataka.</p> <p>DBHPS Rajiv Gandhi College of Education, D.C. Compound, Dharwad – 580001, Karnataka was granted recognition by SRC for offering B.Ed. course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dated 10.07.2000.</p> <p>A Complaint was received on 18.11.2009 from the Secretary, Hindi Prachar Mandali, Bijapur, Karnataka addressed to the Chairperson, NCTE, New Delhi regarding misappropriation of funds and Mal-administration of DBHPS institutions in Karnataka. The Complaint was forwarded to SRC from NCTE, Delhi on 10.12.2009.</p> <p>The allegations made against DBHPS institutions by the complainant is as under:-</p> <p><i>“1. Further, I would like to bring to your kind notice that the student intake is only 100 as per NCTE norms. But in the following colleges they have admitted more than 100 students by taking huge money from other than South India. 1. Dharwad120, 2. Bijapur-150, 3. Belgaum and mysore also excess of students in the attendance they are studying.</i></p> <p><i>2. If NCTE will visit it will be proved through the attendance register, accounts register and how much money collected from the students. It is noticed Sabha people under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti collecting 40,000 Rs. And accounting only 20 and 15 thousand rupees. So this matter is very serious and visiting team may sent for investigation and remedy.</i></p> <p><i>3. In all colleges disqualified lecturers persons are appointed as lecturers with fake degrees by taking huge amount from the students by Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti and Dr. Dilip Singh.</i></p> <p><i>4. All the Principals are under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti only not any other officer and even vice chancellor of Sabha Mr. Chinnayan also. Dr. Malimath is the president chancellor of the Sabha but he became of mouth piece of Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti, Mr. Malimath being the Karnataka person and close person of Mr. Neeral Katti and he is not carrying anything of the Sabha in the Capacity of the President.”</i></p> <p>Further, this office was in receipt of another letter dated 19.8.2009 from Sri. Om</p>

		<p>Narain, Lecturer of Hari Bawa Inter college Gawan, Badaun District, Uttar Pradesh regarding malpractices in B.Ed. College of Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka. The above letter has been forwarded by NCTE, Hqrs. on 16.11.2009.</p> <p><i>The complainant had stated that the annual intake in B.Ed. classes has been fixed at 100 students and the following colleges are admitting more than 100 students and adjusting these excess students against the leftover vacant seats for the preceding years i.e., 2007-2008 and 2008-09:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Afzalpur, Takke Athani Road, Bijapur-586101, Karnataka. 2. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Jilla Hospital Rasta(District Hospital road), Belgaum-590001. 3. Vishveshwara Siksha College, K.R. Mohalla, Bani Vilas Road, Mysore-570004. <p>Further, the complainant had stated that these students neither attend the classes nor go to teaching schools, even then they get more than 80% marks and has requested to investigate in the matter and punish the defaulters.</p> <p>The SRC in its 188th meeting held on 28-29 January, 2010 considered the matter and decided to cause inspection to the institution after obtaining the details of infrastructural and instructional facilities in the Questionnaire format.</p> <p>Accordingly, letter was issued to all 5 DBHPS institutions on 8.3.2010/5.3.2010 to submit explanation along with 10 documents to submit as per Questionnaire within 21 days from the date of receipt of the letter.</p> <p>The institution submitted its written representation on 30.03.2010.</p> <p>SRC in its 191st meeting held on 20-21 April 2010 considered the written representation submitted on 30.03.2010 and decided to cause inspection under section 17.</p> <p>Accordingly, inspection was carried out on 02.06.2010.</p> <p>The SRC in its 193rd meeting held on 21, 22 June, 2010 considered the report and decided to withdraw recognition for B.Ed. course.</p> <p>Accordingly, inspection was carried out on 01.06.2010 and the Committee considered the Report and decided to withdraw recognition for B.Ed. course for the following reasons :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per VT Report and as countersigned and admitted by the institution, the total built-up-area of the building comes to 7963 sq.ft. It is far short of the NCTE norm of 16,000 sq.ft. • As per VT Report and as admitted by the institution, one Lecturer and Principal do not possess requisite qualification and are not qualified as per NCTE norms. • Records were not produced to verify the quantum of admissions done by the
--	--	--

	<p>College giving room for suspecting the credentials.</p> <p>Under the above grounds, the Committee decides to withdraw the recognition for B.Ed. course with immediate effect. It is made clear that the institution is debarred from making any further admission subsequent to the date of issue of this order. The State Government/ affiliating University be informed accordingly.</p> <p>Withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 02.08.2010.</p> <p>Further, this office was in receipt of a copy of the complaint dated 23.11.2010 from aggrieved students which has been addressed to Sri.Kapil Sibal, Ministry of HRD, New Delhi regarding trade of marks cards and certificate in respect of Hindi Distance Education.</p> <p>In the complaint it has been stated that the Centers of DBHP in remote villages are collecting 40 to 50 thousand rupees and granting certificates to various degrees like MA, M.Phil and Ph.D and also they are conducting exams twice in a year. The eligibility for taking such exams are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 10+2+ Hindi Praveen of Equivalent Exam are eligible to take M.A.Exam• 10+2+ Hindi Praveen /Equivalent +Shikshak Training are eligible to take even M.Ed Exam. <p>Further, only Karnataka Government has given its recognition to these degrees for admissions only they are collecting very huge amounts around 50 to 60 thousands rupees from the students to the student and swindling the collected amount without any benefit to students. No classes, no lecturers and no practical classes are being held at any of the centres.</p> <p>The Secretary of the DBHPS, Chennai has issued a pamphlet stating that a sum of Rs.500/- per students will be paid to the pracharak who encourages the students to get admission to these courses and has requested to take action immediately to stop this fraud.</p> <p>The complainant had stated that last year the NCTE conducted investigation in Karnataka about the genuineness of marks cards and certificates issued by DBHPS and found so many loop holes. Such as the exams conducted elsewhere and where as the name of the centres mentioned in the marks cards and certificate are quite different.</p> <p>Further, SRC, NCTE has not given any recognition to Hindi course run through Distance Education mode. The recognition accorded to 5 DBHPS institutions run in Karnataka has been withdrawn during 02.08.2010 for B.Ed course based on the complaint.</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was issued to the institution on 10.02.2011.</p> <p>In the meantime, aggrieved by the Withdrawal order, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE, Hqrs and after considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing,</p>
--	--

	<p>the council reached the conclusion that there was adequate ground to accept the appeal and reverse the SRC's order dated 2.8.2010 with the direction to the SRC for issuance of showcause notice and for further action thereafter. Accordingly, the appeal was accepted and the order of the SRC dated 2.8.2010 reversed vide HQ order No.89-1010/2010-Appeal A29354 dated 23.12.2010.</p> <p>The SRC in its 200th meeting held on 20-21 January 2011 considered the Appellate authority order dated 23.12.2010 VT report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and it was decided to issue Show cause notice. Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 11.03.2011 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. As per VT Report and as countersigned and admitted by the institution, the total built-up-area of the building comes to 7963 sq.ft. It is far short of the NCTE norm of 16,000 sq.ft.2. As per VT Report and as admitted by the institution, one Lecturer and Principal do not possess requisite qualification and are not qualified as per NCTE norms.3. Records were not produced to verify the quantum of admissions done by the College giving room for suspecting the credentials. <p>Now, with the references to the above notice issued by SRC, NCTE dated 11.03.2011 the same was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 (EDN- RES). The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka after considering the matter has ordered the Stay on all further proceedings by SRC. They have also submitted a copy of the order in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 dated 07.04.2011 of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka.</p> <p>Further, the institution has submitted its written representation on 07.03.2011 for the letter dated 10.02.2011, wherein the institution had stated that they have no remarks/comments to offer in this behalf as the letter does not have anything to complain against the college, it specifically mentions Hindi Distance Education, which is not at all concerned with this college.</p> <p>The SRC in its 204th meeting held on 27th and 28th April, 2011 considered the above matter and decided to get the stay vacated.</p> <p>The institution had filed a writ petition against the Showcause Notice issued to the institution vide W.P.No.13832-37/2011 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha(5 institutions) in Karnataka and others.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, the advocate was requested to vacate the interim stay granted to the institutions vide this office letters dated 11.5.2011, 5.12.2011, 16.4.2012, 4.9.2012 and 6.1.2013.</p> <p>A letter dated 13.2.2013 is received by this office on 30.4.2013 from Ashok Haranahalli Associates regarding W.P.No.13832-37/2011 of Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha and others wherein 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi, 2nd respondent is the SRC,</p>
--	--

	<p>NCTE, 3rd respondent is Union of India, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs represented by its Secretary, No.87, Parliament House, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110004 and 4th respondent is the Union of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Dept. of Higher Education, represented by its Secretary, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi-110115.</p> <p>The writ petition is filed by Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka Branch, No.113/114, S.C. Road, Sheshadripuram, Bangalore-560020 in respect of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DBHPS Lal Bahadur Shastri College of Education, Bangalore 2. DBHPS Rajiv Gandhi College of Education, Dharwad 3. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Bijapur 4. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Belgaum and 5. DBHPS Basaveshwara College of Education, Mysore. <p>The writ petition was filed questioning the orders dated 23.12.2010 passed by the 1st respondent-NCTE remanding the matter back to the 2nd respondent, and the consequential show-cause notices dated 11.3.2011 issued by the 2nd respondent-SRC.</p> <p>Letter of Ashok Haranahalli Associates states that “the above matter came up for consideration before the Hon’ble High Court on 13.2.2013 for preliminary hearing in ‘B’ group. After hearing the matter, the Hon’ble Court quashed the impugned orders and notices and remanded the matter to the 1st respondent – NCTE to consider the issue whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction over the petitioner institutions, which are established under Central Legislation and also to consider the case of the petitioners. I have applied for the certified copy of the final order, and the same will be sent to you on its receipt.”</p> <p>Further, the advocate has opined that <i>“In my opinion the writ petitions were premature and as issuance of showcause notices cannot be questioned in the normal course. The learned Single Judge is also not correct in directing the NCTE to decide the issue whether NCTE has got supervision over petitioner institutions when the petitioner institutions are running the teacher training courses after obtaining recognition from NCTE. Further, NCTE Act prevails over all other Acts governing the field. Therefore, in my opinion this is a fit case for filing a Writ Appeal.”</i></p> <p>This office has not yet received certified copy of the order from Hon’ble Court and not even from the institutions. Since the 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi and the direction of Hon’ble Court is for 1st respondent to consider the above issue.</p> <p>The SRC in its 245th meeting held on 19th – 21st May, 2013 considered the matter and decided to inform the Lawyer to file an Appeal against the Court order, by highlighting the grant of recognition by SRCNCTE, Bangalore to DBHS Rajiv Gandhi College of Education, D.C. Compound, Dharwad-580 001, Karnataka for offering B.Ed (AOS0598) & B.Ed (APS0546) course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dt. 10.07.2000.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed to the Advocate with a request to file an appeal against the order of Hon’ble Court dated 13.02.2013.</p>
--	--

		<p>In the meanwhile, a letter dated 2.8.2013 is received on 20.8.2013 from M/s. Haranahalli and Patil, Advocates stating that <i>"In the above matter by the order dated 13.2.2013, the learned single judge of the Hon'ble High Court has quashed the order passed by the SRC withdrawing recognition granted to the petitioner institutions and the order passed by the appellate authority confirming the said orders. However, the learned single judge has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority to decide to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the Petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner – institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.</i></p> <p>In my opinion, since the Learned Single Judge has not decided the issue of applicability of the NCTE Act and has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority, this is not a fit case for filing an appeal. However, the appellate authority/NCTE still wants to file an appeal, you are requested to send the copy of the writ petition along with certified copy of the final order so as to enable us to prepare the appeal papers."</p> <p>The advocates' letter dated 13.2.2013 and 2.8.2013 are contrary to each other. In the letter dated 13.2.2013, the advocate has opined that this is a fit case for filing an appeal. In the letter dated 2.8.2013, he has stated that this is not a fit case for filing an appeal and has requested to send a copy of the writ petition along with certified cop of the final order.</p> <p>The SRC in its 252nd meeting held during 13th – 14th September, 2013 considered the matter, letter from the Advocate dated 2-8-2013 and also Hon'ble High Court direction vide order dated 13-02-2013 remanding the matter to the Appellate authority to decided to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner-institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.</p> <p>Since the case has been remanded to the Appellate authority (i.e., the NCTE) to examine the jurisdictional issued raised and to clarify the legal position, it is decided by the Committee to request the NCTE (H'qrs) to take further action accordingly.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter is addressed to the NCTE, New Delhi on 29.10.2013 with a request to take further action.</p> <p>The original file was sent to the NCTE-Hqrs on 20.11.2013.</p> <p>Now, the appellate authority (NCTE-Hqrs) was submitted its decision in its 12th meeting held on 20.10.2014 received by SRC on 08.12.2014 and the committee decided as under:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"The appeal pertaining to cases filed by Dakshin Hindi Prachar Sabha, Belgaum, Karnataka in pursuance of the Court's order dated 13.02.2013 passed by</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the W.P.No.13831-13837/2011 was discussed in the 10th meeting of the Appeal Committee and Committee noted the legal opinion obtained by NCTE . The legal opinion is in conformity that the powers vested with the Dakshin Hindi Parachar Sabha through an Act to determine and maintain standards for teacher education and to regulate the same. Further the NCTE Act, 1993 is 'subsequent' and the "special legislation" and therefore, the provisions of NCTE Act will apply to Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha in relation to teacher training courses being conducted by it.</i></p> <p><i>The High Court order dated 13.02.2013 while referring the case or adjudication to the Appellate authority had advised that appellate authority shall give an opportunity to the petitioner's, before passing an order, to have their say in the matter.</i></p> <p><i>Appeal Committee, therefore, concluded that the above five appellants may be asked to appear before the Appeal Committee with their written submissions. Accordingly notice noted 30.09.2014 was issued to Secretary, Dakshin Baharath Hindi Prachar Sabha (DBHPS). S/Sh. Deen Bandhu, Special officer and Dr. Satish Kumar Pandey, Principal, Basaweshawara College of Education appeared before the Committee on 20.10.2014. The representatives of DBHPS submitted the written consent to the effect that the Sabha is in the ambit of NCTE Act and its regulations issued from time to time.</i></p> <p><i>Attention of NCTE is however, drawn the verdict dated 13.02.2013 of the High Court of Karnataka in the WP.Case no.13832-13837/2011. As per verdict given by the Hon'ble Court the impugned order dated 02.08.2010 derecognising the institutions was render 'Non Est' and also the consequential order dated 23.12.2010 of Appellate Authority to look into grievances of the petitioners as to whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction when necessarily the petitioner (DBHPS) is a statutory body. Hon'ble Court ha desired that Appellate Authority has to adjudicate in the matter by giving an opportunity to the petitioners before passing any order. After seeking legal opinion and holding deliberations. Appeal Committee formed a view that the institutions imparting teacher education, in whatever dialect, are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act and the representatives of DBHPS have also agreed that all teacher education courses being conducted by DBHPS are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act. A report in this regard is required to be submitted in the Hon'ble Court by the NCTE".</i></p> <p><i>In view of the above, the decision of the Appeal Committee is hereby communicated.</i></p> <p><i>This issue with the appFroval of the competent authority."</i></p> <p><i>The SRC in its 277th meeting held during 20th – 22nd January 2015, considered the matter, Appellate authority order dated 20.10.2014, decided and advised Southern Regional Office to:</i></p>
--	---

	<p>1. Request NCTE (H'qrs) to communicate the appellate order to the Court. 2. Await Court orders.</p> <p>As per decision of SRC, a letter sent to NCTE Hqrs on 11.02.2015.</p> <p>In the meantime, the institution has submitted an affidavit on 22.01.2015 as per the new regulations 2014 and the revised order was issued to the institution on 29.05.2015. The institution has submitted reply to the revised order on 31.05.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 321st meeting held during 28th to 30th September, 2016 considered the revised order reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Title is clear. 2. LUC and EC are given. 3. BP is given. Built-up area is adequate. 4. BCC is given. Built-up area is adequate. 5. Original FDRs- not given. 6. Faculty list is given. It is not as per norms; it shows only 1+7 when 1+15 is required. 7. Fee not paid. 8. Collect fee and cause inspection. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents and check on the deficiencies listed." <p>Based on the website information the institution has submitted a letter requesting for cancellation of proposed inspection on 03.10.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 323rd meeting held during 16th – 18th November, 2016 considered the request of the institution and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "The faculty list was defective and to be corrected. 2. They have resubmitted the same list. 3. Faculty are mostly 'provisionally' appointed. We need appointment orders (for regular employees) and their joining reports. 4. Withdraw recognition w.e.f 2017-18. 5. There will be no fresh admissions in 2017-18. Students in the pipeline will complete their 2nd year B.Ed during 2017-18. " <p>The SRC in its 324th meeting held during 07th – 08th September, 2016 re-considered the decision of 323rd meeting and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "The decision to withdraw recognition was wrongly recorded in this case. The mistake is recognized; the mistake is corrected by cancelling the decision for withdrawal of recognition. 2. All documents are in order. 3. There has already been an inspection w.r.t. the M.Ed application. In any case, in view of the NCTE (HQ)'s recent instructions, no further inspection is necessary in this RPRO case.
--	---

		<p>4. Obtain latest Faculty list and FDRs for considering grant of Formal Recognition.”</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 16.12.2016.</p> <p>A court notice was received by this office on 02.08.2017 from the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P.No. 106596/2017 filed by Dakshina Bharata Hindi Prachara Sabha V/s The Union of India and NCTE & others before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka Bench at Dharwad.</p> <p>Brief of the facts:-</p> <p>The Petitioner's Institution is established by the 1st Respondent under an act of Parliament with an objective of promote Hindi Teaching as a National Language. The Petitioner's Institution has established several constituent Colleges and is issue in Degree / Diplomas in various courses. The 1st Respondent in 1997 directed all Universities and State Governments to recognize the degree in Diplomas issued by the Petitioner and its constituent Colleges for the purpose of employment in Central and State Government.</p> <p>Consequent on establishment of NCTE as a Competent Authority to determine minimum qualifications for appointment to the post of teachers in Primary, Secondary and High Schools. 2014 Regulations were issued prescribing the minimum qualifications for the post of Assistant Teacher. 2002 C & R Rules were issued by the 2nd Respondent prescribing qualification for the post of Assistant Teacher in various subjects of Primary and Secondary High Schools by the 2nd Respondent. It also declared Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course as equivalent to the B.Ed Degree for the purpose of appointment to the post of Language Assistant Hindi. Without noticing, it is only the 3rd Respondent, who has the authority to declare equivalency for the purpose of qualification to the post of Assistant Teacher in Schools.</p> <p>This Hon'ble Court by an order dated 30.07.2015 proceeded to quash the entire C & R Rules issued by the 2nd Respondent on the ground that they are in contravention of the NCTE Regulations subsequently by the impugned order dated 18.04.2017, the 2nd Respondent proceeded to withdraw all the notifications that were issued declaring equivalency of degree and diploma courses conducted by the Petitioner's Institution for the purpose of selection and appointment to the post of Language-Hindi. Without inviting the Petitioner and its constituent colleges. Hence, this Writ Petition.</p> <p>The petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) To call for records relating to issue of the impugned order bearing No. ED25 LBP 2017 issued by the 2nd Respondent. ii) To direct the 3rd Respondent to consider declaring Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution and its constituent Colleges as equal to that of B.Ed Degree for the limited purpose of qualification to the post of Language Assistant Hindi in terms of Regulations
--	--	--

	<p>6 of the 2014 Regulation.</p> <p>iii) To direct the 3rd Respondent to recognize the Hidni Shiksha Snathak Court Certificates obtained by the teachers, who have already appointed to the post of Language Assistant Hindi and Direct the 2nd Respondent to continue their services as Assistant Teachers Language Hindi.</p> <p>iv) To pass such other orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.</p> <p>1st Respondent (The Union of India), 2nd Respondent (The State of Karnataka), 3rd Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education, Hqrs, New Delhi), 4th Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education).</p> <p>As the court case filed by DBHPS Petitioners to equivalency of B.Ed Course, a copy of the WP filed by the institution and the letter of SRC in mailed to the Hq for necessary action vide this office letter No. F.SRO/NCTE/DBHPS/CC/KA/B.Ed/2017/94310 dated 09.08.2017. A reminder was issued to Under Secretary (legal)on 03.10.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail was received from NCTE Hqrs Legal section on 31.10.2017. Accordingly, a letter was issued to the Under Secretary (legal section and to Advocate, Shri. M.B.Kanavi along with a letter dated 31.10.2017 received by NCT, Hqrs and brief of the case on 28.11.2017</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was sent to Under Secretary (Legal), NCTE, Hqrs on 09.08.2017.</p> <p>On 12.12.2017, a letter dated 08.12.2017 is received by this office from the advocate, Shri M.B.Kanavi, in w.p.no. 106596/2017 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha is as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“With reference to the above I writ to state that, I am in receipt of the Parawise Comments in respect of the Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha College of Education at Dharwad, Belagaum, Mysore and Bangalore.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Parawise Comments send to me are the meeting proceedings in respect of the deficiencies of these colleges. However, the issue involved in the writ petition is entirely different. The petitioner is seeking a direction to the Third Respondent for declaring Hindi Shikshana Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution as equal to that of B.Ed Degree course. Hence, it is requested to send the parawise comments on these issues after getting the clarifications from the Head Quarters.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Further, kindly make it a point to send all the supporting documents in support of our contention in all the cases. Since I am repeatedly sending letters seeking documents in support of our contentions.</p> <p>Accordingly, an e-mail was sent to Under Secretary, (Legal) on 20.12.2017.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above Court matter & decided as under:</p>
--	---

		<p>a. The details of the petition are noted.</p> <p>2.1. This office is not mandated to go into issues relating to equivalence of courses/degrees/certificates. DBHPS should approach the NCTE (HQ) for that.</p> <p>2.2. The Communications addressed to this office in this connection have already been forwarded to NCTE (HQ) for appropriate further action.</p> <p>3. No inspection is required in this B.Ed case.</p> <p>4.1. Process the documents as an RPRO case.</p> <p>4.2. Give priority to new application cases. RPRO cases can be taken up after 15 March ie., after we clear the new cases before expiry of the time-limit prescribed by the Supreme Court for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19.</p>
6	<p>AOS00156 APS00544 B.Ed 2 Units DBHPS Lal Bahadur Shastri College of Education, Bangalore, Karnataka</p>	<p>DBHPS Lal Bahadur Shastri College of Education, 113/114, S.C.Road, Sheshadripuram, Bangalore – 560 020, Karnataka.</p> <p>DBHPS Lal Bahadur Shastri College of Education, 113/114, S.C.Road, Sheshadripuram, Bangalore – 560 020, Karnataka was granted recognition by SRC for offering B.Ed. course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dated 10.07.2000.</p> <p>A Complaint was received on 18.11.2009 from the Secretary, Hindi Prachar Mandal, Bijapur, Karnataka addressed to the Chairperson, NCTE, New Delhi regarding misappropriation of funds and Mal-administration of DBHPS institutions in Karnataka. The Complaint was forwarded to SRC from NCTE, Delhi on 10.12.2009.</p> <p>The allegations made against DBHPS institutions by the complainant is as under:-</p> <p>“1. Further, I would like to bring to your kind notice that the student intake is only 100 as per NCTE norms. But in the following colleges they have admitted more than 100 students by taking huge money from other than South India. 1. Dharwad 120, 2. Bijapur-150, 3. Belgaum and Mysore also excess of students in the attendance they are studying.</p> <p>2. If NCTE will visit it will be proved through the attendance register, accounts register and how much money collected from the students. It is noticed Sabha people under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti collecting 40,000 Rs. And accounting only 20 and 15 thousand rupees. So this matter is very serious and visiting team may be sent for investigation and remedy.</p> <p>3. In all colleges disqualified lecturers persons are appointed as lecturers with fake degrees by taking huge amount from the students by Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti and Dr. Dilip Singh.</p> <p>4. All the Principals are under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti only not any other officer and even vice chancellor of Sabha Mr. Chinnayan also. Dr. Malimath is the president/chancellor of the Sabha but he became a mouth piece of Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti, Mr. Malimath being the Karnataka person and close person of Mr. Neeral Katti and he is not carrying anything of the Sabha in the Capacity of the President.”</p>

	<p>Further, this office was in receipt of another letter dated 19.8.2009 from Sri. Om Narain, Lecturer of Hari Bawa Inter college Gawan, Badaun District, Uttar Pradesh regarding malpractices in B.Ed. College of Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka. The above letter has been forwarded by NCTE, Hqrs. on 16.11.2009.</p> <p>The complainant had stated that the annual intake in B.Ed. classes has been fixed at 100 students and the following colleges are admitting more than 100 students and adjusting these excess students against the leftover vacant seats for the preceding years i.e., 2007-2008 and 2008-09:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Afzalpur, Takke Athani Road, Bijapur-586101, Karnataka.2. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Jilla Hospital Rasta(District Hospital road), Belgaum-590001.3. Vishveshwara Siksha College, K.R. Mohalla, Bani Vilas Road, Mysore-570004. <p>Further, the complainant had stated that these students neither attend the classes nor go to teaching schools, even then they get more than 80% marks and has requested to investigate in the matter and punish the defaulters.</p> <p>The SRC in its 188th meeting held on 28-29 January, 2010 considered the matter and decided to cause inspection to the institution after obtaining the details of infrastructural and instructional facilities in the Questionnaire format.</p> <p>Accordingly, letter was issued to all 5 DBHPS institutions on 8.3.2010/5.3.2010 to submit explanation along with 10 documents to submit as per Questionnaire within 21 days from the date of receipt of the letter.</p> <p>SRC in its 191st meeting held on 20-21 April 2010 considered the written representation submitted on 30.03.2010 and decided to cause inspection under section 17 of NCTE Act.</p> <p>Accordingly, inspection was carried out on 3.6.2010.</p> <p>SRC in its 193rd meeting held on 21-22 June, 2010 considered the report and decided to withdraw recognition for B.Ed. course. Accordingly, withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 02.08.10.</p> <p>Further, this office was in receipt of a copy of the complaint dated 23.11.2010 from aggrieved students which has been addressed to Sri. Kapil Sibal, Ministry of HRD, New Delhi regarding trade of marks cards and certificate in respect of Hindi Distance Education.</p> <p>In the complaint it has been stated that the Centers of DBHP in remote villages are collecting 40 to 50 thousand rupees and granting certificates to various degrees like MA, M.Phil and Ph.D and also they are conducting exams twice in a year. The eligibility for</p>
--	--

	<p>taking such exams are as follows</p> <p>10+2+ Hindi Praveen of Equivalent Exam are eligible to take M.A.Exam 10+2+ Hindi Praveen /Equivalent +Shikshak Training are eligible to take even M.Ed Exam.</p> <p>Further, only Karnataka Government has given its recognition to these degrees for admissions only they are collecting very huge amounts around 50 to 60 thousands rupees from the students to the student and swindling the collected amount without any benefit to students. No classes, no lecturers and no practical classes are being held at any of the centres.</p> <p>The Secretary of the DBHPS, Chennai has issued a pamphlet stating that a sum of Rs.500/- per students will be paid to the pracharak who encourages the students to get admission to these courses and has requested to take action immediately to stop this fraud.</p> <p>The complainant had stated that last year the NCTE conducted investigation in Karnataka about the genuineness of marks cards and certificates issued by DBHPS and found so many loop holes. Such as the exams conducted elsewhere and where as the name of the centres mentioned in the marks cards and certificate are quite different.</p> <p>Further, SRC, NCTE has not given any recognition to Hindi course run through Distance Education mode. The recognition accorded to 5 DBHPS institutions run in Karnataka has been withdrawn during 02.08.2010 for B.Ed course based on the complaint. Accordingly, a letter was issued to the institution on 10.02.2011.</p> <p>Aggrieved by the Withdrawal order, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE, Hqrs and after considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the council reached the conclusion that there was adequate ground to accept the appeal and reverse the SRC's order dated 2.8.2010 with the direction to the SRC for issuance of showcause notice and for further action thereafter. Accordingly, the appeal was accepted and the order of the SRC dated 2.8.2010 reversed vide HQ order No.89-1010/2010-Appeal A29354 dated 23.12.2010.</p> <p>The SRC in its 200th meeting held on 20-21 January 2011 considered the Appellate authority order dated 23.12.2010 VT report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and it was decided to issue Show cause notice. Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 11.03.2011.</p> <p>As per VT Report and as countersigned by the Management, the total built-up-area of the building comes to 6736 sq.ft. which is far short of the NCTE norms of 16,000 sq.ft. Language lab. is not available. Games and Sports facilities is not available. Corporation Ground is being used.</p> <p>As per VT Report and as countersigned by the Management, 2 staff members do not possess requisite qualification as per NCTE norms.</p>
--	--

	<p>Now, with the references to the above notice issued by SRC, NCTE dated 11.03.2011 the same was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 (EDN- RES). The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka after considering the matter has ordered the Stay on all further proceedings by SRC. They have also submitted a copy of the order in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 dated 07.04.2011 of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka.</p> <p>Further, the institution has submitted its written representation on 07.03.2011 for the letter dated 10.02.2011, wherein the institution had stated that they have no remarks/comments to offer in this behalf as the letter does not have anything to complain against the college, it specifically mentions Hindi Distance Education, which is not at all concerned with this college.</p> <p>The SRC in its 204th meeting held on 27-28 April, 2011 considered the above matter and decided to get the stay vacated. The institution had filed a writ petition against the Showcause Notice issued to the institution vide W.P.No.13832-37/2011 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha(5 institutions) in Karnataka and others.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, the advocate was requested to vacate the interim stay granted to the institutions vide this office letters dated 11.5.2011, 5.12.2011, 16.4.2012, 4.9.2012 and 6.1.2013.</p> <p>A letter dated 13.2.2013 is received by this office on 30.4.2013 from Ashok Haranahalli Associates regarding W.P.No.13832-37/2011 of Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha and others wherein 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi, 2nd respondent is the SRC, NCTE, 3rd respondent is Union of India, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs represented by its Secretary, No.87, Parliament House, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110004 and 4th respondent is the Union of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Dept. of Higher Education, represented by its Secretary, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi-110115.</p> <p>The writ petition is filed by Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka Branch, No.113/114, S.C. Road, Sheshadripuram, Bangalore-560020 in respect of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DBHPS Lal Bahadur Shastri College of Education, Bangalore 2. DBHPS Rajiv Gandhi College of Education, Dharwad 3. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Bijapur 4. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Belgaum and 5. DBHPS Basaveshwara College of Education, Mysore. <p>The writ petition was filed questioning the orders dated 23.12.2010 passed by the 1st respondent-NCTE remanding the matter back to the 2nd respondent, and the consequential show-cause notices dated 11.3.2011 issued by the 2nd respondent-SRC.</p> <p>Letter of Ashok Haranahalli Associates dated 13.2.2013 stated that "the above matter came up for consideration before the Hon'ble High Court on 13.2.2013 for preliminary hearing in 'B' group. After hearing the matter, the Hon'ble Court quashed the impugned orders and notices and remanded the matter to the 1st respondent – NCTE to consider</p>
--	---

		<p>the issue whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction over the petitioner institutions, which are established under Central Legislation and also to consider the case of the petitioners. I have applied for the certified copy of the final order, and the same will be sent to you on its receipt.”</p> <p>Further, the advocate has opined that “In my opinion the writ petitions were premature and as issuance of showcause notices cannot be questioned in the normal course. The learned Single Judge is also not correct in directing the NCTE to decide the issue whether NCTE has got supervision over petitioner institutions when the petitioner institutions are running the teacher training courses after obtaining recognition from NCTE. Further, NCTE Act prevails over all other Acts governing the field. Therefore, in my opinion this is a fit case for filing a Writ Appeal.”</p> <p>This office has not yet received certified copy of the order from Hon’ble Court and not even from the institutions. Since the 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi and the direction of Hon’ble Court is for 1st respondent to consider the above issue.</p> <p>The SRC in its 245th meeting held on 19th – 21st May, 2013 considered the matter and decided to inform the Lawyer to file an Appeal against the Court order, by highlighting the grant of recognition by SRCNCTE, Bangalore to DBHPS Lal Bahadur Shastri College of Education, 113/114, S.C. Road, Sheshadripuram, Bangalore, Karnataka for offering B.Ed (APS00156) course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dt. 10.07.2000.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed to the Advocate with a request to file appeal against the order of Hon’ble Court dated 13.02.2013.</p> <p>In the meanwhile, a letter dated 2.8.2013 is received on 20.8.2013 from M/s. Haranahalli and Patil, Advocates stating that <i>“In the above matter by the order dated 13.2.2013, the learned single judge of the Hon’ble High Court has quashed the order passed by the SRC withdrawing recognition granted to the petitioner institutions and the order passed by the appellate authority confirming the said orders. However, the learned single judge has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority to decide to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the Petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner – institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.</i></p> <p><i>In my opinion, since the Learned Single Judge has not decided the issue of applicability of the NCTE Act and has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority, this is not a fit case for filing an appeal. However, the appellate authority/NCTE still wants to file an appeal, you are requested to send the copy of the writ petition along with certified copy of the final order so as to enable us to prepare the appeal papers.”</i></p> <p>The advocates’ letter dated 13.2.2013 and 2.8.2013 are contrary to each other. In the letter dated 13.2.2013, the advocate has opined that this is a fit case for filing an appeal. In the letter dated 2.8.2013, he has stated that this is not a fit case for filing an appeal</p>
--	--	---

		<p>and has requested to send a copy of the writ petition along with certified copy of the final order.</p> <p>The Committee considered the matter, letter from the Advocate dated 2-8-2013 and also Hon'ble High Court direction vide order dated 13-02-2013 remanding the matter to the Appellate authority to decide to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner-institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.</p> <p>Since the case has been remanded to the Appellate authority (i.e., the NCTE) to examine the jurisdictional issues raised and to clarify the legal position, it is decided by the Committee to request the NCTE (H'qrs) to take further action accordingly.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter is addressed to the NCTE, New Delhi on 29.10.2013 with a request to take further action. The original file was sent to the NCTE-Hqrs on 20.11.2013.</p> <p>Now, the appellate authority (NCTE-Hqrs) has submitted its decision in its 12th meeting held on 20.10.2014 received by SRC on 08.12.2014 and the committee decided as under:-</p> <p><i>"The appeal pertaining to cases filed by Dakshin Hindi Prachar Sabha, Belgaum, Karnataka in pursuance of the Court's order dated 13.02.2013 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the W.P.No.13831-13837/2011 was discussed in the 10th meeting of the Appeal Committee and Committee noted the legal opinion obtained by NCTE. The legal opinion is in conformity that the powers vested with the Dakshin Hindi Prachar Sabha through an Act to determine and maintain standards for teacher education and to regulate the same. Further the NCTE Act, 1993 is 'subsequent' and the "special legislation" and therefore, the provisions of NCTE Act will apply to Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha in relation to teacher training courses being conducted by it.</i></p> <p><i>The High Court order dated 13.02.2013 while referring the case for adjudication to the Appellate authority had advised that appellate authority shall give an opportunity to the petitioner's, before passing an order, to have their say in the matter.</i></p> <p><i>Appeal Committee, therefore, concluded that the above five appellants may be asked to appear before the Appeal Committee with their written submissions. Accordingly notice dated 30.09.2014 was issued to Secretary, Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha (DBHPS). S/Sh. Deen Bandhu, Special officer and Dr. Satish Kumar Pandey, Principal, Basaweshawara College of Education appeared before the Committee on 20.10.2014. The representatives of DBHPS submitted the written consent to the effect that the Sabha is in the ambit of NCTE Act and its regulations issued from time to time.</i></p> <p><i>Attention of NCTE is however, drawn the verdict dated 13.02.2013 of the High</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>Court of Karnataka in the WP.Case no.13832-13837/2011. As per verdict given by the Hon'ble Court the impugned order dated 02.08.2010 derecognising the institutions was render 'Non Est' and also the consequential order dated 23.12.2010 of Appellate Authority to look into grievances of the petitioners as to whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction when necessarily the petitioner (DBHPS) is a statutory body. Hon'ble Court ha desired that Appellate Authority has to adjudicate in the matter by giving an opportunity to the petitioners before passing any order. After seeking legal opinion and holding deliberations. Appeal Committee formed a view that the institutions imparting teacher education, in whatever dialect, are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act and the representatives of DBHPS have also agreed that all teacher education courses being conducted by DBHPS are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act. A report in this regard is required to be submitted in the Hon'ble Court by the NCTE".</i></p> <p>In view of the above, the decision of the Appeal Committee is hereby communicated.</p> <p>This issue with the approval of the competent authority.</p> <p>The SRC in its 277th meeting held during 20th to 22nd January, 2015 considered the matter, Appellate authority order dated 20.10.2014, decided ad advised Southern Regional Office to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Request NCTE (H'qrs) to communicate the appellate order to the Court. 2.Await Court orders. <p>As per decision of SRC, a letter was issued to NCTE Hqrs on 11.02.2015.</p> <p>In the meantime, the institution has submitted an affidavit on 22.01.2015 as per the new regulations 2014 and the revised order was issued to the institution on 29.05.2015. The institution has submitted reply to the revised order on 29.02.2016 & 31.05.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 321st meeting held during 28th to 30th September, 2016 considered the revised order reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Title is there. 2. LUC is not approved by the competent authority. 3. EC- not given. 4. BP-not approved by competent authority. Built up area is inadequate. 5. BCC is not approved by competent authority. 6. FDRs- not given. 7. Faculty list is not approved; not as per Regulations, Not adequate. Physical education/Fine Arts/Perspectives have not been covered. 8. Fee not paid. 9. Collect fee and cause inspection. 10. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents and check on the deficiencies listed."
--	--	--

	<p>A representation dated 01/10/2016 has been received from the institution requesting for one unit of B.Ed course instead of two units and also for cancellation of inspection.</p> <p>The SRC in its 324th meeting held during 07th – 08th December, 2016 considered the request of the institution for one unit and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. “There is no need of inspection in this case.2. The request for reduction from 2 units to 1 unit is accepted.3. Ask them to submit all relevant documents by 30.12.2016.4. Process; and put up.” <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 16.12.2016.</p> <p>The institution has submitted the following documents for one unit on 30.12.2016.</p> <p>Brief of the facts:-</p> <p>The Petitioner’s Institution is established by the 1st Respondent under an act of Parliament with an objective of promote Hindi Teaching as a National Language. The Petitioner’s Institution has established several constituent Colleges and is issue in Degree / Diplomas in various courses. The 1st Respondent in 1997 directed all Universities and State Governments to recognize the degree in Diplomas issued by the Petitioner and its constituent Colleges for the purpose of employment in Central and State Government.</p> <p>Consequent on establishment of NCTE as a Competent Authority to determine minimum qualifications for appointment to the post of teachers in Primary, Secondary and High Schools. 2014 Regulations were issued prescribing the minimum qualifications for the post of Assistant Teacher. 2002 C & R Rules were issued by the 2nd Respondent prescribing qualification for the post of Assistant Teacher in various subjects of Primary and Secondary High Schools by the 2nd Respondent. It also declared Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course as equivalent to the B.Ed Degree for the purpose of appointment to the post of Language Assistant Hindi. Without noticing, it is only the 3rd Respondent, who has the authority to declare equivalency for the purpose of qualification to the post of Assistant Teacher in Schools.</p> <p>This Hon’ble Court by an order dated 30.07.2015 proceeded to quash the entire C & R Rules issued by the 2nd Respondent on the ground that they are in contravention of the NCTE Regulations subsequently by the impugned order dated 18.04.2017, the 2nd Respondent proceeded to withdraw all the notifications that were issued declaring equivalency of degree and diploma courses conducted by the Petitioner’s Institution for the purpose of selection and appointment to the post of Language-Hindi. Without inviting the Petitioner and its constituent colleges. Hence, this Writ Petition.</p> <p>The petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-</p>
--	--

	<p>i) To call for records relating to issue of the impugned order bearing No. ED25 LBP 2017 issued by the 2nd Respondent.</p> <p>ii) To direct the 3rd Respondent to consider declaring Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution and its constituent Colleges as equal to that of B.Ed Degree for the limited purpose of qualification to the post of Language Assistant Hindi in terms of Regulations 6 of the 2014 Regulation.</p> <p>iii) To direct the 3rd Respondent to recognize the Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course Certificates obtained by the teachers, who have already appointed to the post of Language Assistant Hindi and Direct the 2nd Respondent to continue their services as Assistant Teachers Language Hindi.</p> <p>iv) To pass such other orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.</p> <p>1st Respondent (The Union of India), 2nd Respondent (The State of Karnataka), 3rd Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education, Hqrs, New Delhi), 4th Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education).</p> <p>As the court case filed by DBHPS Petitioners to equivalency of B.Ed Course, a copy of the WP filed by the institution and the letter of SRC is mailed to the Hq for necessary action vide this office letter No. F.SRO/NCTE/DBHPS/CC/KA/B.Ed/2017/94310 dated 09.08.2017. A reminder was issued to Under Secretary (legal)on 03.10.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail was received from NCTE Hqrs Legal section on 31.10.2017. Accordingly, a letter was issued to the Under Secretary (legal section and to Advocate, Shri. M.B.Kanavi along with a letter dated 31.10.2017 received by NCT, Hqrs and brief of the case on 28.11.2017</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was sent to Under Secretary (Legal), NCTE, Hqrs on 09.08.2017.</p> <p>On 12.12.2017, a letter dated 08.12.2017 is received by this office from the advocate, Shri M.B.Kanavi, in w.p.no. 106596/2017 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha is as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“With reference to the above I writ to state that, I am in receipt of the Parawise Comments in respect of the Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha College of Education at Dharwad, Belagaum, Mysore and Bangalore.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Parawise Comments send to me are the meeting proceedings in respect of the deficiencies of these colleges. However, the issue involved in the writ petition is entirely different. The petitioner is seeking a direction to the Third Respondent for declaring Hindi Shikshana Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution as equal to that of B.Ed Degree course. Hence, it is requested to send the parawise comments on these issues after getting the clarifications from the Head Quarters.</p>
--	---

		<p>Further, kindly make it a point to send all the supporting documents in support of our contention in all the cases. Since I am repeatedly sending letters seeking documents in support of our contentions.</p> <p>Accordingly, an e-mail was sent to Under Secretary, (Legal) on 20.12.2017.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above Court matter & decided as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. The details of the petition are noted.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2.1. This office is not mandated to go into issues relating to equivalence of courses/degrees/certificates. DBHPS should approach the NCTE (HQ) for that.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2.2. The Communications addressed to this office in this connection have already been forwarded to NCTE (HQ) for appropriate further action.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">3. No inspection is required in this B.Ed case.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4.1. Process the documents as an RPRO case.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4.2. Give priority to new application cases. RPRO cases can be taken up after 15 March ie., after we clear the new cases before expiry of the time-limit prescribed by the Supreme Court for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19.</p>
7	<p>AOS00602 APS00538 B.Ed 2 Units DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Belgaum, Karnataka</p>	<p>DBHPS Dr.B.D. Jatti College of Education, Civil Hospital Road, Ayodhya Nagar, Belgaum – 590 001, Karnataka.</p> <p>DBHPS Dr.B.D. Jatti College of Education, Civil Hospital Road, Ayodhya Nagar, Belgaum – 590 001, Karnataka was granted recognition by SRC for offering B.Ed. course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dated 10.07.2000.</p> <p>A Complaint was received on 18.11.2009 from the Secretary, Hindi Prachar Mandal, Bijapur, Karnataka addressed to the Chairperson, NCTE, New Delhi regarding misappropriation of funds and Mal-administration of DBHPS institutions in Karnataka. The Complaint was forwarded to SRC from NCTE, Delhi on 10.12.2009.</p> <p>The allegations made against DBHPS institutions by the complainant is as under:-</p> <p><i>“1. Further, I would like to bring to your kind notice that the student intake is only 100 as per NCTE norms. But in the following colleges they have admitted more than 100 students by taking huge money from other than South India. 1. Dharwad 120, 2. Bijapur-150, 3. Belgaum and Mysore also excess of students in the attendance they are studying.</i></p> <p><i>2. If NCTE will visit it will be proved through the attendance register, accounts register and how much money collected from the students. It is noticed Sabha people under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti collecting 40,000 Rs. And accounting only 20 and 15 thousand rupees. So this matter is very serious and visiting team may be sent for investigation and remedy.</i></p> <p><i>3. In all colleges disqualified lecturers persons are appointed as lecturers with fake degrees by taking huge amount from the students by Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti and Dr. Dilip</i></p>

		<p><i>Singh.</i></p> <p><i>4. All the Principals are under the instruction of Mr. Neeral Katti only not any other officer and even vice chancellor of Sabha Mr. Chinnayan also. Dr. Malimath is the president chancellor of the Sabha but he became of mouth piece of Mr. R.F. Neeral Katti, Mr. Malimath being the Karnataka person and close person of Mr. Neeral Katti and he is not carrying anything of the Sabha in the Capacity of the President."</i></p> <p>Further, this office was in receipt of another letter dated 19.8.2009 from Sri. Om Narain, Lecturer of Hari Bawa Inter college Gawan, Badaun District, Uttar Pradesh regarding malpractices in B.Ed. College of Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka. The above letter has been forwarded by NCTE, Hqrs. on 16.11.2009.</p> <p><i>The complainant had stated that the annual intake in B.Ed. classes has been fixed at 100 students and the following colleges are admitting more than 100 students and adjusting these excess students against the leftover vacant seats for the preceding years i.e., 2007-2008 and 2008-09:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Afzalpur, Takke Athani Road, Bijapur-586101, Karnataka.</i> <i>2. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti Siksha College, Jilla Hospital Rasta (District Hospital road), Belgaum-590001.</i> <i>3. Vishveshwara Siksha College, K.R. Mohalla, Bani Vilas Road, Mysore-570004.</i> <p>Further, the complainant had stated that these students neither attend the classes nor go to teaching schools, even then they get more than 80% marks and has requested to investigate in the matter and punish the defaulters.</p> <p>The SRC in its 188th meeting held on 28-29 January, 2010 considered the matter and decided to cause inspection to the institution after obtaining the details of infrastructural and instructional facilities in the Questionnaire format.</p> <p>Accordingly, letter was issued to all 5 DBHPS institutions on 8.3.2010/5.3.2010 to submit explanation along with 10 documents to submit as per Questionnaire within 21 days from the date of receipt of the letter.</p> <p>The institution submitted its written representation on 30.03.2010.</p> <p>SRC in its 191st meeting held on 20-21 April 2010 considered the written representation submitted on 30.03.2010 and decided to cause inspection under section 17 of NCTE Act.</p> <p>Accordingly, inspection was carried out on 01.06.2010.</p> <p>The SRC in its 193rd meeting held on 21-22 June, 2010 considered the Report and decided to withdraw recognition for B.Ed. course for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per VT Report and as countersigned by the institution, the total built-up-area earmarked for the course is 8,109 sq.ft.; but on calculation, the total built-up-
--	--	--

	<p>area comes to only 4976.43 sq.ft. It is far less than NCTE norms of 16,000 sq.ft. of built-up-area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per VT report and as countersigned by the institution, three teachers are not qualified as per NCTE norms. • As per VT report and as countersigned by the institution, the institution is in the habit of carrying forward the shortage of admissions(unfilled seats of previous years) to the next year and is admitting more than the stipulated intake of 100 in subsequent years as and when demand increases/comes. This unacademic/commercial practice is not acceptable as per the norms. <p>Under the above grounds, the Committee decides to withdraw the recognition for B.Ed. course with immediate effect. It was made clear that the institution is debarred from making any further admission subsequent to the date of issue of this order. The State Government/affiliating University be informed accordingly.</p> <p>As per the decision of 193rd meeting of SRC, Withdrawal order was issued the institution on 02.08.2010.</p> <p>Further, this office was in receipt of a copy of the complaint dated 23.11.2010 from aggrieved students which has been addressed to Sri.Kapil Sibal, Ministry of HRD, New Delhi regarding trade of marks cards and certificate in respect of Hindi Distance Education.</p> <p>In the complaint it has been stated that the Centers of DBHP in remote villages are collecting 40 to 50 thousand rupees and granting certificates to various degrees like MA, M.Phil and Ph.D and also they are conducting exams twice in a year.</p> <p>The eligibility for taking such exams are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10+2+ Hindi Praveen of Equivalent Exam are eligible to take M.A.Exam • 10+2+ Hindi Praveen /Equivalent +Shikshak Training are eligible to take even M.Ed Exam. <p><i>Further, only Karnataka Government has given its recognition to these degrees for admissions only they are collecting very huge amounts around 50 to 60 thousands rupees from the students to the student and swindling the collected amount without any benefit to students. No classes, no lecturers and no practical classes are being held at any of the centres.</i></p> <p>The Secretary of the DBHPS, Chennai has issued a pamphlet stating that a sum of Rs.500/- per students will be paid to the pracharak who encourages the students to get admission to these courses and has requested to take action immediately to stop this fraud.</p> <p>The complainant had stated that last year the NCTE conducted investigation in Karnataka about the genuineness of marks cards and certificates issued by DBHPS and found so many loop holes. Such as the exams conducted elsewhere and where as the name of the centres mentioned in the marks cards and certificate are quite different.</p>
--	--

	<p>Further, SRC, NCTE has not given any recognition to Hindi course run through Distance Education mode. The recognition accorded to 5 DBHPS institutions run in Karnataka has been withdrawn during 02.08.2010 for B.Ed course based on the complaint.</p> <p>Accordingly, a letter was issued to the institution on 10.02.2011.</p> <p>In the meantime, aggrieved by the Withdrawal order, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE, Hqrs and after considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the council reached the conclusion that there was adequate ground to accept the appeal and reverse the SRC's order dated 2.8.2010 with the direction to the SRC for issuance of showcause notice and for further action thereafter. Accordingly, the appeal was accepted and the order of the SRC dated 2.8.2010 reversed vide HQ order No.89-1010/2010-Appeal A29346 dated 23.12.2010.</p> <p>The institution had preferred an appeal to NCTE, Hqrs and the appellant authority has reversed the withdrawal order of SRC vide order dated 23.12.2010 with a direction to the SRC for issuance of show cause notice.</p> <p>The SRC in its 200th meeting held on 20-21 January 2011 considered the Appellate authority order dated 23.12.2010 VT report, VCD and all the relevant documentary evidences and it was decided to issue Show cause notice. Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 11.03.2011 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As per VT Report and as countersigned by the institution, the total built-up-area earmarked for the course is 8,109 sq.ft.; but on calculation, the total built-up-area comes to only 4976.43 sq.ft. Both are far less than NCTE norms of 16,000 sq.ft. of built-up-area. 2. As per VT report and as countersigned by the institution, three teachers are not qualified as per NCTE norms. 3. As per VT report and as countersigned by the institution, the institution is in the habit of carrying forward the shortage of admissions(unfilled seats of previous years) to the next year and is admitting more than the stipulated intake of 100 in subsequent years as and when demand increases/comes. This un-academic/commercial practice is not acceptable as per the norms. <p>Now, with the references to the above notice issued by SRC, NCTE dated 11.03.2011 the same was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 (EDN- RES). The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka after considering the matter has ordered the Stay on all further proceedings by SRC. They have also submitted a copy of the order in W.P.No. 13832-13837/2011 dated 07.04.2011 of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka.</p> <p>Further, the institution has submitted its written representation on 04.03.2011 for the letter dated 10.02.2011, wherein the institution had stated that they have no remarks/comments to offer in this behalf as the letter does not have anything to complain against the college, it specifically mentions Hindi Distance Education, which is not at all concerned with this college.</p>
--	---

		<p>The SRC in its 204th meeting held on 27th and 28th April, 2011 considered the above matter and decided to get the stay vacated.</p> <p>The institution had filed a writ petition against the Showcause Notice issued to the institution vide W.P.No.13832-37/2011 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha(5 institutions) in Karnataka and others.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, the advocate was requested to vacate the interim stay granted to the institutions vide this office letters dated 11.5.2011, 5.12.2011, 16.4.2012, 4.9.2012 and 6.1.2013.</p> <p>A letter dated 13.2.2013 is received by this office on 30.4.2013 from Ashok Haranahalli Associates regarding W.P.No.13832-37/2011 of Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha and others wherein 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi, 2nd respondent is the SRC, NCTE, 3rd respondent is Union of India, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs represented by its Secretary, No.87, Parliament House, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110004 and 4th respondent is the Union of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Dept. of Higher Education, represented by its Secretary, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi-110115.</p> <p>The writ petition is filed by Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha, Karnataka Branch, No.113/114, S.C. Road, Sheshadripuram, Bangalore-560020 in respect of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DBHPS Lal Bahadur Shastri College of Education, Bangalore 2. DBHPS Rajiv Gandhi College of Education, Dharwad 3. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Bijapur 4. DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Belgaum and 5. DBHPS Basaveshwara College of Education, Mysore. <p>The writ petition was filed questioning the orders dated 23.12.2010 passed by the 1st respondent-NCTE remanding the matter back to the 2nd respondent, and the consequential show-cause notices dated 11.3.2011 issued by the 2nd respondent-SRC.</p> <p>Letter of Ashok Haranahalli Associates dated 13.2.2013 stated that “the above matter came up for consideration before the Hon’ble High Court on 13.2.2013 for preliminary hearing in ‘B’ group. After hearing the matter, the Hon’ble Court quashed the impugned orders and notices and remanded the matter to the 1strespondent – NCTE to consider the issue whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction over the petitioner institutions, which are established under Central Legislation and also to consider the case of the petitioners. I have applied for the certified copy of the final order, and the same will be sent to you on its receipt.”</p> <p>Further, the advocate has opined that “In my opinion the writ petitions were premature and as issuance of showcause notices cannot be questioned in the normal course. The learned Single Judge is also not correct in directing the NCTE to decide the issue whether NCTE has got supervision over petitioner institutions when the petitioner institutions are running the teacher training courses after obtaining recognition from NCTE. Further, NCTE Act prevails over all other Acts governing the field. Therefore, in my opinion this is a fit case for filing a Writ Appeal.”</p>
--	--	---

		<p>This office had not received certified copy of the order from Hon'ble Court and also from the institutions. Since the 1st respondent is the NCTE, New Delhi and the direction of Hon'ble Court is for 1st respondent to consider the above issue.</p> <p>The SRC in its 245th meeting held during 19th – 21st May, 2013 considered the above matter and decided to inform the Lawyer to file an Appeal against the Court order, by highlighting the grant of recognition by SRCNCTE, Bangalore to DBHPS Dr. B.D. Jatti College of Education, Civil Hospital Road, Ayodhya Nagar, Belgaum-590 001, Karnataka for offering B.Ed (AOS0602) & B.Ed (APS0538) course with an intake of 60 students from the session 2000-2001 vide order dt. 10.07.2000.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed to the Advocate with a request to file appeal against the order of Hon'ble Court dated 13.02.2013.</p> <p>In the meanwhile, a letter dated 2.8.2013 is received on 20.8.2013 from M/s. Haranahalli and Patil, Advocates stating that "In the above matter by the order dated 13.2.2013, the learned single judge of the Hon'ble High Court has quashed the order passed by the SRC withdrawing recognition granted to the petitioner institutions and the order passed by the appellate authority confirming the said orders. However, the learned single judge has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority to decide to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the Petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner – institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.</p> <p>In my opinion, since the Learned Single Judge has not decided the issue of applicability of the NCTE Act and has remanded the matter to the Appellate authority, this is not a fit case for filing an appeal. However, the appellate authority/NCTE still wants to file an appeal, you are requested to send the copy of the writ petition along with certified copy of the final order so as to enable us to prepare the appeal papers."</p> <p>The advocates' letter dated 13.2.2013 and 2.8.2013 are contrary to each other. In the letter dated 13.2.2013, the advocate has opined that this is a fit case for filing an appeal and that certified order will be sent in due course. In the letter dated 2.8.2013, he has stated that this is not a fit case for filing an appeal and has requested to send a copy of the writ petition along with certified copy of the final order.</p> <p>The SRC in its 252nd meeting held during 13-14 September, 2013 considered the matter, letter from the Advocate dated 2-8-2013 and also Hon'ble High Court direction vide order dated 13-02-2013 remanding the matter to the Appellate authority to decided to look into the grievance of the petitioners including the applicability of the act to the petitioner-institutions. Therefore, now the appellate authority has to take a decision in the matter after issuing notice to the petitioner-institutions regarding the applicability of the Act and the deficiencies.</p> <p>Since the case has been remanded to the Appellate authority (i.e., the NCTE) to</p>
--	--	--

	<p>examine the jurisdictional issued raised and to clarify the legal position, it is decided by the Committee to request the NCTE (H'qrs) to take further action accordingly.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter is addressed to the NCTE, New Delhi on 29.10.2013 with a request to take further action.</p> <p>A letter F. No. 91-17th Mtg. 2013-Appeal dated 12.11.2013 is received by SRC from the Section Officer, NCTE, New Delhi requesting to send the original records pertaining to DBHPs Dr. B.D.Jatti College of Education, Belgaum District, Karnataka B.Ed along with comments of this office for necessary action.</p> <p>The original file was sent to the NCTE-Hqrs on 20.11.2013.</p> <p>The institution preferred an appeal to NCTE Hqrs and the NCTE Appellate Authority in its order F.No. 89-1009, 1010, 1012, 1013 and 1014/2010-Appeal/12th Meeting 2014 dated 26.11.2014 order stated as follows:</p> <p><i>“The appeal pertaining to cases filed by Dakshin Hindi Prachar Sabha, Belgaum, Karnataka in pursuance of the Court's order dated 13.02.2013 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the W.P.No.13831-13837/2011 was discussed in the 10th meeting of the Appeal Committee and Committee noted the legal opinion obtained by NCTE . The legal opinion is in conformity that the powers vested with the Dakshin Hindi Parachar Sabha through an Act to determine and maintain standards for teacher education and to regulate the same. Further the NCTE Act, 1993 is 'subsequent' and the “special legislation” and therefore, the provisions of NCTE Act will apply to Dakshin Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha in relation to teacher training courses being conducted by it.</i></p> <p><i>The High Court order dated 13.02.2013 while referring the case or adjudication to the Appellate authority had advised that appellate authority shall give an opportunity to the petitioner's, before passing an order, to have their say in the matter.</i></p> <p><i>Appeal Committee, therefore, concluded that the above five appellants may be asked to appear before the Appeal Committee with their written submissions. Accordingly notice noted 30.09.2014 was issued to Secretary, Dakshin Baharath Hindi Prachar Sabha (DBHPS). S/Sh. Deen Bandhu, Special officer and Dr. Satish Kumar Pandey, Principal, Basaweshawara College of Education appeared before the Committee on 20.10.2014. The representatives of DBHPS submitted the written consent to the effect that the Sabha is in the ambit of NCTE Act and its regulations issued from time to time.</i></p> <p><i>Attention of NCTE is however, drawn the verdict dated 13.02.2013 of the High Court of Karnataka in the WP.Case no.13832-13837/2011. As per verdict given by the Hon'ble Court the impugned order dated 02.08.2010 derecognising the institutions was render 'Non Est' and also the consequential order dated 23.12.2010 of Appellate Authority to look into grievances of the petitioners as to</i></p>
--	--

	<p><i>whether NCTE has got supervisory jurisdiction when necessarily the petitioner (DBHPS) is a statutory body. Hon'ble Court ha desired that Appellate Authority has to adjudicate in the matter by giving an opportunity to the petitioners before passing any order. After seeking legal opinion and holding deliberations. Appeal Committee formed a view that the institutions imparting teacher education, in whatever dialect, are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act and the representatives of DBHPS have also agreed that all teacher education courses being conducted by DBHPS are covered under the ambit of NCTE Act. A report in this regard is required to be submitted in the Hon'ble Court by the NCTE".</i></p> <p>In view of the above, the decision of the Appeal Committee is hereby communicated.</p> <p>This issue with the approval of the competent authority.</p> <p>The SRC in its 277th meeting held during 20th -22nd January, 2015, considered the matter, Appellate authority order dated 20.10.2014, and decided advised to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request NCTE (H'qrs) to communicate the appellate order to the Court. 2. Await Court orders. <p>As per decision of SRC, a letter sent to NCTE Hqrs on 11.02.2015.</p> <p>In the meantime, the institution has submitted an affidavit on 22.01.2015 as per the new regulations 2014 and the revised order was issued to the institution on 29.05.2015. The institution has submitted reply to the revised order on 29.02.2016 and 04.06.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 321st meeting held during 28th – 30th September, 2016 considered the revised order reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Title is clear. Land area is adequate. 2. LUC- not by competent authority. 3. EC is given. 4. BP is given. Built up area shown is adequate. 5. BCC is in order. Built up area shown is adequate. 6. Original FDRs not given. 7. Faculty list is given. Not approved. Not as per norms 1+15 are required; only 1+10 are shown. 8. Fee not paid. 9. Collect fee and cause inspection. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents and check on the deficiencies listed." <p>Accordingly as per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 16.11.2016. But the inspection was not conducted.</p> <p>The SRC in its 343rd meeting held during 1st- 2nd August, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "These are RPRO cases. In view of the latest instructions, no
--	---

	<p>inspection is required in these.</p> <p>2. But, these also involve 'shifting'. Therefore, VT Inspection will be required.</p> <p>3. The SRO's request is noted and permission is given for organizing VT Inspection in these case."</p> <p>In the meantime a court notice was received by this office on 02.08.2017 from the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P.No. 106596/2017 filed by Dakshina Bharata Hindi Prachara Sabha V/s (1)The Union of India (2) The State of Karnataka (3) NCTE New Delhi (4) NCTE Bangalore & others before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka Bench at Dharwad.</p> <p>Brief of the facts:-</p> <p>The Peitioner's Institution is established by the 1st Respondent under an act of Parliament with an objective of promote Hindi Teaching as a National Language. The Petitioner's Institution has established several constituent Colleges and is issue in Degree / Diplomas in various courses. The 1st Respondent in 1997 directed all Universities and State Governments to recognize the degree in Diplomas issued by the Petitioner and its constituent Colleges for the purpose of employment in Central and State Government.</p> <p>Consequent on establishment of NCTE as a Competent Authority to determine minimum qualifications for appointment to the post of teachers in Primary, Secondary and High Schools. 2014 Regulations were issued prescribing the minimum qualifications for the post of Assistant Teacher. 2002 C & R Rules were issued by the 2nd Respondent prescribing qualification for the post of Assistant Teacher in various subjects of Primary and Secondary High Schools by the 2nd Respondent. It also declared Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course as equivalent to the B.Ed Degree for the purpose of appointment to the post of Language Assistant Hindi. Without noticing, it is only the 3rd Respondent, who has the authority to declare equivalency for the purpose of qualification to the post of Assistant Teacher in Schools.</p> <p>This Hon'ble Court by an order dated 30.07.2015 proceeded to quash the entire C & R Rules issued by the 2nd Respondent on the ground that they are in contravention of the NCTE Regulations subsequently by the impugned order dated 18.04.2017, the 2nd Respondent proceeded to withdraw all the notifications that were issued declaring equivalency of degree and diploma courses conducted by the Petitioner's Institution for the purpose of selection and appointment to the post of Language-Hindi. Without inviting the Petitioner and its constituent colleges. Hence, this Writ Petition.</p> <p>The petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-</p> <p>v) To call for records relating to issue of the impugned order bearing No. ED25 LBP 2017 issued by the 2nd Respondent.</p> <p>vi) To direct the 3rd Respondent to consider declaring Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution and its constituent</p>
--	---

	<p>Colleges as equal to that of B.Ed Degree for the limited purpose of qualification to the post of Language Assistant Hindi in terms of Regulations 6 of the 2014 Regulation.</p> <p>vii) To direct the 3rd Respondent to recognize the Hindi Shiksha Snathak Course Certificates obtained by the teachers, who have already appointed to the post of Language Assistant Hindi and Direct the 2nd Respondent to continue their services as Assistant Teachers Language Hindi.</p> <p>viii) To pass such other orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.</p> <p>1st Respondent (The Union of India), 2nd Respondent (The State of Karnataka), 3rd Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education, Hqrs, New Delhi), 4th Respondent (National Council for Teacher Education).</p> <p>As the court case filed by DBHPS Petitioners to equivalency of B.Ed Course, a copy of the WP filed by the institution and the letter of SRC is mailed to the Hq for necessary action vide this office letter No. F.SRO/NCTE/DBHPS/CC/KA/B.Ed/2017/94310 dated 09.08.2017. A reminder was issued to Under Secretary (legal)on 03.10.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail was received from NCTE Hqrs Legal section on 31.10.2017. Accordingly, a letter was issued to the Under Secretary (legal section and to Advocate, Shri. M.B.Kanavi along with a letter dated 31.10.2017 received by NCT, Hqrs and brief of the case on 28.11.2017</p> <p>On 12.12.2017, a letter dated 08.12.2017 is received by this office from the advocate, Shri M.B.Kanavi, in w.p.no. 106596/2017 filed by Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha is as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“With reference to the above I write to state that, I am in receipt of the Parawise Comments in respect of the Dakshina Bharath Hindi Prachar Sabha College of Education at Dharwad, Belagum, Mysore and Bangalore.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Parawise Comments send to me are the meeting proceedings in respect of the deficiencies of these colleges. However, the issue involved in the writ petition is entirely different. The petitioner is seeking a direction to the Third Respondent for declaring Hindi Shikshana Snathak Course Certificates issued by the Petitioner's Institution as equal to that of B.Ed Degree course. Hence, it is requested to send the parawise comments on these issues after getting the clarifications from the Head Quarters.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Further, kindly make it a point to send all the supporting documents in support of our contention in all the cases. Since I am repeatedly sending letters seeking documents in support of our contentions.</p> <p>Accordingly, an e-mail was sent to Under Secretary, (Legal) on 20.12.2017.</p>
--	--

		<p>The Committee considered the above Court matter & decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The details of the petition are noted. 2.1. This office is not mandated to go into issues relating to equivalence of courses/degrees/certificates. DBHPS should approach the NCTE (HQ) for that. 2.2. The Communications addressed to this office in this connection have already been forwarded to NCTE (HQ) for appropriate further action. 3. No inspection is required in this B.Ed case. 4.1. Process the documents as an RPRO case. 4.2. Give priority to new application cases. RPRO cases can be taken up after 15 March ie., after we clear the new cases before expiry of the time-limit prescribed by the Supreme Court for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19.
8	<p>SRCAPP1447 1 D.El.Ed-AI Parameswari College of Education, Vizianagaram , Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Parameswari College of Education, Kalavarai Village & Post, Bobbili Taluk & City, Vizianagaram District-535558, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Uma General Technical And Medical Educational Society, Main Road, Kalavarai Village & Post, Bobbili Taluk & City, Vizianagaram District-535558, Andhra Pradesh has applied for grant of recognition to Parameswari College of Education, Kalavarai Village & Post, Bobbili Taluk & City, Vizianagaram District-535558, Andhra Pradesh for offering D.El.Ed-AI course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 29/06/2015. The institution has submitted hard copy of the application on 10/07/2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 16.07.2015 Followed by recommendation 06.10.2015 and reminder II on 14.11.2015.</p> <p>A letter address to the institution regarding composite character as per regulation 2014 was sent on 07.10.2015. The institution has submitted reply on 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 297th meeting held on 27th-28th December, 2015 has considered the matter, documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They already have D.El.Ed., B.Ed., D.P.Ed and B.P.Ed. 2. When BPEd and DPEd were cleared they needed 8 acres; but, they had only 5

	<p>acres. They have now shown about 12.50 acres. If these new applications are cleared, they will have adequate lands for all the courses. Only, the 'contiguity' factor has to be checked.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. B.P., BCC, LUC, EC are available. 4. Cause Composite Inspection of all the 7 programmes. Send a team of 5 members. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was fixed between 22nd-26th January & 23rd Jan to 01st Feb, 2016. The same was intimated to the institution on 19.01.2016.</p> <p>Accordingly, the inspection of the institution was conducted on 24.01.2016. The VT report received in this office of SRC-NCTE on 28.01.2016.</p> <p>A letter received from the institution on 27.01.2016 stating as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"We have applied for the recognition for M.Ed course in the name of Maheswari College of Education (SRCAPP-14522). On after thought we have decided not to pursue for M.Ed course. we have given up the course for the present. The same thing was informed to the vising team which conducted composite inspection of our existing courses B.P.Ed, D.P.Ed, B.Ed and D.Ed and proposed M.P.Ed and D.El.Ed-AI courses on 24.01.2016.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Hence, I request you not to process our application now for M.Ed course. This is for your information and necessary action".</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 300th meeting held on 29th – 31st January, 2016 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue LOI for D.El.Ed-AI (1 Unit) 2. For D.El.Ed (basic unit) and D.El.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 <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC the Letter of Intent was sent to the institution on 02.02.2016.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its written representation on 29.01.2016, requesting sanction D.El.Ed-AI 02 units to our College for the year 2016-17.</p> <p>The SRC in its 303rd meeting held on 15th February 2016, the committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modify LOI
--	--

		<p>2. D.El.Ed-AI for 2 units.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC a Modify Letter of Intent (LOI) for 2 units was issued to the institution on 20.02.2016.</p> <p>The institution submitted LOI reply on 03.03.2016, along with documents.</p> <p>The same was placed before SRC in its 306th meeting held on 1st to 4th March 2016; the committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Issue Formal Recognition for D.El.Ed-AI (2 units) w.e.f. 2016-17.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Formal recognition order was issued to the institution on 11.04.2016.</p> <p>The Institution submitted a letter dated on 16.10.2017, received by this office on 20.10.2017, regarding Reduction of intake from 2 units to 1 unit of D.El.Ed-AI programme.</p> <p>The SRC in its 349th Meeting held on 15th & 16th December 2017, the committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a request for reduction from B.Ed (2 units) to B.Ed (1 unit). 2. We have prescribed certain formalities to be completed before such a request can be entertained. 3. See that such cases are always put up when all formalities have been completed. <p>The action taken by SRO by correcting the programme name in point No. 1 of the decision submitted for ratification please.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter & decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our decision dated 15-16 December 2017 about reduction of the intake – strength wrongly referred to the course as B.Ed when it should have been D.El.Ed-AI. 2. The mistake is acknowledged. The decision is reviewed and corrected to read “D.El.Ed-AI”. 3.1. SRO has already issued an order corrected accordingly.. 3.2. The action taken by SRO is ratified.
9	<p>SRCAPP2016 30043 B.Sc.B.Ed 1 Unit Amrita</p>	<p>Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Ettimadai Village, Amrita Nagar Street, Coimbatore Taluk and Mandal, Ettimadai Town, Coimbatore District-641112, Tamilnadu</p> <p>Mata Amritanandamayi Math, Bogadi Village, # 114, 7th Cross, Bogadi II Stage, Mysuru Town and City, Mysore District-570026, Karnataka had applied for grant of recognition to</p>

Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu	<p>Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Ettimadai, Amrita Nagar Street, Coimbatore Taluk and Mandal, Ettimadai Town, Coimbatore District-641112, Tamilnadu for offering B.A.B.Ed/ B.Sc.B.Ed course for four years integrated programme for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 26.05.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 08.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Government, the period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application is processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.A.B.Ed., B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Karnataka.</p> <p>The SRC in its 328th meeting, held on 31st January, 2017, considered the scrutiny of the application and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"The University is in Coimbatore. They want to start the College in Mysuru.</i> 2. <i>The College is in Mysuru will have to be affiliated to the Mysore University and not their own University in Coimbatore.</i> 3. <i>They should give NOC of the University in Mysore.</i> 4. <i>Issue Notice accordingly."</i> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 01.02.2017 through e-mail. The institution has submitted reply to the show cause notice through on 13.02.2017 and hard copy submitted on 15.02.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 331st meeting held during 22nd February, 2017 considered the notice reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"Their reply is satisfactory.</i> 2. <i>Cause inspection"</i> <p>Accordingly, the inspection of the institution was conducted on 30th – 31st March, 2017 and the VT report along with documents received on 04.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 335th meeting held during 11th – 12th April, 2017, considered the VT report and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"Title is clear.</i> 2. <i>UGC has clarified that Deemed Universities can have off-campus centres.</i> 3. <i>LUC is not given. But, Karnataka Govt. order is given.</i> 4. <i>EC is in order.</i> 5. <i>Blue-print of BP is not given. Built-up area details are not there.</i> 6. <i>BCC is not approved by competent authority.</i> 7. <i>FDRs have been given only for one course (1 unit). It is also not in joint</i>
---	--

	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>account.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">8. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.”</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 18.04.2017 through online which was replied by the institution has submitted show cause notice reply on 08.05.2017 and 22.05.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 342nd meeting held during 05th – 06th July, 2017 considered the show cause notice reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “LUC is in order. 2. They want B.A.B.Ed (1 unit) + B.Sc.B.d (1 unit). They have B.Ed (1 unit). 3. Land required is 2500 sq.mtrs. Built-up area required is 4500 sq.mts. 4. There are 2 Building Plans. Which one is to be reckoned with, they should clarify. 5. BCC is approved. Built-up area shown is 3101.56 sq.mts. This will suffice only for B.Ed (1 unit) and 1 unit of B.A. B.Ed or B.Sc . B.Ed. They should indicate their choices of courses. 6. According to the BCC, M.P. Hall roofing is of sheets. This is not permissible. They should clarify. 7. Issue SCN accordingly. ” <p>As per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 13.07.2017. The institution has submitted a reply to the show cause notice on 26.07.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 343rd meeting held during 01st – 02nd August, 2017 considered the notice reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “FDRs have not been given. FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7+5 lakhs per course. 2. Issue LOI for B.Sc.B.Ed (1 unit). 3. Collect FDRs along with the LOI reply. ” <p>As per the decision of SRC a letter of Intent was issued to the institution on 13.09.2017. The institution has submitted LOI reply to this office on 06.11.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 348th meeting held during 05th – 06th December, 2017 considered the LOI reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> “1. Faculty list is examined. 2. The following deficiencies are there: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) 1 Asst Prof (Biological Sc.) is required. ii) The list is not authenticated by the Registrar in all the pages. 3. All relevant details should be uploaded on the website even before grant of recognition. 4. Issue SCN accordingly.”
--	---

		<p>As per the decision of SRC a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 08.12.2017. The institution has submitted LOI notice reply on 20.12.2017.</p> <p>The Committee considered the reply to the LOI notice of the institution & decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their reply is satisfactory. All the deficiencies have been rectified. 2. FDRs have been received. 3.1. Issue FR for BSc.B.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f.2018-19. 3.2. Issue in the name of “....an off-campus constituent unit of Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham.
10	<p>SRCAPP2016 30080 D.P.S.E 2Units St. Peters Educational Association, Warangal, Telangana</p>	<p>St. Peters Educational Association, Hanamkonda Village, Vidyaanagar, Hanamkonda Taluk & City, Warangal District-506001, Telangana</p> <p>St. Peters Educational Association, Hanamkonda Village, Vidyagar, Hanamkonda Taluk & City, Warangal, District-506001, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to St. Peters Educational Association, Hanamkonda Village, Vidyanagar, Hanamkonda Taluk & City, Warangal District-506001, Telangana for offering D.P.S.E course for two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 06.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016, followed by Reminder-I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder-II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation was received from the State Government within stipulated period. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18 there is no ban for D.P.S.E course in the State of Telangana.</p> <p>As directed, the documents were processed along with original file and placed before the SRC in its 325th meeting held on 19th – 20th December, 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Case of B.Ed (2 units), D.El.Ed (1 unit) and (now) D.P.SE (2 units). Total land area required will be 0.6 acre; built-up area required will be 5000 sqmts. 2. Title deed is clear. Sy.nos 280, 281 and 282 (sy.no. 283 not mentioned). Land area involved-more than one acre. It is adequate. 3. EC is in order. 4. LUC-is in order. 5. BP is approved. Built-up area approved is 2619 sqmts. 6. BCC is duly approved. Built-up area shown is 3025 sqmts. This exceeds the area approved in BP. 7. FDRs-not given. 8. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly.

	<p>Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution through online mode on 21.12.2016. The institution has not submitted reply.</p> <p>The SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th – 07th February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NOC (issued by Director of School Education) is given. 2. Reply to SCN not received. 3. According to the computer programme in force, non-submission of reply to SCN should lead to rejection of the case. It will be unfortunate if this case, which fulfils all requirements for VT inspection has to be rejected because of the technical difficulty in the computer programme. 4. Remind them for an early reply. 5. Put up on 22.2.17. <p>The institution submitted the reply on 13.02.2016.</p> <p>Meanwhile, some instructions/clarification were made from NCTE Hqrs based on which the hard copy of the SCN reply was scanned and uploaded in the PDF format in the Section dash board to overcome the technical problem.</p> <p>The SRC in its 331st meeting held on 22nd February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have fulfilled all the conditions. 2. Reply to SCN could not be given because of a problem in our software. We cannot hold it out against them. 3. Cause composite inspection. <p>Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members through online on 01.03.2017. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 27th and 28th March 2017 and the VT report along with CD was received on 10.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th – 12th April, 2017, considered the VT Report along with documents and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have D.El.Ed.(1 unit) & B.Ed.(2 units). They want DPSE(2 units). 1.1 The land area required is (3000 sq.mts. for D.El.Ed. + B.Ed.; 2500 sq.mts. for DPSE) 5500 sq.mts. 1.2 Built-up area required is (3000 for D.El.Ed. / B.Ed. combo + 500 for B.Ed.2nd unit + 2000 for DPSE 2 units) 5500 sq.mts. 2. Title is clear. Land area is not clear. The Sale deeds show it as 0.10 guntas or 0.10 hectares. These units of land area are vastly different. They must explain. 3. LUC is in order. 4. EC is in order.
--	---

	<p>a. BP is only a photocopy. Approved. Original required. Built-up area shown is 4783.79 sq.mts. There is a mention of proposed area of 569.29 sq.mts. The BP entries are not at all clear. They must explain.</p> <p>b. Covers Sy.No. 324 which is not in title deed.</p> <p>1.1 BCC covers 280,281,282 and 283. Sy.No.283 is not covered by Sale Deed.</p> <p>1.2 BCC-1 shows built-up area of 3525 sq.mts. BCC-2 shows built-up area of 1836 sq.mts. Area covered by Sy.No.283 has to be deducted.</p> <p>1.3 They must explain the correct position.</p> <p>8.1 Course wise earmarking of area is not indicated.</p> <p>8.2 Additional construction for school extension, Pharmacy building and Residential block is shown.</p> <p>8.3 They must explain how much of area is available for DPSE, D.El.Ed. and B.Ed.</p> <p>9. FDRs are required in original, in Joint account, valid for 5 years @ 7+5 lakhs for each unit of each course.</p> <p>10. Issue SCN accordingly.</p> <p>Before issuance of Show Cause Notice, as per the website information, the institution submitted its reply on 17.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 336th meeting held on 19th – 20th April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are too many complications and discrepancies in this case, esp. relating to land documents. 2. Put up in the next meeting. <p>The institution submitted written representation through e-mail on 24.04.2017. The SRC in its 337th meeting held on 25th – 26th April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The detailed replies given to the elaborate points raised are satisfactory. 2. Only, EC for Sy.No.324 is required. 3. The EC for Sy.No. 324 should come along with the LOI reply. 4. The built-up area required is well within what is available. But, their calculation is erroneous. The calculation of ours is 3000(for D.El.Ed.+B.Ed. combo)+2000(for DPSE-2 units). This total of 5000 is within the 5361 sq.mts. available. 5. FDRs are required in original in joint account, with a 5-year validity@7+5 lakhs for each unit of each course. 6. Issue LOI for DPSE (2 units). <p>Letter of intent was issued to the institution on 27.04.2017. The institution submitted its reply on 01.05.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st – 03rd May, 2017 considered the LOI reply and</p>
--	--

		<p>decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their LOI reply is seen. 2. The Faculty list for DPSE(2 units) is examined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number is alright; the staffing pattern is alright. - But, the list is not approved. - Lect.(Creative & Perf. Arts) is not qualified. 3. FDRs have to be given in 2 sets(of 7+5); but, only one set has been given. 4. Faculty list is not uploaded in the website. 5. They have to give FDRs in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7+5 lakhs for each unit of each old course also. 6. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, show cause notice was sent to the institution on 16.05.2017. The institution has submitted show cause notice reply on 05.06.2017 along with documents.</p> <p>The SRC in its 341st meeting held on 15th – 16th June, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All requirements have been met. 2. Only, the Faculty list, as approved by the SCERT, remains to be furnished. 3. For Lect.(Creative& Perf. Arts) a separate Faculty Member has to be appointed; any person cleared for such appointment in D.El.Ed. cannot be shared. 4. Since, after 2.5.17, we can consider cases for FR only w.e.f. 2018-19. They are given time till 31.1.18 for submission of the approved staff list. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC a letter was sent to the institution on 29.06.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted written representation on 28.12.2017.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The case is ready for consideration of issue of FR for 2018-19. 1.2. But, FR can be issued only after submission of an approved Faculty list in accordance with the 2014 Regulations; Requirements. 2.1. They want time till end of March 18 to submit the Faculty list. 2.2. This can be accepted. Only, if the approved faculty list is not given before 2 March 18, it will not be possible to consider this case for FR w.e.f. 2018-19. 3. Issue a reply accordingly.
11	<p>SRCAPP3011 B.Ed- Distance (500 intake) Institute of Distance</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Institute of Distance Education University of Madras, Khasara No.3173, Plot No. 133/137, Chepauk Village and Taluk, Triplicane Post, Chennai City and District-600005, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Institute of Distance Education, University of Madras, Plot No. 133/137, Wallajah Road, Chepauk Village and Taluk, Triplicane Post, Chennai City and District-600005, Tamil</p>

<p>Education, University of Madras</p>	<p>Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Institute of Distance Education University of Madras, Khasara No.3173, Plot No. 133/137, Chepauk Village and Taluk, Triplicane Post, Chennai City and District-600005, Tamil Nadu for offering B.Ed-Distance mode of 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 30.05.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 22.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 25.06.2015, and Reminder-I on 11.11.2016.</p> <p>Sub-clause (2) of clause 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(2) The application shall be summarily rejected under one or more of the following circumstance-</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(a) Failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the National Council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 on or before the date of submission of online application;</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(b) Failure to submit print out of the applications made online along with the land documents as required under sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 within fifteen days of the submission of the online application”.</i></p> <p><i>Sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 reads as under:-</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“While submitting the application online a copy of the registered land document issued by the competent authority, indicating that the society or institution applying for the programme possesses land on the date of application, shall be attached along with the application.”</i></p> <p>Sub-clause (3) of clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution is deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution has not submitted hard copy of application within 15 days of online submission. • The application is not duly signed by the applicant on all pages as per Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014. <p>The SRC in its 291st meeting held on 20th -21st August, 2015 considered the matter, and</p>
--	--

		<p>after careful perusal of the original application for B.Ed (DE) course for the session 2016-17 submitted on-line on 30.05.2015 and hard copy on 22.06.2015 decided to Summarily Reject the application as per clause 7 2(b) of Regulations 2014 on the following ground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution has not submitted hard copy of application within 15 days of online submission. <p>As per the decision of SRC, rejection order was issued to the institution 13.10.2015.</p> <p>Meantime letter dated 14.01.2016 was received on 19.01.2016 from NCTE Hqrs regarding Acceptance of hardcopy of applications for 2016-17. The letter stated that <i>“I am directed to refer to this office letter even no. dated 15th July, 2015 conveying therein orders of Chairperson in paragraph 4 of the letter that 15th July 2015 will be the last date for submission of hardcopy of application for the academic session 2015-16, irrespective of the date of online submission. In this regard, attention is invited to a subsequent letter dated 7th September, 2015 wherein under the last line of paragraph I, the position as it exists in clause 7 of the Regulations 2014 has been indicated. It is hereby clarified that inclusion of this line was an inadvertent mistake, therefore was not necessary and may be ignored. As such, the directions of the chairperson NCTE, as conveyed in this office vide above mentioned letter dated 15th July 2014, extending the date of acceptance of the hardcopy of the applications for 2016-17, up to 15th July 2015 is reiterated for compliance”</i></p> <p>An email dated 18.01.2016 was received from NCTE Hqrs with the request to send original records of the institution along with comments on the appeal.</p> <p>The SRC in its 300th meeting held on 29th -30th January, 2016 considered the matter and decided as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“..keeping in mind the over-all public interest , the committee revised its earlier stand to reject all cases of non-submission or delayed submission of NOC's and decided to reopen and process all such rejected cases by accepting NOCs even now irrespective of their dates of issue”.</i></p> <p>A letter was sent to NCTE Hqrs on 03.02.2016 stated that the file required to be placed before SRC, hence the file not sent to the NCTE-Hqrs.</p> <p>The matter was again placed for reconsideration before SRC in its 304th meeting held on 19th & 20th February, 2016, The Committee considered matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BP is not approved by competent authority. 2. BCC to be submitted. 3. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents. 4. Cause Composite Inspection. <p>As per the decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members on 17.03.2016. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 22.03.2016</p>
--	--	--

	<p>and VT report along with documents received on 28.03.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 308th meeting held on 28th -30th March 2016, considered the matter and decided as under</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of study centers not given. <p>Accordingly, a letter was sent to the institution on 16.08.2016, The institution has not submitted reply.</p> <p>The SRC in its 323rd meeting held on 16th to 18th November, 2016 considered the matter and decided as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BCC is not yet given. 2. Duly approved BP is also not yet given. 3. Details of study centres are also not given. 4. Other details listed in Cl.9, Appendix 10 of the Regulations are not given. 5. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>As for the decision of the SRC, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 30.11.2016. Reply to the SCN was received from the institution on 26.12.2016. The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th & 05th January, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BCC is not in the prescribed format. 2. Same photocopy of BP is submitted for B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. without any apportionment, demarcation, etc. details. 3. Details of clause 9, appendix-10 of Regulations are still not given. 4. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a show cause Notice was issued to the institution on 18.01.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 10.02.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 330th meeting held on 12th to 13th February, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The BP with details of convenience apportionment and earmarking of built-up area has to be given duly approved by the Competent authority. Only a photocopy has been repeated. 2. BCC format is given in the SRC website. Building Completion Certificate should be given in that format duly approved by the competent authority. 3. Project documents and study material should be ready before the recognition can be given. Issue a letter accordingly. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 14.02.2017. The institution has submitted representation on 03.03.2017.</p>
--	--

	<p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February to 3rd March, 2017 the committee considered the reply and documents and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Details of Study centres are given. 2. But, Study material not yet shown. To say that they will be borrowed from IGNOU is not enough. 3. BP-total plan is approved by the University Engineer. But, earmarking and formal allocation of that space for B.Ed.-DE is required. 4. BCC is duly approved. But, only a photocopy is given. Original or a certified copy is required. 5. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued on 09.03.2017. The institution has not submitted reply so far.</p> <p>The SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th & 31st March, 2017 considered the non – submission of reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SCN was issued on 9.3.17. There has been no reply so far. 2. Only a small action remains to be taken after LOI. Give further time till 18.4.17. 3. Put up on 19.4.17. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 07.04.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted the show cause notice reply on 30.03.2017.</p> <p>The SRC, in its 335th meeting held on 11th to 12th April, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BP is not approved by competent authority. 2. BCC is approved. But, every page should be signed. Also, it should indicate the date of approval/issue. The title shows it to be a building for Diploma in Elementary Education. This should be corrected. 3. Study material are still not ready. Whether approval of UGC is required is not clear. 4. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, a show cause Notice was issue to the University on 20.04.2017. The University has submitted reply to the SCN on 01.05.2017.</p> <p>The reply was placed before SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st to 03rd May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their reply is seen. 2. BP and BCC are now in order. 3.1 They have admitted that study materials are not ready. They have requested for some 'gestation period'. 3.2 We have no discretion to issue FR without the study material being ready.
--	--

		<p>3.3. But, we have no difficulty in giving more time for preparation of study material. Only, because of a Supreme Court prescribed time-limit of 2.5.17, for issue of FR w.e.f. 2017-18, we will not be able, after 2.5.17, to issue FR w.e.f. 2017-18.</p> <p>3.4 Time is given till 1.8.17 for preparation of study material.</p> <p>4. Inform accordingly.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the University on 09.05.2017.</p> <p>The university submitted a letter dated 26.07.2017 received by this office on 02.08.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“With reference to the above, I would like to inform you that the institute of Distance Education, University of Madras has already initiated necessary arrangements to prepare the study material on its own and the work is under progress. Hence it is required to provide another 2 months gestation time in order to complete the B.Ed lesson writing work.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 345th meeting held on 21st to 22nd, September, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have requested for more time to prepare the study material. 2. Give time till 30.11.2017. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the University on 04.10.2017. The University submitted its written representation regarding extension of time on 17.11.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“With reference to the above, I would like to inform you that the institute of Distance Education, University of Madras has already initiated necessary arrangements to prepare the study material on its own and the work is under progress. Hence, it is requested to provide another three months gestation time in order to complete the B.Ed lesson writing work”.</i></p> <p>The matter was placed before SRC in its 349th meeting held on 15th to 16th December, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have repeatedly been asking for time. 2. Give a last extension up to 31.12.2017. 3. It has been clarified that the study centres have also to be recognised T.E.Is conducting B.Ed course continuously for the last 5 years. Ask them to confirm this understanding. 4. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>As per decision of SRC, a Show Cause notice was issued to the University on 27.12.2017.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Now, the University submitted a letter dated 29.12.2017 received by this office on 01.01.2018 regarding extension of time for further period of one month required for the preparation of lesson materials along with acceptance letter from the two colleges to conduct the PCP. Classes and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>“With reference to the above, I am pleased inform you that the University of Madras has made all required arrangements to conduct the PCP Classes for the B.Ed. Degree course at the following colleges (Study Centers) which are affiliating to the Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University and they are conducting the B.Ed Degree course for more than five years. The following colleges have given their consent to conduct the PCP Classes.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Jaya College of Education, Chennai.</i> 2. <i>Annai Velankani College of Education, Chennai.</i> 3. <i>NKT. National College of Education for Women, Chennai.</i> <p><i>Further, I am to inform you that the Board of Studies met and designed the curriculum, Syllabi and study materials in self Learning Method. The study materials for the 1st year is almost completed and we will print it and mail you within a month. The materials will be mailed as and when ready from next week.</i></p> <p><i>Hence, we kindly request to you permit us to conduct the B.Ed programme from the academic year 2018-19”.</i></p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Two issues remain to be settled. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Eligibility of the Study Centres ; and, (ii) Availability of approved study material. 2.1. As regards ‘study centres’, the Madras University has confirmed availability of 3 eligible study centers. 2.2. The study centres have to have NCTE Recognition. Please request them to give the NCTE recognition code nos. 2.3. We have to point out that, according to the Regulations, a study centre can have only 50 students. In other words they will need 10 study centres (and, not just 3) for a 500 intake-strength. 3. Study material have to be in accordance with Appendix-10 of the Regulations ; and, have to be in place before grant of FR. This Committee does not have the authority to issue conditional FRs. 4. Issue SCN accordingly.
12	SRCAPP2016 30081 B.Ed-ODL-AI (500 intake) Mother Teresa	<p>Mother Teresa Women’s University, Vilpatti Village, Pallangi Road, Kodaikanal Taluk & City, Dindigul District-624102,Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Mother Teresa Women’s University, Vilpatti Village, Pallangi Road, Kodaikanal Taluk & City, Dindigul District-624102,Tamilnadu applied for grant of recognition to Mother Teresa Women’s University, Vilpatti Village, Pallangi Road, Kodaikanal Taluk & City,</p>

Women's University, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu	<p>Dindigul District-624102,Tamilnadu for offering B.Ed-ODL-AI course of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 09.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016. <i>Positive Recommendation received from the Higher Education Department, Chennai</i> on 10.10.2016. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.Ed-ODL course in the State of Tamilnadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application has been scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and documents and placed before SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th & 05th January, 2017 the committee considered the Scrutiny of the application and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State University case. 2. Title is automatically established. 3. LUC/EC... not necessary. 4. BP is given. Approved by Executive Engineer. Not in format. 5. BCC is given. Approved by Executive Engineer. Details of built-up area, etc. not given. 6. Details under clause 5 & 9 of Appendix 10 of Regulations not given. 7. NAAC certificate given. 8. Cause inspection. 9. Ask VT to collect proper BP & BCC as also other details as indicated. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, the inspection letter was sent to the University through online mode.</p> <p>VT Members names were generated through On-line VT module for inspection during the period on 08.02.2017 to 28.02.2017, Hard copy Visiting Team report was received on 27.02.2017 and online copy not submitted.</p> <p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February to 03rd March, 2017 the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have still not given the details under clauses 5 & 9 of Appendix-10 of the Regulations. 2. Remind. 3. Put up when the details are received. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter sent to the University on 12.04.2017. The University has submitted a letter reply on 16.05.2017.</p>
--	--

		<p>The SRC in its 339th meeting held on 22nd to 23rd May, 2017 the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant University has not taken action to comply with the material aspect of requirements under clauses 5 & 9 of Appendix 10 of the Regulations. 2.1 It is not enough to say that the T.N.O.U. has been requested to give their study material for use in this course. 2.2 It should be first ensured that the course material in reference of the T.N.O.U. is for the 2-year B.Ed. course. 3. Seek clarification from the Applicant University. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 30.05.2017. The University has submitted a written representation on 28.07.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 344th meeting held on 17th to 18th August, 2017 the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have still not arranged for the study material. 2. Because of the Supreme Court prescribed date line for issue of FR, we can consider consider this case only for 2018-19. 3. Give time till 30.11.17 for finalizing the study material and other requirements under Appendix 10 of the Regulations. 4. If they fulfil the requirements in time, we can issue LOI for the course. Otherwise, we may have to reject their application. <p>As per SRC decision, a letter was issued to the Registrar on 01.09.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted reply to our letter dated 01.09.2017, received by this office on 29.11.2017, stating as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“With reference to the above, as per direction, the proposal for “Bachelor of Teacher Education Programme through Open and Distance Learning System leading to Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) Programme under Tamil medium has been submitted by Mother Teresa Women’s University, Kodaikanal through “Online on 30.08.2016 with application ID SRCAPP201630081. The study materials for B.Ed Programme have been purchased from Open University. Herewith I have enclosed the letter of acknowledgement from the Registrar of Tamil Nadu Open University. The details with regard to study centres and other requirements under Appendix 10 of the Regulations are already submitted on 20.07.2017. This is for your kind perusal and further action.”</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two issues remain to be settled. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Eligibility of the Study Centres ; and, (ii) Availability of approved study material. 2. Whereas the University refers conclusively to availability of study Material, the TNOU only says, “The study Material is available ; and, will be given if needed”.
--	--	---

		<p>The applicant – University may conclude the deal to procure the study material and then confirm its availability’.</p> <p>3. 10 study centres named have to be eligible according to the Regulations. Ask them to confirm that they have been running B.Ed Courses for 5 years. Ask them also to cite the NCTE recognition code numbers of the study centres.</p> <p>4. Issue a reply accordingly</p>
13	<p>SRCAPP1413 7 D.El.Ed-AI 1 Unit Mother College of Education, Nellore, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Mother College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.769/6, 769/12, Vinjamur Village and Post Office, Vinjamur Taluk and Town/City, Nellore District-524228, Andhra Pradesh St. Andrews Educational Rural Development Society, Plot No.27.10.23, M.G.Road, Governorpeta Village, Buckinghampeta Post Office, Vijayawada Taluk and Town/City, Krishna District-520002, Andhra Pradesh had applied for grant of recognition to Mother College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.769/6, 769/12, Vinjamur Village and Post Office, Vinjamur Taluk and Town/City, Nellore District-524228, Andhra Pradesh for offering D.El.Ed-AI course of 2 years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 27.06.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 23.09.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 16.07.2015, followed by Reminder-I on 04.09.2015 and Reminder-II on 14.11.2015 The Sub Clause (7) of Clause 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</p> <p>The SRC in its 297th meeting held on 27th to 28th December 2015, considered the matter, documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SCN has already been issued separately for the B.Ed Programme for want of NOC 2. Cause composite inspection for D.El.Ed and D.El.Ed (A.I.) 3. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents especially BCC. <p>As per the decision of SRC, the inspection intimation letter was sent to the institution on 18.01.2016.</p> <p>In the meanwhile, the institution submitted a request for postponement of inspection which is as under:-</p> <p><i>“This is to bring to your kind notice that the 297th meeting of SRC has appointed a visiting team for the Inspection of Mother College of Education Additional intake D.El.Ed programme.</i></p> <p><i>Since our secretary & correspondent was severely ill and unable to attend his duties, we hereby express our inability in facing the visiting team inspection.</i></p>

		<p><i>Hence we request you to consider the issue and kindly postpone the visiting team inspection."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 302nd meeting held on 09th to 11th February 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request for postponement is accepted. Time is given till Sep.16. 2. It is made clear that this delay will result in missing the time-limit. Of 3 March 16 for final decisions relating to academic year 2016-17. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC a letter was sent on 05.04.2016, the institution has not submitted any reply till date for causing inspection.</p> <p>The SRC in its 325th n meeting held on 19th to 20th December 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No reply has been received, even after 10 months, about revival of the Inspection. 2. Cause composite inspection of D.El.Ed and D.El.Ed-AI in the second week of January 17. 3. If they fail to cooperate again, we can take adverse notice and reject the application. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC a letter was sent to the institution on 16.01.2017.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC a inspection of the institution was scheduled during 04.02.2017 to 24.02.2017.</p> <p>An email received from VT Member Dr Joginder Singh on 14.02.2017 and stating as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>".....I have contact to this college both contact number so many times before last 4-5 day. But they have not receive my phone what can I do."</i></p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. VT Inspection has been ordered in this case. 2. The applicant college was duly notified. 3. Inspite of that, the VT Members have not been able to get any response from the College. 4. Issue SCN accordingly.
14	SRCAPP3266 SRCAPP3263 B.P.Ed 1 Unit	M.J. Samuel College of Physical Education, Plot No. 29, Rajevnagar Street, Lakshmaneswaram Village, Narsapur Post, Taluk & City, west Godavari District – 534275, Andhra Pradesh

<p>D.El.Ed 1 Unit M.J. Samuel College of Physical Education, West Godavari, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>SRCAPP3266/B.P.Ed</p> <p>Santhinekethan Educational Society, Plot No. 29, Lakshmaneswaram Street & Village, Narsapur Post, Taluk and City, West Godavari District – 534275, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition M.J. Samuel College of Physical Education, Plot No. 29, Rajevnagar Street, Lakshmaneswaram Village, Narsapur Post, Taluk & City, west Godavari District – 534275, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.P.Ed course of 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 30.05.2015 The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 08.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 24.06.2015 followed by Reminder I 25.08.2015, a letter for furnishing information in support of composite institutions was sent on 25.08.2015. Reminder II was sent on 10.12.2015.</p> <p>SRCAPP3263/D.El.Ed</p> <p>Santhinekethan Educational Society, Plot No. 29, Lakshmaneswaram Street & Village, Narsapur Post, Taluk and City, West Godavari District – 534275, Andhra Pradesh had applied for grant of recognition to M.J. Samuel College of Elementary Education, Plot No. 29, Rajevnagar Street, Lakshmaneswaram Village, Narsapur Post, Taluk & City, west Godavari District – 534275, Andhra Pradesh for offering D.El.Ed course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.05.2015. The institution has submitted hard copy of the application on 08.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 17.06.2015 followed by Reminder-I and a letter for furnishing information in support of composite institutions was sent on 01.09.2015. Reminder II was sent to the institution on 10.12.2015.</p> <p>The Scrutiny of Application for causing inspection was prepared and placed before the SRC in its 296th meeting held on 15th - 16th December, 2015 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Land Usage Certificate and Building Completion Certificate to be submitted 2) Blue Print of the Building Plan to be submitted 3) Affidavit to be submitted 4) Original Fixed Deposit Receipts to be submitted 5) Ask VT to obtain relevant Land and Building documents
--	---

		<p style="text-align: center;">6) Cause Composite Inspection</p> <p>Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members on 12.01.2016.</p> <p>The inspection has not been conducted till date.</p> <p>The SRC in its 331st meeting held on 22nd February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In both these cases, VT inspections, ordered in 2016, have not yet been carried out. 2. Check with the VTs to ascertain the reasons for this delay; and, check the current status from both the VTs and the institutions. <p>The SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th & 31st March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In both cases, VT inspections have been delayed. 2. RD has not been able to get through on phone either to VT members or to the institution. 3. The institution also does not appear to be serious about its applications. They have not submitted most of the documents. 4. Report in the next meeting on 11.4.17. <p>The SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th & 12th April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No progress in the matter. Try again. 2. Try to contact VT members by phone or e-mail. 3. Try to contact the Management also. 4. Put up on 19.4.17. <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per the decision of SRC Contacted the VT Members and the management of the college today also but no response from them. <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. VT Inspection has been ordered in this case. 2. The applicant college was duly notified. 3. Inspite of this position, neither the VT Members nor the SRO have been able to contact the applicant college. 4. Issue SCN accordingly
--	--	--

15	<p>SRCAPP2016 30111 BA.B.Ed BSc.BEd 2 Units Alwardas Institute of Education and Training, Vishakapatna m, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Alwardas Institute of Education and Training, Vepagunta Village, RRV Puram, Gopalapatnam Taluk, Vepagunta City, Visakhapatnam District-530029, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Sri. Venkateswara Vidya Peeth Regd, Visakhapatnam Village, MVP Colony Visakhapatnam Taluk, City & District-530017, Andhra Pradesh had applied for grant of recognition to Alwardas Institute of Education and Training, Vepagunta Village, RRV Puram, Gopalapatnam Taluk, Vepagunta City, Visakhapatnam District-530029, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.A.B.Ed.B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course for four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 03.06.2016. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 10.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016, followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Government, the period of 90 days as per Regulations is over; hence, the application is processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.A.B.Ed.B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course in the State of Andhra Pradesh.</p> <p>The application has been scrutinized through online along with hard copy of application and placed before the SRC in its 325th meeting held on 19th – 20th December, 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title is clear. Sy.No. 124. Area 3.50 acre. Land area is adequate for D.El.Ed (2 units) and BA B.Ed / B.Sc B.Ed (2 units). 2. EC and LUC are in order. 3. BP is not legible. 4. BCC is approved. The built-up area shown is inadequate. 5. FDRs – not given. 6. NOC is given. 7. Fire safety certificate is given. 8. The built-up area details are different in the BCC, Fire safety certificate and, in the on-line submission. 9. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly. <p>Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution through online mode on 21.12.2016.</p> <p>A letter was sent to S.V.L.N. Swamy Devasthanam on 18.01.2017 regarding obtaining a copy of Govt. Owner permitting you to sell the land.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply.</p> <p>The SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th & 07th February, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p>
----	--	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NOC (issued by Director of School Education) is given. 2. Reply to SCN not received. 3. According to the computer programme in force, non-submission of reply to SCN should lead to rejection of the case. It will be unfortunate if this case, which fulfils all requirements for VT inspection has to be rejected because of the technical difficulty in the computer programme. 4. Remind them for an early reply. <p>A letter to the institution was sent on 15.02.2017 conveying the decision of 329th SRC meeting. The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February – 03rd March, 2017, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have not yet replied to the SCN issued online on 21.12.2016 and to the letter issued separately on 15.2.2017. 2. Give them some more time. 3. Put up on 3.3.2017. <p>The institution has not submitted reply for SCN till date.</p> <p>The SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th & 12th April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No reply to SCN has at all been received. 2. In this case, the processes cannot be completed before 2.5.17. In other words, they can be given more time for reply and for VT inspection, thereafter, if possible. 3. Give time till 31.5.17. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 21.04.2017.</p> <p>On 13.09.2017 a letter received from Under Secretary, NCTE-Hqrs regarding 4 year integrated BSc.B.Ed & BA.B.Ed – permission accorded by NCTE-SRC, Bangalore to certain private unaided colleges in AP – Absence of Minimum infrastructure and instructional requirements along with list of colleges.</p> <p>Accordingly, as directed by NCTE-Hqrs the original file was sent on 18.09.2017.</p> <p>Remarks:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A copy of two member Committee report was received from the Under Secretary, Inspection Section – NCTE-Hqrs on 20.11.2017.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The same was placed before SRC in its 348th meeting held on 05th & 06th December, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p>
--	--	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>There is no provision in law for RCs to reopen decided cases. If any further scrutiny is required, then, action therefore will have to be introduced by the NCTE (HQ); and after prescribed due process, the case has to be referred to the RC for action u/s 17 of the NCTE Act.</i> 2. <i>Please ask NCTE (HQ) whether these cases have been referred to us accordingly.</i> <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, letter was sent to Shri.N.K.Sharma, Under Secretary on 22.12.2017.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This case is locked up in some vigilance enquiry. 2.1. The file is with NCTE (HQ). 2.2. Our reference to them seeking advice is also pending. 3. In this backdrop, we are in no position to take any action. Seek advice from the NCTE (HQ) about the process to be observed in this case.
16	SRCAPP1418 8 BA.B.Ed BSc.BEd 2 Units Ramana College of Education, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh	<p>Ramana College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.255/1, Raja Street, Rellivalasa Village & Post, Pusapatirega Taluk, Vizianagaram City, Vizianagaram District – 535204, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Renuka Educational Society, Plot No.255/1, Raja Street, Rellivalasa Village & Post, Pusapatirega Taluk, Vizianagaram City, Vizianagaram District – 535204, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Ramana College of Education, Plot/Khasara No.255/1, Raja Street, Rellivalasa Village & Post, Pusapatirega Taluk, Vizianagaram City, Vizianagaram District – 535204, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.A,B.Sc course for four years duration of integrated course 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 28.06.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 02.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter was sent to State Government for recommendation on 14.07.2015, followed by Reminder-I on 19.11.2015 and Reminder-II on 14.12.2015. Letter to institution for furnishing information on 'Composite' character on 19.11.2015.</p> <p>Sub-clause (3) of Clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the</i></p>

	<p><i>applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution is deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOC dated 27.05.2015 issued by SCERT is for new Diploma in Elementary Education course i.e. Ramana College of Elementary Education and not for B.A,B.Sc course. <p>The SRC in its 292nd meeting held on 29th & 30th September, 2015 considered the matter and decided to issue Show Cause Notice for non submission of NOC.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 21.10.2015</p> <p>The institution has submitted its written representation on 06.11.2015.</p> <p>The SRC in its 294th meeting held on 14th – 16th November, 2015 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NOC submitted by the applicant is dated 30.06 .2015, which is before 15.07.2015. 2. Process the application for causing inspection. <p>The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</p> <p>The application was processed and placed before SRC in its 296th meeting held on 15th & 16th December, 2015 Committee considered and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Building Plan and affidavit to be submitted 2) Built up area adequate of 2 units of one programme and 1 unit of second programme 3) Original FDRs to be submitted 4) Ask VT to obtain relevant Land and Building documents 5) Cause Composite Inspection <p>As per the decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members on 16.01.2016. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 26.01.2016 and VT report along with documents received on 29.01.2016.</p>
--	---

		<p>The SRC in its 301st meeting held on 05th – 06th February, 2016 considered the VT report along with original file of the institution and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built up area is not at all available for both the new programmes applied for. • Issue SCN for rejection. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 29.02.2016.</p> <p>Now, the institution has submitted its written representation on 10.03.2016 stating as follows:</p> <p><i>“According to your reference cited show cause notice we humble intimate you that at the time of applying the application for D.El.Ed and B.Sc.B.Ed. we are unable to understand the required sufficient buildup area so that we constructed our building with 2200 sqm. The available 2200 sqm is sufficient for D.El.Ed two units (100 seats) according to NCTE norms and restriction, and then we will have to build additional 1500 sqm within three months, without fail then the total buildup area will be 3700 sqm. We have degree program so give us D.El.Ed (2 units) now and B.Sc.B.Ed later.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 308th Meeting held on 28th-30th March, 2016 considered the matter and it was decided as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue LOI for D.El.Ed (2 Units) 2. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished 3. Only if these are given on or before 02.05.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible. 4. Time is given for submission of further details in the B.Sc.B.Ed matter when the additional accommodation is ready. Only, after 2.05.2016 we can not consider cases for 2016-17. <p>Now, the institution has submitted a letter dated 29.04.2016 stating as follows:</p> <p><i>“According to NCTE notification we applied for B.Sc.B.Ed Integrated course (2 units) of Ramana B.Ed College under Renuka Educational Society. At the time of NCTE committee Visiting we were not complete the building. We appeal to your grace notice. The NCTE has given the time to complete the building within three months. Now we completed our B.Ed college building with 2200 sq.mts. As per norms of 2014 NCTE rule and regulations. So kindly request you that you may kindly accept our request and to issue letter of intent.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 313th meeting held on 02nd-03rd May, 2016 considered the matter and it was decided to 1. Cause inspection of the additional built-up area in reference. 2. This case can be considered only for 2017-18.</p>
--	--	--

Now, the institution has submitted a letter dated 10.05.2016 stating as follows:

“We submit that 301 meeting on February 5th & 6th SRCAPPP14188 has given as permission to complete the building for our B.Sc.B.Ed within 3 months. We are ready with building of 2200 sq.mts. We request you to cause inspection and grant LOI for 1 unit each of B.Sc.B.Ed & B.A.B.Ed.”

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

- Cause inspection for B.Sc.B.Ed

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, an inspection intimation letter was sent to the institution on 03.08.2016.

The names of VT members were generated online and inspection during the period 10.11.2016 to 27.11.2016. The inspection was conducted on 26.11.2016 and the VT report received on 01.12.2016 along with documents and CD.

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

1. Title is clear.
2. NOC is given.
3. LUC is given.
4. EC is in order. Latest EC is required.
5. BP - not approved by competent authority.
6. BCC – is in format. But, it has over-writings.
7. Original FDRs required.
8. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was sent to the institution on 09.02.2017. The institution has not submitted reply till date.

The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th Feb - 04th March, 2017 considered the matter and Committee decided as under:

1. They have already been given FR for D.El.Ed.(2 units).
2. They have applied for B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit) and B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit). The built-up area available (2200 sq.mts) is not adequate to meet the requirement of (1500+1500) 3000 sq.mts. It will however, suffice for B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units).
3. BP is not approved by competent authority.
4. FDRs are not in original.
Only photocopies are given. Also, it is in single account and not in joint account. They should give FDRs in original, in Joint account, at the rate of

	<p>7+5 lakhs separately for each unit of each course.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. They have not yet replied to our SCN dated 9.2.17. 6. Give further time till 30.3.17. 7. Put up in the meeting on 31.3.17. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 08.03.2017. The institution submitted show cause notice reply along with relevant documents on 09.03.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 333rd meeting held on 24th March, 2017 considered the show cause notice reply and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are processing this case only for B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units). The built-up area is not adequate for B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit) and B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit). 2. Latest EC is required. 3. Their replies are satisfactory. 4. Only, FDRs @ 7+5 lakhs 'per unit' are required in original, in joint account. 5. Issue LOI for B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units). <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC LOI and letter was sent to the institution on 28.03.2017. The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The SRC in its 340th meeting held on 08th & 09th June, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No reply has been received to our LOI. 2. Give more time till 31.12.17. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 15.06.2017. On 13.09.2017 a letter received from Under Secretary, NCTE-Hqrs regarding 4 year integrated BSc.B.Ed & BA.B.Ed – permission accorded by NCTE-SRC, Bangalore to certain private unaided colleges in AP – Absence of Minimum infrastructure and instructional requirements along with list of colleges.</p> <p>Accordingly, as directed by NCTE-Hqrs the original file was sent on 18.09.2017. Now, the institution submitted its written representation along with documents on 27.12.2017 and stating as under;</p> <p><i>“.....according to your sanctioned LOI to conduct the BSc.B.Ed course at Ramana College of Education. We fulfilled all the requirements and we appointed the teaching staff as per NCTE norms but in the eve of Andhra Pradesh state government and our related Andhra University has not been</i></p>
--	--

		<p><i>forming the rules and regulations for conducting the integrated courses. We have already applied to Andhra University for Staff ratification but they suggested us to wait until the government proceedings formatting.</i></p> <p><i>So, we humble request that you may kindly give the time, extension up to University will announce the proceeding for the integrated course.</i></p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.This case is locked up in some vigilance enquiry. 2.1. The file is with NCTE (HQ). 2.2. Our reference to them seeking advice is also pending. 3. In this backdrop, we are in no position to take any action. Seek advice from the NCTE(HQ) about the process to be observed in this case.
17	<p>SRCAPP2016 30096 M.Ed 1 Unit Adikavi Nannaya University, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Adikavi Nannaya University, Velugubanda Village, Rajah Narendra Nagar, Rajahmundry City, East Godavari District-533296, Andhra Pradesh (State University)</p> <p>Adikavi Nannaya University, Velugubanda Village, Rajah Narendra Nagar, Rajahmundry City, East Godavari District-533296, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Adikavi Nannaya University, Velugubanda Village, Rajah Narendra Nagar, Rajahmundry City, East Godavari District-533296, Andhra Pradesh for offering M.Ed course for two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 06.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 04.07.2016, followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. No recommendation received from the State Government, the period of 90 days as per Regulations is over; hence, the application is processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for M.Ed course in the State of Andhra Pradesh.</p> <p>The documents were processed and placed before the SRC in its 325th meeting held on 19th – 20th December, 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land is of the University. Title is clear. Details checked in B.Ed case. 2. EC/LUC – not required. 3. NOC of Govt is there. NOC of University is not required. 4. BP- is approved. Sy.no. of plinth area not shown. 5. BCC- approved. Built up area shown is 29,615 sqft. 2751 sqm. Whereas only 2000 sqmts required. 6. FDRs not required. 7. Cause Inspection. <p>Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members through</p>

		<p>online on 03.02.2017. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 02.03.2017 and the VT report along with CD received on 09.03.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th & 31st March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land Title is clear. 2. EC/LUC not required. 3. NAAC certificate not given. 4. BP is approved. 5. BCC is approved. 6. Built-up area is adequate. 7. Issue SCN for NAAC certificate. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was issued on 07.04.2017. The institution submitted show cause notice reply along with documents through email on 11.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th & 12th April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put up with the HQ circular on the subject of taking further action on the basis of NAAC acknowledgement. <p>As per website information the University submitted show cause notice reply along with documents on 17.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 336th meeting held on 19th & 20th April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Universities are not required to submit NAAC certificate. In any case, they have applied to NAAC. 2. Issue LOI for M.Ed (1 unit). <p>Accordingly, as directed by SRC LOI was issued on 21.04.2017.</p> <p>The University has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have not given reply to the LOI. 2. Give further time till 31.03.2018. 3. Clarify that if the approved Faculty list, in accordance with the requirements of the 2014 Regulations, is not received before 1.03.2018, We can not consider this case for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19 because of the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19. 4. Issue SCN accordingly.
--	--	---

18	<p>SRCAPP14167 B.Ed 1 unit SRCAPP3583 D.El.Ed 1Unit AVR and SVR College of Education, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>AVR and SVR College of Education, Plot No. 100,103, Street No.1, Nannur Village, Post Office & City, Kurnool Taluk, Kurnool District-518010, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>SRCAPP14167/B.Ed</p> <p>Lavanya Charita Educational Society, Plot No.100,103, Street No.2, Hyderabad Village, Taluk & City, Himayathnagar Post Office, Hyderabad District-500020, Andhra Pradesh had applied for grant of recognition to AVR and SVR College of Education, Plot No. 100,103, Street No.1, Nannur Village, Post Office & City, Kurnool Taluk, Kurnool District-518010, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.Ed course of 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 28.06.2015 The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 29.06.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted NOC dated 10.04.2015 issued by Registrar, Rayalseema University, Kurnool.</p> <p>SRCAPP3583/D.El.Ed</p> <p>Lavanya Charita Educational Society, Plot No-102, 2nd Street, Hyderabad Village, Himayathnagar Post, Hyderabad Taluk & District-500020, Andhra Pradesh had applied for grant of recognition to AVR & SVR College of Education, Plot No-100-103, 1st Street, Nannur Village & Post, Kurnoor Taluk & District-518010, Andhra Pradesh for offering D.El.Ed course of 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 25.06.2015 The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 29.06.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted No Objection Certificate dated 27.05.2015 issued by the Director SCERT, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh along with the hard copy of the application.</p> <p>The applications have been processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>Sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 reads as under:-</p> <p><i>“While submitting the application online a copy of the registered land document issued by the competent authority, indicating that the society or institution applying for the programme possesses land on the date of application, shall be attached along with the application.”</i></p> <p>The Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014; (Manner of making application and time limit) stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page,</i></p>
----	---	--

		<p><i>including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was found deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The application is not duly signed by the applicant on all pages as per Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014.</i> <i>The institution has not submitted certified copy of registered land document issued by the competent authority. The document submitted shows the land in individual name.</i> <p>The SRC in its 291st meeting held during 20th to 21st August, 2015 considered the application of the institution and decided as under :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Summarily rejected for the deficiency cited in the agenda note. i.e land document is in the name of individual and not in the name of Society/Institution.</i> <p>On 23.09.2015, based on the website information, the institution submitted a representation as under:</p> <p><i>“ In obedience to the ref cited above (291st meeting of SRC), we the management of AVR & SVR College of Education (B.Ed),Mannur , Kurnool District ,Andhra Pradesh bearing No.SRCAPP14167 beg your goodness to consider the following request .</i></p> <p><i>After seeing the particulars of 291st meeting of the Committee, SRC-NCTE Bangalore on 20th and 21st august, 2015 on online, we the management know that our college is summarily rejected and approached RD-SRC –NCTE, Bangalore and the cause of rejection is that the institution has not submitted the copy of the land document on the name of Lavanya Chairta Educational Society. This is a mistake and the institution has not done it intentionally.</i></p> <p><i>Hence, we humbly request the Regional Director and Committee–SRC-NCTE, Bangalore to kindly excuse this mistake for first time and grant permission to the institution to proceed further as we are submitting herewith original land documents on the name of the Society and Xerox copies as well.</i></p> <p>Remarks :</p> <p>The institution submitted certified photocopy of the sale deed dated 26.12.2007 in favour of ‘Lavanya Charita Educational Society on 23.09.2015.</p> <p>The SRC in its 292nd meeting held during 29th to 30th September,2015 considered the matter, request of the institution vide letter dated 23.09.2015 and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Earlier decision to reject summarily was correct.</i>
--	--	---

	<p>As per the decision of SRC, a rejection order was issued to the institution on 31.10.2015.</p> <p>Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC, the institution filed an appeal before the appellate authority NCTE Hqrs.</p> <p>The appellate authority vide order F.No.89-343/2015 Appeal/3rd Meeting 2016 dated 18.04.2016 remanded the case to SRC as under:-</p> <p><i>“The Committee noted that the SRC on finding that the land document submitted with the application was in the name of an individual, in their 291st meeting held on 20-21 August, 2015, decided to reject the application on the ground that the land is in the name of the individual. The appellant seeing the decision online, sent a letter, which was received in SRC on 23.09.2015. In that letter, the appellant admitting that by mistake they did not submit the land document in the name of Lavanya Charitha Educational Society, enclosed original and Xerox copies of the said land documents. The Committee also noted that the SRC thereafter considered the matter again in their 292nd meeting held on 29-30 Sept., 2015 and concluded that the earlier decision to reject summarily was correct and issued the rejection order on 31.10.2015.</i></p> <p><i>The committee noted that a copy of the land document submitted with the application was a sale deed in the name of an individual registered on 25.04.2007. The committee also noted that the appellant has submitted to SRC on 23.09.2015 a copy of the land sale deed registered in the name of the society on 26.12.2007, admitting his mistake in not submitting the same along with the application since the land stood registered in the name of the society on 26.12.2007, and the sale deed mentioned that the earlier sale of this land was done on 25.04.2007 in favour of the vendor. The non-submission of the document registered on 26.12.2007 initially appears to be a bone-fide mistake on the part of the appellant. In view of this, the committee concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC for processing the application further on the basis of the land document registered in the name of the society as per the Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>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 deserved to be remanded to SRC for processing the application further on the basis of the land documents registered in the name of the society as per the Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>The Council hereby remands back the case of AVR & SVR College of Education, Nannur, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 312th meeting held during 28th & 29th April, 2016 considered the matter, documents submitted by the institution for D.El.Ed (SRCAPP3583) and B.Ed (SRCAPP14167) course along with hard copy of application and decided as under :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both the cases have been revived by the Appellate Authority. 2. Cause Composite Inspection.
--	--

		<p>3. Ask VT to collect all documents especially BCC, LUC and latest EC.</p> <p>As per decision of SRC, Inspection generated through online. The names of VT Members were generated through online VT module. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 19.08.2016. VT report along with CD and documents received on 23.08.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 323rd held on 16th & 17th November, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title is there. 2. LUC and EC are in order. 3. BP is in order. 4. BCC is in order. Built-up area is adequate. 5. Issue LOI for B.Ed(1 unit) and D.El.Ed(1 unit). <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, LOI was sent on 05.12.2016 for both B.Ed and D.ElEd courses.</p> <p>The institution has submitted reply on 06.02.2017 seeking extension of time for both courses.</p> <p>The SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th & 07th February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request for time to file LOI reply is accepted. 2. Time is given till 31.12.17 subject to the understanding that the opportunity to be considered for FR w.e.f. 2017-18 will be lost on 3.3.17. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, letter was sent to the institution on 04.03.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have not given reply to the LOI. 2. Give further time till 31.03.2018. 3. Clarify that if the approved Faculty list, in accordance with the requirements of the 2014 Regulations, is not received before 1.03.2018, We can not consider this case for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19 because of the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19. 4. Issue SCN accordingly.
19	SRCAPP1460 1 D.El.Ed-AI	Addanki College of Education, Plot No. 2302/2, 2300/1, Block 1, North Addanki Village, Addanki Post Office, Taluk & City, Prakasam Distirct-523201, Andhra

1	Unit Addanki College of Education, Prakasam, Andhra Pradesh	<p style="text-align: center;">Pradesh</p> <p>Vignana Bharathi Educational Society, 1 Block, North Addanki Road, Addanki Village & Post Office, Addanki Taluk & City, Prakasam District-523201, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Addanki College of Education, Plot No. 2302/2, 2300/1, Block 1, North Addanki Village, Addanki Post Office, Taluk & City, Prakasam District-523201, Andhra Pradesh for offering D.El.Ed-AI course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 29.06.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 10.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 16/07/2015 followed by Reminder I and a letter for information in support of Composite character was sent to the institution on 31.08.2015. The institution has submitted reply to the composite letter on 28.09.2015. Reminder II was sent on 09.11.2015.</p> <p>The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decide that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 296th meeting held on 15th-16th December, 2015 considered the documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BCC is to be submitted. 2. Original FDRs to be submitted 3. Ask VT to obtain relevant Land and Building documents 4. Cause Composite Inspection <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 18.01.2016. The institution has submitted a letter requesting postponement of inspection on 02.02.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 302nd meeting held on 09th -11th February, 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request for postponement is accepted. Time is given till Sep.16. 2. It is made clear that this delay will result in missing the time-limit. of 3 March 16 for final decisions relating to academic year 2016-17. <p>Accordingly, a letter to the institution conveying the 302nd SRC decision was sent on</p>
---	--	---

		<p>02.05.2016.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted any reply.</p> <p>The SRC in its 323rd meeting held on 16th -18th November, 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Details of location are not available about the college running the supportive liberal arts/science courses. 2. Proof of running the liberal courses is not available. 3. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 29.11.2016. The institution has submitted SCN Reply on 17.12.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 328th meeting held on 31st January, 2017, considered the SCN reply and decided to "Put up in the next meeting."</p> <p>Accordingly, agenda was put up before the SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th – 07th February, 2017. The Committee considered the SCN reply and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have D.El.Ed. (1 unit). They have liberal education courses. 2. They want D.El.Ed.-A.I.(1 unit) 3. Fee paid. 4. Cause composite inspection. 5. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents; and, check on adequacy of built-up area for D.El.Ed. (1 unit) + D.El.Ed.-A.I (1 unit). <p>Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members through online on 13.03.2017. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 10.03.2017 & 11.03.2017 and the VT report along with CD received on 21.03.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th & 31st March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Govt. land allotted. Title is clear. 2. LUC/EC is not required. 3. BP&BCC are in order. 4. Land area & built-up area are adequate. 5. FDRs@ 7+5 lakhs for each unit for each programme, in original in joint account is required. 6. Issue LOI for D.El.Ed.-A.I.(1 unit). <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC LOI was sent on 06.04.2017.</p> <p>A Court notice dated 27.04.2017 received by High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad on 17.05.2017 filed by Addanki College of Education, Prakasam District, Andhra Pradesh in</p>
--	--	--

		<p>WP No. 14108 of 2017.</p> <p>Accordingly, as directed brief of the institution was sent to the Advocate Shri. K. Ramakanth Reddy on 23.05.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted LOI reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have not given reply to the LOI. 2. Give further time till 31.03.2018. 3. Clarify that if the approved Faculty list, in accordance with the requirements of the 2014 Regulations, is not received before 1.03.2018, We can not consider this case for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19 because of the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19. 4. Issue SCN accordingly.
20	<p>SRCAPP14750 D.El.Ed 1 Unit</p> <p>Mother D.Ed College, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Mother D.Ed College, Plot/Khasara No.210/1, Yallavaram Dondapeta Village, Nathavaram Post, Nathavaram Mandal Taluk, Vishakhapatnam City and District – 531115, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Mother Educational Society, YD Peta Village, Nathavaram Mandal Post and Taluk, Vishakhapatnam City and District–531115, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Mother D.Ed College, Plot/Khasara No.210/1, Yallavaram Dondapeta Village, Nathavaram Post, Nathavaram Mandal Taluk, Vishakhapatnam City and District – 531115, Andhra Pradesh for offering D.El.Ed course for two years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2015. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 20.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter was sent to State Government for recommendation on 23.07.2015.</p> <p>Sub-section (2) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(2) The application shall be summarily rejected under one or more of the following circumstance-</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the National Council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 on or before the date of submission of online application;</i> <i>(b) Failure to submit print out of the applications made online along with the land documents as required under sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 within fifteen days of the submission of the online application. “</i>

		<p><i>Sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 reads as under:-</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“While submitting the application online a copy of the registered land document issued by the competent authority, indicating that the society or institution applying for the programme possesses land on the date of application, shall be attached along with the application.”</i></p> <p>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:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution has not submitted application within 15 days from the date of application. <p>The SRC in its 291st meeting held on 20th-21st August, 2015 considered the matter, and after careful perusal of the original application for D.El.Ed course for the session 2016-17 submitted on-line on 30.06.2015 and hard copy on 20.07.2015, decided to Summarily Reject the application as per 7 2(b) of Regulations 2014 on the following ground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution has not submitted application within 15 days from the date of application. <p>As per the decision of SRC, rejection order was issued to the institution on 15.10.2015. Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE Hqrs and the appellate authority vide order no.F.No.89-50/2016 Appeal/5th Meeting - 2016 has stated as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“.....AND WHEREAS, Sh. K.B.L.R.M Naidu, Administrator, Mother D.Ed College, Vishakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh presented the case of the appellant institution on 26.04.2016. In the appeal and during personal presentation it was submitted that “they dispatched the hardcopy of the online application along with relevant documents through India Post (RMS) on 14.07.2015 to the Southern Regional Office, NCTE, Bangalore. The online application was submitted on 30.06.2015 and the hard copies were dispatched on 14.07.2015, i.e within 15 days which is permissible under the Regulations of NCTE 2014. The India Post (RMS) number is “B RN969565576IN” dated 14.07.2015.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>AND WHEREAS, the committee noted that the council has issued instructions their Regional Committees informing them that, for 2016-17, 15th July, 2015 will be the last date for submission of hard copies of the applications with NOC irrespective of the date of online submission. The committee also noted that the appellant has filed their application online on 30.06.2015 and submitted the hardcopy of the application with their letter dt. 13.07.2015 by speed post on 14.07.2015, which was received in the SRC on 20.07.2015. Since the hardcopy of the application was submitted within the extended date i.e 15.07.2015, the committee concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to SRC with a direction to process the application further as per the NCTE Regulations.</i></p>
--	--	--

AND WHEREAS, after careful perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to SRC with a direction to process the application further as per the NCTE Regulations.

NOW THEREFORE, the council hereby remand back the case of Mother D.Ed College, Vishakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above”.

In pursuance to the Appellate Authority orders the application was processed and placed before SRC in its 317th meeting held on 28th – 30th July, 2016 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:

1. Fee paid
2. Cause Inspection.
3. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents especially BCC.

Inspection of the institution was generated through online mode, inspection of the institution was conducted on 02.03.2017 & 03.03.2017 and VT report along with documents and original CD received on 08.03.2017.

The SRC in its 333rd meeting held on 24th March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;

1. VT inspection report is seen.
2. All details are in order.
3. Only, FDRs @ 7 + 5 lakhs ‘per unit’ are required in original, in joint account.
4. Issue LOI for D.El.Ed (1 unit).

Accordingly, as per decision of SRC LOI was sent to the institution on 28.03.2017. The institution has not submitted reply till date.

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

1. Reply to our LOI has not been received.
2. Give time till 31.12.2017 because we can now consider cases for FR only w.e.f 2018-19.

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

The institution has not submitted reply till date.

		<p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have not given reply to the LOI. 2. Give further time till 31.03.2018. 3. Clarify that if the approved Faculty list, in accordance with the requirements of the 2014 Regulations, is not received before 1.03.2018, We can not consider this case for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19 because of the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19. 4. Issue SCN accordingly.
21	<p>SRCAPP2947 B.Ed 2 Units Bhagiratha College of Education, Chithradurga, Karnataka</p>	<p>Bhagiratha College of Education, Plot No. 45/2AP2-P1, Madhure Village and Post Office, Hosadurga Taluk & City, Chithradurga District-577527, Karnataka.</p> <p>Sri Upaveera Jagdguru Vidya Samsthe, Plot No. 45/2AP2-P1, Brahma Vidyanagara Street, Madhure Village and Post Office, Hosadurga Taluk & City, Chithradurga District-577527, Karnataka had applied for grant of recognition to Bhagiratha College of Education, Plot No. 45/2AP2-P1, Madhure Village and Post Office, Hosadurga Taluk & City, Chithradurga District-577527, Karnataka for offering B.Ed course of 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 30.05.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 30.05.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Government was sent on 09.06.2015 followed by reminder I on 04.07.2015.</p> <p>Sub-Clause (2) of Clause 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates under:-</p> <p>“(2) The application shall be summarily rejected under one or more of the following circumstances-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Failure to furnish the application fee, as prescribed under rule 9 of the National Council for Teacher Education Rules, 1997 on or before the date of submission of online application; b) Failure to submit print out of the applications made online along with the last documents as required under sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 within fifteen days of the submission of the online application. “ <p><i>Sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 reads as under:-</i></p> <p>“While submitting the application online a copy of the registered land documents issued by the competent authority, indicating that the society or institution apply</p>

	<p><i>for the programme possesses land on the date of application, shall be attached along with the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was found deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The institution has submitted a copy of the registered land documents which is the name of an individual (Shri shri shri Purushothamanand Puri Mahaswamiji). and not in the name of Society /Trust/Institution.</i> <p>The SRC in its 291st meeting held during 20th to 21st August, 2016 considered the matter and after careful perusal of the original application for B.Ed course for the session 2016- submitted on-line on 30.05.2015 and hard copy on 30.05.2015, decided to Summarily reject the application as per Clause 7 2(b) of Regulations 2014.</p> <p>The land documents as required under sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 5 is not submitted. The institution submitted a copy of the registered land documents which is in the name of an individual (Shri shri shri Purushothamanand Puri Mahaswamiji) and not in the name of Society /Trust/Institution.</p> <p>As per decision of SRC, a rejection order was issued to the Institution on 15.10.2015</p> <p>Aggrieved by the Rejection order of SRC, the institution filed an appeal before the appellate authority, NCTE Hqrs.</p> <p>The appellate authority vide order No. F.No.89-301/2015 F.No. 89301 Appeal/3rd Meeting 2016, 170940 dated 18.04.2016 remanded the case to SRC as under:-</p> <p>“The Committee noting that the correction Land sale deed, which is in favour of President, Bhageeratha Peetha, was got executed on the same day i.e. 09.01.2007 (which date the earlier submitted sale deed was executed in the name of an individual) concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the S.R.C with a direction to process the application further on receipt of the Correction Deed from the appellant. The appellant is directed to submit the correction Deed to the S.R.C within 15 days of receipt of the orders on the appeal.</p> <p>After perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, documents available on record and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to SRC with a direction to process the application further on receipt of the correction Deed from the appellant. The appellant is directed to submit the correction deed to the SRC within 15 days of receipt of the orders on the appeal.</p>
--	---

	<p>The Council hereby remands back the case of Bhagiratha College of Education Hosadurga, Chitradurga District, Karnataka to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action indicated above.”</p> <p>The matter was placed before the SRC, in its 312th meeting held on 28th & 29th April, 2016. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Built up area, as per the BCC, is inadequate for the existing and proposed courses 2. Latest EC is not submitted 3. FDRs have to be given in joint account and in original 4. Cause Composite Inspection 5. Ask VT to collect all documents during the inspection 6. According to the time-limit extended by the Supreme Court, 2 May 2016 is the last date for issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f. 2016-17. All concerned should be advised of the position so that they can take advantage of the extended time-limit even if necessary by foregoing normal ‘notice periods’. <p>The inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 27.09.2016.</p> <p>The inspection of the institution was conducted on 08.10.2016 and the VT report received at the office on 13.10.2016 along with documents.</p> <p>The SRC, in its 323rd meeting held during 16th to 18th November, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title is not in the name of either the Society or Institution. 2. LUC and EC are given. 3. BP is in order. 4. BCC is in order. 5. Built-up area is adequate. 6. The B.Ed application is not supported by any other course to provide composite status. 7. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Besides the above, the institution is also required to submit the latest Encumbrance Certificate.</p> <p>On 23.11.2016, NOC is received from Proceedings of the Government of Karnataka vide order no: ED 319 UNE 2015 Bangalore, dated 09.11.2016.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 28.11.2016.</p> <p>The Show Cause Notice reply was not received by this office even after completion of 9 days from the date of issue of notice reply to the institution. Accordingly the non-submission of show cause notice reply was placed before SRC 327th meeting.</p>
--	---

	<p>The SRC, in its 327th meeting held during 19th to 20th January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <p>“ The main objection in this case was about ‘stand alone’ status. The fact of their running a D.El.Ed. course was not reported.</p> <p>Now that the new information has come up, put up again before the SRC for reconsideration in the next meeting on 31.01.2017.</p> <p>In the meantime, the institution has submitted Show Cause notice Reply on 17.01.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 328th meeting held during 31st January, 2017 considered the show cause notice reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. “There is support from a running D.El.Ed course.2. The deficiency relating to land document is rectified.3. Issue LOI for B.Ed (2 units).” <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter of Intent was issued to the institution on 03.02.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 335th meeting held during 11th- 12th April, 2017 considered the matter of non submission of LOI reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. “LOI reply not yet received.2. Give further time till 24.4.17.3. Put up on 25.4.17.” <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter to the institution was issued on 20.04.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted LOI reply on 24.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 337th meeting held during 25th – 26th April, 2017 considered the LOI reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. “LOI reply has now been received.2. The Faculty list is checked.3. Lecturer (ITC) is extra. Needs to be replaced by Lecturer (Psy).4. Service Certificate of Principal is required.5. Website is non-functional.6. FDRs are required in original, in joint account with a 5 year validity, @ 7+5 lakhs for each unit of each course7. Issue SCN accordingly.” <p>As per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on</p>
--	---

		<p>28.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 341st meeting held during 15th – 16th June, 2017 considered the non submission of SCN reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “No reply to our SCN has been received. 2. Give time till 31.12.2017 because we can now consider cases for FR only w.e.f. 2018-19.” <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 13.07.2017, informing that time is given up to 31st December, 2017 for submission of SCN reply for further processing of the application.</p> <p>But, till date the institution has not submitted show cause notice reply.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Give further time till 31.03.2018. 2. Clarify that if the approved Faculty list, in accordance with the requirements of the 2014 Regulations, is not received before 1.03.2018, We can not consider this case for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19 because of the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19. 3. Issue SCN accordingly.
22	<p>SRCAPP2016 30132 BA.B.Ed BSc.BEd 1 Unit & B.Ed 1 Unit Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Rangareddy, Telangana</p>	<p>Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Hyderabad Vilalge, S.R.Sankaran Block, TSIPARD Campus, Hyderabad Taluk & City, Rangareddy District-500030, Telangana</p> <p>Tata Institute of Social Science (Deemed University), Deonar Village, V.N.Purav marg, Deonar Taluk, Mumbai City, Gr.Mumbai District-400088, Maharashtra applied for grant of recognition to Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Hyderabad Vilalge, S.R.Sankaran Block, TSIPARD Campus, Hyderabad Taluk & City, Rangareddy District-500030, Telangana for offering B.A.B.Ed.B.Sc.B.Ed four years integrated course and B.Ed course for 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 24.06.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 01.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 12.07.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.A.B.Ed.B.Sc.B.Ed and B.Ed course in the State of Telangana.</p> <p>A Letter dated 27.10.2016 received from Smt.Ranjeev R.Acharya, Education Department, Government of Telangana vide D.O.letter No. 7754/SE-Trg./A1/2016-2, dated: 27.10.2016 reads as under:</p>

		<p><i>“...that the National Council for Teacher Education, Southern Regional Committee, Bangalore in their reminders vide reference 3rd to 9th cited, has sought the Recommendations of the Government of Telangana for granting of Recognition to the Colleges for conducting B.Ed/D.P.S.E/M.Ed Programme from the Academic Year, 2017-2018, to the following Colleges in the State of Telangana:-</i></p>			
		Code No.	Name of the Educational Society applied for recognition	Name of the College	Course applied
		SRCAPP201630 079	Sri Venkatachalapathi Educational Society, Medak District	Vinayaka College of Education, Medak	B.Ed
		SRCAPP201630 052	Madrasa I Aizza, Adilabad District	Aizza College of Education, Adilabad	B.Ed
		SRCAPP201630 065	Vyjayanthi Educational Society, RR District	Sree Dattha Brindavan Institute of Teacher Education, Mahabubnagar	B.A.B.Ed., B.Sc.B.Ed
		SRCAPP201630 039	Central University, Rejection District	University of Hyderabad Rejection District	M.Ed
		SRCAPP201630 144	AIM ASIA, Nacharam, Hyderabad	Mckenna College of Education, Nalgonda District.	B.Ed & DPSE
		SRCAPP201630 135	Tata Institute of Social Science, (Deemed University) Mumbai, Maharastra	Tata Institute of Social Sciences, TSIPARD Campus, RR District.	B.Ed. M.Ed
		SRCAPP201630 132	Tata Institute of Social Science, (Deemed University) Mumbai, Maharastra	Tata Institute of Social Sciences, TSIPARD Campus, RR District.	BA B.Ed / B.S B.Ed & B.Ed
		<p><i>2. In this context, it is to inform you that, vide reference 2nd cited (copy enclosed), Government of Telangana already informed you not to grant ay Recognition to any proposal pending with the NCTE for starting New B.Ed/B.P.Ed/M.Ed/M.P.Ed Colleges which includes the Colleges specified in the reference 3rd to 9th cited duly enclosing the Director of School Education, Telangana, Hyderabad, letter mentioned in the reference 1st cited (copy enclosed) which was addressed to the NCTE, New Delhi, and a copy marked to you in the matter. The Acknowledgement of the receipt of the reference 2nd cited by the NCTE is enclosed herewith for your information.</i></p> <p><i>3. In spite of the Letter 2nd cited, which was received on 27.09.2016 by you, we are still receiving reminders dated 01.10.2016 and 26.10.2016, which were received in the department on 07.10.2016 & 27.10.2016 respectively, in the</i></p>			

		<p>cases of the Colleges mentioned in the references 3rd to 9th cited. It is not clear as to why this is happening.</p> <p>4. Therefore, it is once again requested that NCTE should not grant any Recognition to any of these proposals pending with the NCTE for starting New B.Ed/B.P.Ed/M.Ed/M.P.Ed Colleges, which includes the colleges specified in the references 3rd to 9th cited, for the Academic Year 2017-2018 onwards, until specific requisition is sent from the State Government.</p> <p>5. Your reply in the matter is requested at the earliest.</p> <p>The SRC in its 323rd meeting held on 16th – 18th November 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRC has no authority to recognize requests for ‘banning’ courses. The State Government should have taken it up at the appropriate time with the NCTE (HQ). • The present letter also cannot be taken as a common objection to all such cases pertaining to the State. At best, we can treat it as the State Govt.’s objection to the 7 cases listed in the letter. As regards other cases, it will be necessary for the State Govt. , in response to our notice, to send specific objections in individual cases. According to the NCTE Regulations, in case of no reply (to our notice in individual cases) from the State Governments, the Regional Committees will be free to process the case further and decide it on its merits. <p>The State Government may be advised accordingly.</p> <p>A letter sent to Dr. Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Research Officer, NCTE Hqrs regarding Clarification about Recommendation from the State Government of Telangana on 22.11.2016.</p> <p>A letter received from NCTE Hqrs through email dated 19.12.2016, it stated as under:</p> <p><i>“...It is a legally, well settled position that once applications for various courses have been invited/received, they are to be processed by the Regional Committee concerned as per the Regulation 2014 and comments of State Govt. are again sought for under NCTE Regulations (Clause 7(4) of the Regulation 2014). The comments/recommendations of the state Govt. at this stage are expected to be based on merit of the individual application, in the absence of which RC’s take their own decision regarding grant of recognition/refusal. It appears that in these cases when the comments of the State Govt. were invited, the State Govt. simply gave a negative recommendation with a blanket refusal and without assigning any reasons in each individual case. It was possible for the SRC to consider the views of the State Govt. if the recommendation would have been made available in each case on merit with adequate reason. As such, SRC has</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>acted within its rights conferred under the provision of Section 14&15 of the NCTE Act 1993.</i></p> <p><i>However, in all such cases wherever the State Govt. feels that the institution does not qualify for grant of recognition and it is aggrieved with the decision of the SRC they may file an 'Appeal' under Section 18 of the NCTE Act. Section 18(1) of the Act categorically provides that 'any person aggrieved' by an order under Section 14 or 15 or 17 can prefer an Appeal. Till date, under this category, only applicant institutions have been filing appeals and not any other 'aggrieved person'."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th – 05th January, 2017 considered and Noted the matter.</p> <p>A letter was sent to Smt. Ranjeev R.Acharya, Special Chief Secretary to Govt., Education Department, Government of Telangana on 18.01.2017 regarding communicating clarification from NCTE Hqrs in this regard.</p> <p>The SRC in its 327th meeting held on 19th -20th January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>This was finally disposed of in the last meeting. Even NCTE (HQ) has sent a detailed reply to the State Government.</i> 2. <i>No further action is required for correspondence with the State Government.</i> 3. <i>The Regional Director (SRO) has confirmed that no further communication has been received from the Govt. of Telangana about their objection to these 7 cases individually. The earlier common objection letter also does not give any reasons for the objection. The NCTE letter to the State Govt. makes it very clear that a blanket refusal without giving any reasons in each individual case renders it impossible for the SRC to consider the view of the State Govt. on merit with adequate reason.</i> 4. <i>In the result, and for the reasons given above, it will not be possible to reject (or, even, hold up) these 7 cases. The Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3 March 17 for issue of FR w.e.f. 2017-18 makes it imperative for us to give attention to these cases without further delay. That being so, processes these 7 cases and put them up for SRC consideration in the next meeting.</i> <p>The documents were processed and placed before the SRC in its 328th meeting held on 31st January, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have applied for 2 courses in one application- B.A.B.Ed./BSc. B.Ed./ B.Ed. This is not correct. There can be only one course in one application. They should choose which course they want to pursue. Ascertain and process accordingly. 2. Return the Fee paid for the second course. 3. They should supply BP, BCC and NOC from the University concerned in Telangana.
--	--	---

		<p>4. Issue Notice accordingly.</p> <p>Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution through online on 01.02.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its reply on 22.02.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February to 3rd March 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their contention about 'off-campus unit' is accepted. 2. There seems to be some confusion about BP and BCC. They are not required from the Telangana University; they are required from Municipal Committee/ Panchayat and from a Govt./University Engineer. TISS will be required to submit these. 3. Cause VT inspection for B.Ed. (1 unit). 4. The Telangana Govt.'s objection conveyed as a 'blanket refusal' for many courses, without giving reasons, as already stated in other similar cases, cannot be recognized as a valid objection. The State Govt. must give their objection in each case and with supporting reasons at that. Otherwise, it is not possible to consider their objection critically. <p>Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members through online on 11.03.2017. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 3th and 4th April 2017 and the VT report along with CD received on 10.04.2017.</p> <p>The documents were processed and placed before the SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th – 12th April, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This case has many deficiencies. 2.1 They do not have clear title to the land. The application was accompanied by a Conveyance Deed from the Govt. of A.P. that land was in Mahaboobnagar Dist. Now, they have changed to a Lease Deed from KSW. 2.2 That the new land at Ranga Reddy District is also Govt. land is not very relevant. The Govt. land is on lease with ICSW. ICSW have sub-leased it to TISS through an MOU. NCTE Regulations do not allow private lease. Also, it is not clear whether KSW is authorized to sub-lease the land. 3. Further more, at the time of application TISS did not have any title to the land in Ranga Reddy District. The sub-lease arrangement also was executed in April 2017. 4. TISS have also not given any documents. LUC, EC, BP, BCC – all have not been given. 5. With so many infirmities and deficiencies, it will not be possible for the SRC to take any further action in this case. 6. Issue SCN accordingly.
--	--	--

		<p>Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution through online on 18.04.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted its reply till date.</p> <p>The SRC in its 339th meeting held on 22nd & 23rd May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No reply to our SCN dt. 18.4.17 has been received. 2. Give more time till 31.12.17. 3. It may be clarified to them that, after 2.5.17 time limit prescribed by the Supreme Court, it will not be possible for us to grant FR w.e.f. 2017-18. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 30.05.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have not replied to our SCN. 2.1. They have not given any documents. Remind. 2.2 .Request them in particular to give a document to show that the MOU signed between TISS & ICSW has the clearance of the state Govt. 3. Issue a letter accordingly
23	<p>SRCAPP2016 30135 B.Ed.M.Ed 1 Unit Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Rangareddy, Telangana</p>	<p>Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Hyderabad Village, S.R.Sankaran Block, TSIPARD Campus, Hyderabad Taluk & City, Rangareddy District-500030, Telangana</p> <p>Tata Institute of Social Science (Deemed University), Deonar Village, V.N.Purav marg, Deonar Taluk, Mumbai City, Gr.Mumbai District-400088, Maharashtra applied for grant of recognition to Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Hyderabad Village, S.R.Sankaran Block, TSIPARD Campus, Hyderabad Taluk & City, Rangareddy District-500030, Telangana for offering B.Ed.M.Ed integrated course for three years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 27.06.2016.The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 02.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 12.07.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.Ed.M.Ed course in the State of Telangana.</p> <p>A Letter dated 27.10.2016 received from Smt.Ranjeev R.Acharya, Education Department, Government of Telangana vide D.O.letter No. 7754/SE-Trg./A1/2016-2, dated: 27.10.2016 reads as under:</p>

		<p><i>“...that the National Council for Teacher Education, Southern Regional Committee, Bangalore in their reminders vide reference 3rd to 9th cited, has sought the Recommendations of the Government of Telangana for granting of Recognition to the Colleges for conducting B.Ed/D.P.S.E/M.Ed Programme from the Academic Year, 2017-2018, to the following Colleges in the State of Telangana:-</i></p>																																	
		<table> <tr> <th>Code No.</th><th>Name of the Educational Society applied for recognition</th><th>Name of the College</th><th>Course applied</th></tr> <tr> <td>SRCAPP201630 079</td><td>Sri Venkatachalapathi Educational Society, Medak District</td><td>Vinayaka College of Education, Medak</td><td>B.Ed</td></tr> <tr> <td>SRCAPP201630 052</td><td>Madrasa I Aizza, Adilabad District</td><td>Aizza College of Education, Adilabad</td><td>B.Ed</td></tr> <tr> <td>SRCAPP201630 065</td><td>Vyjayanthi Educational Society, RR District</td><td>Sree Dattha Brindavan Institute of Teacher Education, Mahabubnagar</td><td>B.A.B.Ed B.Sc.B.Ed</td></tr> <tr> <td>SRCAPP201630 039</td><td>Central University, Rejection District</td><td>University of Hyderabad Rejection District</td><td>M.Ed</td></tr> <tr> <td>SRCAPP201630 144</td><td>AIM ASIA, Nacharam, Hyderabad</td><td>Mckenna College of Education, Nalgonda District.</td><td>B.Ed & DPSE</td></tr> <tr> <td>SRCAPP201630 135</td><td>Tata Institute of Social Science, (Deemed University) Mumbai, Maharastra</td><td>Tata Institute of Social Sciences, TSIPARD Campus, RR District.</td><td>B.Ed. M.Ed</td></tr> <tr> <td>SRCAPP201630 132</td><td>Tata Institute of Social Science, (Deemed University) Mumbai, Maharastra</td><td>Tata Institute of Social Sciences, TSIPARD Campus, RR District.</td><td>BA B.Ed / B.Sc. B.Ed & B.Ed</td></tr> </table>	Code No.	Name of the Educational Society applied for recognition	Name of the College	Course applied	SRCAPP201630 079	Sri Venkatachalapathi Educational Society, Medak District	Vinayaka College of Education, Medak	B.Ed	SRCAPP201630 052	Madrasa I Aizza, Adilabad District	Aizza College of Education, Adilabad	B.Ed	SRCAPP201630 065	Vyjayanthi Educational Society, RR District	Sree Dattha Brindavan Institute of Teacher Education, Mahabubnagar	B.A.B.Ed B.Sc.B.Ed	SRCAPP201630 039	Central University, Rejection District	University of Hyderabad Rejection District	M.Ed	SRCAPP201630 144	AIM ASIA, Nacharam, Hyderabad	Mckenna College of Education, Nalgonda District.	B.Ed & DPSE	SRCAPP201630 135	Tata Institute of Social Science, (Deemed University) Mumbai, Maharastra	Tata Institute of Social Sciences, TSIPARD Campus, RR District.	B.Ed. M.Ed	SRCAPP201630 132	Tata Institute of Social Science, (Deemed University) Mumbai, Maharastra	Tata Institute of Social Sciences, TSIPARD Campus, RR District.	BA B.Ed / B.Sc. B.Ed & B.Ed	
Code No.	Name of the Educational Society applied for recognition	Name of the College	Course applied																																
SRCAPP201630 079	Sri Venkatachalapathi Educational Society, Medak District	Vinayaka College of Education, Medak	B.Ed																																
SRCAPP201630 052	Madrasa I Aizza, Adilabad District	Aizza College of Education, Adilabad	B.Ed																																
SRCAPP201630 065	Vyjayanthi Educational Society, RR District	Sree Dattha Brindavan Institute of Teacher Education, Mahabubnagar	B.A.B.Ed B.Sc.B.Ed																																
SRCAPP201630 039	Central University, Rejection District	University of Hyderabad Rejection District	M.Ed																																
SRCAPP201630 144	AIM ASIA, Nacharam, Hyderabad	Mckenna College of Education, Nalgonda District.	B.Ed & DPSE																																
SRCAPP201630 135	Tata Institute of Social Science, (Deemed University) Mumbai, Maharastra	Tata Institute of Social Sciences, TSIPARD Campus, RR District.	B.Ed. M.Ed																																
SRCAPP201630 132	Tata Institute of Social Science, (Deemed University) Mumbai, Maharastra	Tata Institute of Social Sciences, TSIPARD Campus, RR District.	BA B.Ed / B.Sc. B.Ed & B.Ed																																
		<p><i>2. In this context, it is to inform you that, vide reference 2nd cited (copy enclosed), Government of Telangana already informed you not to grant any Recognition to any proposal pending with the NCTE for starting New B.Ed/B.P.Ed/M.Ed/M.P.Ed Colleges which includes the Colleges specified in the reference 3rd to 9th cited duly enclosing the Director of School Education, Telangana, Hyderabad, letter mentioned in the reference 1st cited (copy enclosed) which was addressed to the NCTE, New Delhi, and a copy marked to you in the matter. The Acknowledgement of the receipt of the reference 2nd cited by the NCTE is enclosed herewith for your information.</i></p> <p><i>3. In spite of the Letter 2nd cited, which was received on 27.09.2016 by you, we are still receiving reminders dated 01.10.2016 and 26.10.2016, which were received in the department on 07.10.2016 & 27.10.2016 respectively, in the</i></p>																																	

		<p><i>cases of the Colleges mentioned in the references 3rd to 9th cited. It is not clear as to why this is happening.</i></p> <p><i>4. Therefore, it is once again requested that NCTE should not grant any Recognition to any of these proposals pending with the NCTE for starting New B.Ed/B.P.Ed/M.Ed/M.P.Ed Colleges, which includes the colleges specified in the references 3rd to 9th cited, for the Academic Year 2017-2018 onwards, until specific requisition is sent from the State Government.</i></p> <p><i>5. Your reply in the matter is requested at the earliest.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 323rd meeting held on 16th – 18th November 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRC has no authority to recognize requests for ‘banning’ courses. The State Government should have taken it up at the appropriate time with the NCTE (HQ). • The present letter also cannot be taken as a common objection to all such cases pertaining to the State. At best, we can treat it as the State Govt.’s objection to the 7 cases listed in the letter. As regards other cases, it will be necessary for the State Govt. , in response to our notice, to send specific objections in individual cases. According to the NCTE Regulations, in case of no reply (to our notice in individual cases) from the State Governments, the Regional Committees will be free to process the case further and decide it on its merits. <p>The State Government may be advised accordingly.</p> <p>A letter sent to Dr. Prabhu Kumar Yadav, Research Officer, NCTE Hqrs regarding Clarification about Recommendation from the State Government of Telangana on 22.11.2016.</p> <p>A letter received from NCTE Hqrs through email dated 19.12.2016, it stated as under:</p> <p><i>“...It is a legally, well settled position that once applications for various courses have been invited/received, they are to be processed by the Regional Committee concerned as per the Regulation 2014 and comments of State Govt. are again sought for under NCTE Regulations (Clause 7(4) of the Regulation 2014). The comments/recommendations of the state Govt. at this stage are expected to be based on merit of the individual application, in the absence of which RC’s take their own decision regarding grant of recognition/refusal. It appears that in these cases when the comments of the State Govt. were invited, the State Govt. simply gave a negative recommendation with a blanket refusal and without assigning any reasons in each individual case. It was possible for the SRC to consider the views of the State Govt. if the recommendation would have been made available in each case on merit with adequate reason. As such, SRC has acted within its rights conferred under the provision of Section 14&15 of the</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>NCTE Act 1993.</i></p> <p><i>However, in all such cases wherever the State Govt. feels that the institution does not qualify for grant of recognition and it is aggrieved with the decision of the SRC they may file an 'Appeal' under Section 18 of the NCTE Act. Section 18(1) of the Act categorically provides that 'any person aggrieved' by an order under Section 14 or 15 or 17 can prefer an Appeal. Till date, under this category, only applicant institutions have been filing appeals and not any other 'aggrieved person'."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th – 05th January, 2017 considered and Noted the matter.</p> <p>A letter was sent to Smt. Ranjeev R.Acharya, Special Chief Secretary to Govt., Education Department, Government of Telangana on 18.01.2017 regarding communicating clarification from NCTE Hqrs in this regard.</p> <p>The SRC in its 327th meeting held on 19th -20th January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <i>This was finally disposed of in the last meeting. Even NCTE (HQ) has sent a detailed reply to the State Government.</i> 6. <i>No further action is required for correspondence with the State Government.</i> 7. <i>The Regional Director (SRO) has confirmed that no further communication has been received from the Govt. of Telangana about their objection to these 7 cases individually. The earlier common objection letter also does not give any reasons for the objection. The NCTE letter to the State Govt. makes it very clear that a blanket refusal without giving any reasons in each individual case renders it impossible for the SRC to consider the view of the State Govt. on merit with adequate reason.</i> 8. <i>In the result, and for the reasons given above, it will not be possible to reject (or, even, hold up) these 7 cases. The Supreme Court prescribed dateline of 3 March 17 for issue of FR w.e.f. 2017-18 makes it imperative for us to give attention to these cases without further delay. That being so, processes these 7 cases and put them up for SRC consideration in the next meeting.</i> <p>The documents were processed and placed before the SRC in its 328th meeting held on 31st January, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. B.Ed., M.Ed., Integrated course is a recognized course. 2.1. But, to apply for this course, they should have B.Ed. & M.Ed. as running courses for more than 5 years. They do not have. 2.2 The regulations require that they should also have residential accommodation. There is no indication that they have this. 3. They should have NAAC certificate with at least 'B' grade. 4. They should have given NOC from the University concerned in Telangana. <p>The Regulations do not contemplate courses being affiliated to Universities in</p>
--	--	--

	<p>other Regions.</p> <p>5. Issue Notice accordingly and ask them to clarify.</p> <p>Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution through online on 01.02.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its reply on 22.02.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February to 3rd March 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All requirements are met. 2. The emphasis in the Regulations is on “UGC recognized...”. There is no separate mention of ‘Deemed to be University’ anywhere in the Regulations. We can, therefore, assume that Deemed Universities will also be covered in the Regulation listing ‘institutions’ eligible to apply. 3. Cause VT inspection. 4. The Telangana Govt.’s objection conveyed as a ‘blanket refusal’ for many courses, without giving reasons, as already stated in other similar cases, cannot be recognized as a valid objection. The State Govt. must give their objection in each case and with supporting reasons at that. Otherwise, it is not possible to consider their objection critically. <p>Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members through online on 11.03.2017. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 3th and 4th April 2017 and the VT report along with CD received on 12.04.2017.</p> <p>The documents were processed and placed before the SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th – 12th April, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. This case has many deficiencies. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 They do not have clear title to the land. The application was accompanied by a Conveyance Deed from the Govt. of A.P. that land was in Mahaboobnagar Dist. Now, they have changed to a Lease Deed from KSW. 2.2 That the new land at Ranga Reddy District is also Govt. land is not very relevant. The Govt. land is on lease with ICSW. ICSW have sub-leased it to TISS through an MOU. NCTE Regulations do not allow private lease. Also, it is not clear whether KSW is authorized to sub-lease the land. 3. Further more, at the time of application TISS did not have any title to the land in Ranga Reddy District. The sub-lease arrangement also was executed in April 2017. 4. TISS have also not given any documents. LUC, EC, BP, BCC – all have not been given. 5. With so many infirmities and deficiencies, it will not be possible for the SRC to take any further action in this case. 6. Issue SCN accordingly.
--	--

		<p>Accordingly, show cause notice was issued to the institution through online on 18.04.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted its reply till date.</p> <p>The SRC in its 339th meeting held on 22nd & 23rd May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. No reply to our SCN dt. 18.4.17 has been received. 5. Give more time till 31.12.17. 6. It may be clarified to them that, after 2.5.17 time limit prescribed by the Supreme Court, it will not be possible for us to grant FR w.e.f. 2017-18. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 30.05.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have not replied to our SCN. 2.1. They have not given any documents. Remind. 2.2 .Request them in particular to give a document to show that the MOU signed between TISS & ICSW has the clearance of the state Govt. 3. Issue a letter accordingly
24	<p>SRCAPP2016 30082 B.P.Ed 1 Unit School of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kannur, Kerala</p>	<p>School of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kallayasseri Village, Cherukunnu Road, Taliparamba Taluk, Kallayasseri Town, Kannur District-670756, Kerala.</p> <p>Kannur University Kallyasseri, Cherukunnu Road, Taliparamba, Kannur, Kerala applied for grant of recognition to School of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kallayasseri Village, Cherukunnu Road, Taliparamba Taluk, Kallayasseri Town, Kannur District-670756, Kerala for offering B.P.Ed course and M.P.Ed courses of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.06.2016</p> <p>As per Regulations, letters were sent to the State Government for recommendation on 27.10.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.12.2016 and Reminder II on 11.01.2017. The University has submitted recommendation for B.P.Ed and M.P.Ed course on 10.01.2017.</p> <p>As per the direction, both the applications were scrutinized online along with hard copy of the applications and documents were placed before SRC in its 327th meeting held during 19th to 20th January, 2017 and the Committee matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NOC is not required. 2. Land document is given. Title is clear. Land area (21 acres) is adequate. 3. LUC/EC – not required since it is Govt. land.

		<p>4. BP is in order. Built-up area – not legible. 5. BCC not given. 6. Cause inspection. 7. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, inspection of the institution for B.P.Ed and M.P.Ed courses were scheduled through online mode during 01.02.2017 to 21.02.2017. Two VT members for each course have given their acceptance for the visit. On 01.02.2017, an E-mail is received from Head of the Department, School of Physical Education, Kannur University stating as under :- <i>“NCTE has detailed two visiting teams separately to carry out the inspection of B.P.Ed and M.P.Ed courses of School of Physical and Sports Science , Kannur University.</i> <i>B.P.Ed Course – Application ID No. SRCAPP201630082</i> <i>M.P.Ed Course – Application ID No. SRCAPP201630085</i></p> <p><i>Since the B.P.Ed and M.P.Ed courses are being run under School of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kannur University, we shall be grateful if you could arrange one visiting team to carry out a comprehensive inspection for both the courses in between 8th to 22nd February, 2017.”</i></p> <p>This office has received a clarification from Mr. Ibrahim in the matter of inspection of two courses of the institution with separate applications which is as under :-</p> <p>In case of online applications ; there are two situations (a) Institute has submitted the application under one single form for multiple courses (b) Institute has submitted multiple applications for multiple courses.</p> <p>a) In case of multiple applications it would not be possible as for each application there is a separate application ID/No including payment and other details. Technically it will not be able to merge under one single record as each of these applications are treated as a separate entity.</p> <p>b) In case an institute has submitted for multiple courses under a single application</p> <p>The SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th to 07th February, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:- 1. NCTE(HQ) has clarified that in cases of 2 separate applications, joint or composite inspection is not permissible for 2017-18. 2. Their request for a joint inspection is, therefore, rejected. 3. Let the VT inspections proceed as already ordered.</p> <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 15.02.2017. Visiting Team report was received on 21.02.2017 and online copy not submitted. The SRC in its 331st meeting held on 22nd February, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decide as under:- 1. They have fulfilled all the conditions. 2. Issue LOI for B.P.Ed.(1 unit)</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, a Letter of Intent was issue to the institution on 03.03.017. The institution has submitted the LOI reply on 28.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st to 03rd May, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decide as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LOI reply is seen. 2. Faculty list is examined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Service certificate of Principal is not there. - One Associate Prof. is not there. - As against 3 Asst. Profs. Required, they have 6. - The 3 extra can be considered against the vacant positions of Sports Trainers. - But, the 3 extra Asst. Profs. Are contractual employees, not regular. 3. Faculty list is submitted commonly for B.P.Ed. & M.P.Ed. While some flexibility of deployment in such cases is provided for, total merger is not permissible. The faculty list has, therefore, to be called incomplete. 4. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 08.05.2017. The institution has submitted SCN reply on 02.06.2017.</p> <p>An email was received by this office on 08.06.2017 the institution has submitted Service certificate of the Principal.</p> <p>The SRC in its 341st meeting held on 15th & 16th June, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They were seen, in an earlier meeting to have satisfied all requirements. Only, the Faculty list was to be examined. 2. LUC/EC are in order. 3. BP is in order; approved by the competent authority. Built-up area is not shown. Built up area is not stated. 4. BCC is in order. Built-up area shown (4649 sq.mts.) is adequate for B.P.Ed.(1 unit). VT Inspection Report confirms this. 5.1 One Associate Prof. is required. 5.2 Asst. Prof. only 3 are in position. Out of the 3 also, 2 are on contract. The remaining 3 positions are vacant and need to be filled. 5.3 Others are in order. 6. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, Show cause Notice was issued to the institution on 28.06.2017. The institution not replied to the SCN.</p> <p>The SRC in its 344th meeting held on 17th & 18th August, 2017 the committee considered the non submission of SCN reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reply to LOI has not been received. 2. Since we can now consider this case for FR with effect only from 2018-19, give further time till 31.12.2017. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 15.09.2017. The institution has not replied to the Letter (LOI Notice) till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Give further time till 31.03.2018.
--	---

		<p>2. Clarify that if the approved Faculty list, in accordance with the requirements of the 2014 Regulations, is not received before 1.03.2018, We can not consider this case for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19 because of the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19.</p> <p>3. Issue SCN accordingly.</p>
25	<p>SRCAPP2016 30085 M.P.Ed 1 Unit School of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kannur, Kerala</p>	<p>School of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kallayasseri Village, Cherukunnu Road, Taliparamba Taluk, Kallayasseri Town, Kannur District-670756, Kerala.</p> <p>Kannur University Kallyasseri, Cherukunnu Road, Taliparamba, Kannur, Kerala applied for grant of recognition to School of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kallayasseri Village, Cherukunnu Road, Taliparamba Taluk, Kallayasseri Town, Kannur District-670756, Kerala for offering B.P.Ed course and M.P.Ed courses of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, letters were sent to the State Government for recommendation on 27.10.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.12.2016 and Reminder II on 11.01.2017. The University has submitted recommendation for B.P.Ed and M.P.Ed course on 10.01.2017.</p> <p>As per the direction, both the applications were scrutinized online along with hard copy of the applications and documents were placed before SRC in its 327th meeting held during 19th to 20th January, 2017 and the Committee matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NAAC Certificate is given. 2. NOC is not required. 3. Land document is given. Title is clear. Land area (21 acres) is adequate. 4. LUC/EC – not required since it is Govt. land. 5. BP is in order. Built-up area – not legible. 6. BCC not given. 7. Cause inspection. 8. Ask V T to collect all relevant documents. <p>As per the decision of SRC, inspection of the institution for B.P.Ed and M.P.Ed courses were scheduled through online mode during 01.02.2017 to 21.02.2017. Two VT members for each course have given their acceptance for the visit.</p> <p>On 01.02.2017, an E-mail is received from Head of the Department, School of Physical Education, Kannur University stating as under :-</p> <p><i>“NCTE has detailed two visiting teams separately to carry out the inspection of B.P.Ed and M.P.Ed courses of School of Physical and Sports Science , Kannur University.</i></p> <p><i>B.P.Ed Course – Application ID No. SRCAPP201630082</i></p> <p><i>M.P.Ed Course – Application ID No. SRCAPP201630085</i></p> <p><i>Since the B.P.Ed and M.P.Ed courses are being run under School of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Kannur University, we shall be grateful if you could arrange one visiting team to carry out a comprehensive inspection for both the courses in between 8th to 22nd February, 2017.”</i></p>

	<p>This office has received a clarification from Mr. Ibrahim in the matter of inspection of two courses of the institution with separate applications which is as under :-</p> <p>In case of online applications ; there are two situations (a) Institute has submitted the application under one single form for multiple courses (b) Institute has submitted multiple applications for multiple courses.</p> <p><u>a)</u> In case of multiple applications it would not be possible as for each application there is a separate application ID/No including payment and other details. Technically it will not be able to merge under one single record as each of these applications are treated as a separate entity.</p> <p><u>b)</u> In case an institute has submitted for multiple courses under a single application form then system will handle it automatically</p>
	<p>The SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th to 07th February, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NCTE(HQ) has clarified that in cases of 2 separate applications, joint or composite inspection is not permissible for 2017-18. 2. Their request for a joint inspection is, therefore, rejected. 3. Let the VT inspections proceed as already ordered. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 15.02.2017. Visiting Team report was received in hard copy on 22.02.2017 and online copy not submitted.</p> <p>The SRC in its 331st meeting held on 22nd February, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decide as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The failure to submit VT report is a technical deficiency attributable to our software. We cannot hold it out against them. 2. They have fulfilled all the conditions. 3. Issue LOI for M.P.Ed.(1 unit) <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, a Letter of Intent was issued to the institution on 02.03.017. The institution has submitted the LOI reply on 28.04.2017. The SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st to 03rd May, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decide as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LOI reply is seen. 2. Faculty list is examined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Service certificate of Principal is not there. - One Associate Prof. is not there. - As against 3 Asst. Profs. Required, they have 6. - The 3 extra can be considered against the vacant positions of Sports Trainers. - But, the 3 extra Asst. Profs. Are contractual employees, not regular. 3. Faculty list is submitted commonly for B.P.Ed. & M.P.Ed. While some flexibility of deployment in such cases is provided for, total merger is not permissible. The faculty list has, therefore, to be called incomplete. 4. Issue SCN accordingly.

		<p>As per the decision of the SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 08.05.2017. The institution has submitted SCN reply on 02.06.2017.</p> <p>An email was received by this office on 08.06.2017 the institution has submitted Service certificate of the Principal.</p> <p>The SRC in its 341st meeting held on 15th to 16th June, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title is clear. 2. LUC/EC are in order. 3. BP & BCC are in order. Land area is adequate. Built-up area is adequate. 4.1 The Principal of B.P.Ed. is a common Principal for M.P.Ed. also. The post of Prof. is deemed to be filled by this common Principal. 4.2 The 2 posts of Associate Profs. are vacant. They have to be filled up. Associate Profs. of B.P.Ed. cannot be shown for M.P.Ed. also. 4.3 3 Asst. Profs. are in position. Out of them, 2 are on contract. They have to be regular. And, 1 of the 3 should be a PG in Yoga. The Asst. Prof.(Yoga) of B.P.Ed. cannot be shared with M.P.Ed. There has to be an independent Faculty member. 4.4 Out of the 3 part-time Sports Trainers, 1 is appointed. But, he is not qualified. 1 is repeated from the B.P.Ed. list This is not allowed. The third post is vacant. In other words, 3 part-time Sports Trainers are required. 5. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Accordingly, As per the decision of SRC show cause notice was issued to the institution on 29.06.2017. The institution not replied to the SCN.</p> <p>The SRC in its 344th meeting held on 17th & 18th August, 2017 the committee considered the non submission of SCN reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reply to LOI has not been received. 2. Since we can now consider this case for FR with effect only from 2018-19, give further time till 31.12.2017. 3. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 15.09.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not replied to the Letter (LOI Notice) till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Give further time till 31.03.2018. 2. Clarify that if the approved Faculty list, in accordance with the requirements of the 2014 Regulations, is not received before 1.03.2018, We can not consider this case for issue of FR w.e.f. 2018-19 because of the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit for issue of FRs w.e.f. 2018-19. 3. Issue SCN accordingly.
26	A letter dated 12.12.2017 is received from Bengaluru	A letter dated 12.12.2017 is received by this office from Bengaluru Central University (Central College Campus) is received by this office on 29.12.2017 which is as under:-

	Central University (Central College Campus)	<p>“The Government of Karnataka, by an Act of Karnataka Legislature and through its Gazette Notification No. 34 of 2015 dated 13.8.2015 amending KSU Act 2015, has established Bengaluru Central University (BCU) with headquarters at Central College Campus, Bengaluru, trifurcating Bangalore University. It has the territorial Jurisdiction comprising of 13 Karnataka Legislative Assembly Constituencies namely Shanthinagara, Byatarayanapura, Yelahanka, Malleshwaram, Hebbal, Shivajinagar, Gandhinagar, Chickpet, Basavanagudi, BTM Layout, Jayanagar of Bengaluru Urban District. There are about 239 affiliated college with more than 1,00,000 student population within the purview of BCU. A copy of the gazette notification is enclosed.</p> <p>Prof.S. Japhet has assumed charge of the Office of the Vice-Chancellor of BCU on 25th July 2017. The Government vide Notification No. ED/167/UBV/2017 Dt: 29.06.2017 has accorded approval for commencement of Bangalore Central University with effect from 01.07.2017. The BCU has initiated steps for granting fresh affiliation to new colleges, renewal of affiliations of existing colleges situated in the notified jurisdiction of the University. The BCU is functioning as full-fledged University with effect from 01.07.2017.</p> <p>The BCU is envisaged as a multi-faculty and multi-disciplinary University to be recognized under sections 2 (f) and 13-B of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956. The BCU has been recognized by the University Grants Commission under 2(f) of the UGC Act 1956 vide Notification F9-19 / 2017 (CPP-I/PU) dated 20th Oct 2017 and empowered the Bengaluru Central University to award the degrees as specified by the UGC under Section 22 of the UGC Act 1956 through its own departments and its constituent / affiliated college in regular mode.</p> <p>The BCU as of now has eight Departments of studies in the Central College Campus namely, Chemistry, Bio-Chemistry, Mathematics, Commerce, Management, Communication, Foreign Languages and Apparel Technology. The BCU is planning to start 20 new Departments of Studies during 2018-19.</p> <p>I request you kindly to make note of the above facts and due recognition may be extended to new Bengaluru Central University on par with other established Universities in the country.”</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noted the letter that has been sent by Bengaluru Central University to NCTE (HQ)</p>
27	APS01390 B.Ed 1 Unit Ezhuthachan Training	<p>Ezhuthachan Training College, Manjapra P.O Palakkad District, Kerala.</p> <p>Ezhuthachan Training College, Manjapra P.O Palakkad District, Kerala submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition for starting Secondary course of one year duration from the academic session 2004-2005</p>

College, Palakkad, Kerala	<p>with an annual intake of 100 students and was granted recognition on 25.02.2005.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014 letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations, 2014 seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted its willingness affidavit on 29.01.2015 as per Regulations 2014. Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 13.05.2015 for two basic units of 50 students each, with a condition that the institution has not maintained revalidated FDR's.</p> <p>On 20.05.2015 an email was received from the institution regarding Sanctioning of one basic unit under New Regulations. A corrigendum was issued to the institution on 07.07.2015 for one unit.</p> <p>On 07.10.2015 a complaint letter was received from Mr/ms. Sobhana Aravindakshan & Divya Vinod regarding obtaining recognition violating Recognition Norms and procedures.</p> <p>On 05.12.2015 a letter was addressed to Mr/ms. Sobhana Aravindakshan & Divya Vinod Kadavali House, kerala seeking an affidavit a stamp paper for authenticity verification of veracity of complaint.</p> <p>On, 23.12.2015, a complaint matter on affidavit dated 14.12.2015 is received by this office from Sobhana Aravnidakshan, Kadavil House, P.O, Vallachira, Thrissur-680562, Kerala and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“An affidavit signed by me in Rs.100/- stamp paper is enclosed. My daughter Mrs. Divya Vinod is at present away from home in connection with playing tennis at Thailand and she will be back at home only by February 2016. Affidavit signed by her will be forwarded in due course.</p> <p>Regarding my allegations I submit the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have already submitted a copy of Document No. 409/2003 of Alathur Sub Registry dated 11th February 2003 indicating ownership of the property in which the college is situated. It is cristal clear that the Ezhuthachan Educational Society has absolutely no right on the property. As such the recognition is in violation of Regulation 8 (4)(i) of the Recognition Norms and Proceedure Regulation 2009. 2. I had also enclosed copies of Deposit Receipts for Joint Deposit of Rs. 5,00,000/- in State Bank of Travancore, Thrissur and another Deposit of Rs. 3,00,000/- in the South Indian Bank Ltd. Thrissur in which no mention of the Charitable Society is available. This indicates that the society has no stake in the Deposits.
---------------------------------	---

		<p>3. The Ezhuthachan Educational Society had not submitted any accounts to the NCTE and the accounts of the society does not include expenditure and income of the college in their annual accounts prepared for submission to the District Registrar. Copies of the accounts of the society has been called for from the Registrar under RTI Act and will be produced in due course.</p> <p>4. Regarding allegations regarding compliance of Norms regarding appointment of staff, payment of salaries, library etc. all these details are available with the management only and this can be called for by the NCTE from them directly as it is not covered under RTI Act. An inspection would reveal all these facts. I request that the allegations may kindly be examined honestly, if necessary, by conducting an inspection of the college and its records.</p> <p>The Complaint matter was placed before SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February to 3rd March, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Send the complaint to the affiliating University to help us with their comments after verification of details with the originals. 2. Send copies of the land documents and FDRs in our file to the University for verification of authenticity. 3. Tell the University that the main thrust of the complaint is about forgery of documents. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the Calicut University on 21.03.2017 enclosed copy of land documents & FDRs.</p> <p>A letter dated 14.02.2017 received by this office on 22.03.2017 from the institution on 22.03.2017 regarding withdrawal of interest amount.</p> <p>A letter dated 31.07.2017 received on 08.08.2017 from the University of Calicut on 08.08.2017 regarding clarification on the land documents and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>“Kindly attention is invited to the reference cited wherein it was requested to verify the authenticity of the land document No.409/2003 of Alathur sub Registry dated 11th February, 2003 in respect of the Ezhuthachan Training College, Manjapra Po, Palakada Kerala.</i></p> <p><i>The office of the Sub Registrar, Vadakkancherry (Palakkad District, Kerala), where the document was actually registered has reported vide reference 2nd cited that the land property in respect of document No.409/2003 is seen registered in the name of the Chairman, Secretary and committee members on behalf of the Ezhuthachan Training College. It is further added that there is no reference about Ezhuthachan Educational Society in the said document”.</i></p> <p>Again, a letter dated 21.12.2017 received from the University of Calicut on 01.01.2018 regarding allegation of forgery of documents against Ezhuthachan Training College and stating as under:-</p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>“As per the reference cited 1st, (this office letter dated 21.03.2017) it was informed that a case of forgery of documents has been alleged against the Ezhuthachan Training College, Palakad, kerala and, therefore, requested to verify the authenticity of the land documents No.409/2003 of Alathur sub Registry dated 11th February, 2003, in respect of the Ezhuthachan Training College, Manjapra Po, Palakad, Kerala. Accordingly, the verification report, as requested, was forwarded vide letter 2nd cited. (University letter dated 31.07.2017).</i></p> <p><i>The continuation of provisional affiliation for the academic year 2018-19 in respect of the B.Ed programme in the College will be granted only after finalising the proceedings related with above allegation against the College. You are, therefore, requested to inform whether the proceedings with regards to the allegation against the Ezhuthachan Training College as mentioned in your letter cited has been finalized and if so kindly communicate the decision.</i></p> <p><i>Kindly treat this as mist urgent as the information is necessary for issuing renewal of affiliation for the next academic year”.</i></p> <p>Note :- The institution has not submitted reply to the compliance for RPRO till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The University., after due verification, has confirmed the genuineness of the title-deed. 2. The allegation about FDRs being fake has not been commented upon. Let us contact the Bank concerned directly to verify. 3. Advise the University that affiliation should be restored with retrospective effect. 4. Take action as per (2) & (3) above.
28	APS07494 B.Ed 2 Units University College of Education, Ananthapur, Andhra Pradesh	<p>University College of Education, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Ananthpur – 515003, Andhra Pradesh.</p> <p>Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh submitted an application for B.Ed course of one year duration with an annual intake of 100 students at University College of Education, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Ananthpur – 515003, Andhra Pradesh and the recognition was granted on 25.09.2007.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014, a letter was issued to the institution regarding notification of new Regulations, 2014 and seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The institution submitted the affidavit for offering B.Ed course with an intake of 100 students and M.Ed course with an intake of 50 students on 13.02.2015.</p> <p>The SRC in its 276th meeting held on 7th-9th January, 2015 decided to issue provisional</p>

		<p>recognition orders to the existing institutions and the committee also decided to maintain a check list of such cases for verification in October/November and for causing inspection.</p> <p>Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution for B.Ed on 06.05.2015 with a condition that the institution has not maintained/revalidated the Fixed Deposited Receipts towards Endowment and Reserve Funds.</p> <p>On 08.12.2015, a letter dated 27.11.2015, was received from the Registrar, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Ananthapur District, Andhra Pradesh.</p> <p>The SRC in its 298th meeting held on 8th to 10th January , 2016 considered the matter, and other relevant documents of the institution, and decided as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue SCN for inadequate faculty in M.Ed., B.Ed; and B.Ed (DE). <p>Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 03.02.2016. The institution submitted its reply along with documents on 25.02.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 307th meeting held on 9th March, 2016 considered the reply of the institution and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The reply is not at all satisfactory. Regular B.Ed & M.Ed are being run by adhoc teachers. The B.Ed (DE) is being handled by teachers attached from other colleges.</i> 2. <i>Withdraw recognition.</i> <p>The SRC, Committee has not mentioned from which academic session Recognition Withdrawal Order may be issued.</p> <p>The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th – 05th January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The decision to withdraw recognition was taken on 9.3.2016. The withdrawal will therefore be w.e.f. 2016-17. 2. The main objection was about inadequacy of faculty. Their letter dated 22.2.2016 does not give any reply to meet this objection. 3. Our decision was, therefore, not incorrect. As already stated, we cannot at this stage change that decision. The University can appeal if they wish to. 4. Issue the effective date of withdrawal of recognition. <p>Accordingly, withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 24.01.2017.</p> <p>The University submitted its written representation dated 24.03.2017 received on 27.03.2017 and stating as under;</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“.....the SRC, NCTE, Bangalore has withdrawn the recognition for B.Ed ar</i></p> </div>
--	--	---

		<p><i>courses from the academic year 2016-17 due to inadequacy of teaching staff.</i></p> <p><i>The matter was placed before the University Executive Council held on 14.02.2017 to obtain permission for filling up of teaching positions as per NCTE, norms which were approved by the Executive Council vide ref. 2nd cited. Accordingly, the University has issued a notification for walk-in-interviews vide ref. 3rd & 4th cited.</i></p> <p><i>It is further informed that, the University has decided to withdraw the M.Ed. Course from the Academic Year 2017-18 due to meager admissions from the last two academic years.</i></p> <p><i>The University has conducted walk-in-interviews on 23.03.2017 and 115 candidates have attended the interview. Out of which the University has selected required number of teaching faculty for all positions as per NCTE-2014 norms by following the rule of reservation. The list of selected candidates will be submitted to you within short period.</i></p> <p><i>Hence, we appeal to you to consider the recognition of B.Ed course with Two units from the academic year 2016-17. The required amount of Demand Draft towards application fee for Rs. 25,000/- bearing No. 157612 dated 16.03.2017, Andhra Bank, S.K. University (scanned copies sent). Please use your good offices by promoting excellence in B.Ed course with continuation of recognition."</i></p>	
		<p>The University submitted written representation on 25.04.2017 along with faculty list and stating as under;</p> <p><i>".....I am herewith sending the list of newly appointed Teaching staff of S.K.U Co Education along with the appointment orders, joining reports and affidavits submitted by candidates. The Certificates relating to the Educational qualifications and service certificates are also enclosed.</i></p> <p><i>Further, it is informed that the Govt. of A.P. has already conducted EDCET examination on 19.04.2017 and shortly the admission schedule is going to be issued. I request you to renew the recognition to B.Ed and M.Ed courses for the academic year 2017-18 and for B.Ed. Only for the academic year 2017-18 and necessary orders may be issued by University Authorities.</i></p> <p><i>I wish to further inform that the S.K. University is a state owned one and is located in a remote poverty stricken area and is in a chronically drought prone district catering to the educational needs of the marginalized and poor sections of the society and the university has appointed the teaching staff as per NCTE 2014 norms."</i></p> <p>Aggrieved by withdrawal order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal with NCTE-Hqrs and the NCTE Appellate Authority in its order No. F.No.89-216/2017 Appeal/13th Meeting-2017/57081 dated: 21.08.2017 received by this office on 29.08.2017 stated as follows:</p> <p><i>"AND WHEREAS the Committee also noted that the main ground for withdrawal</i></p>	

		<p><i>is inadequacy of staff. The Committee noted that the appellant through their letter dt. 24.03.2017 and 22.04.2017, has informed the SRC with supporting documents, about the steps taken by them to provide the faculty for the courses under consideration. In these circumstances, the Committee concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to consider the teaching faculty provided by the appellant and take further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>AND WHEREAS after perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to consider the teaching faculty provided by the appellant and take further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>NOW THEREFORE, the Council hereby remands back the case of Sri Krishnadevaraya University, S.V. Puramu, Ananthapuramu, Andhra Pradesh to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 345th meeting held on 21st & 22nd September, 2017 considered the matter and decided to "Process".</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The faculty list for B.Ed now given is examined. 2. Three Asst Profs in Perspective Group and one Asst Prof (Performing Arts) are required. 3. Faculty list for M.Ed is not given. 4. All the appointment are shown as 'adhoc'. The Regulations do not permit other than 'regular' faculty. 5. Issue SCN accordingly.
29	APS09642 B.Ed-DE 500 students Sri Krishnadevar aya University, Ananthapur, Andhra Pradesh	<p>Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Sri Venkateswarapuram, Ananthapur District-515055, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Anantapur Centre for Distance Education, Sri Venkateswarapuram, Ananthapur District-515055, Andhra Pradesh submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Sri Venkateswarapuram, Ananthapur District-515055, Andhra Pradesh for B.Ed (Distance Education) course of two years duration with an annual intake of 500 students and was granted recognition on 29.05.2009.</p> <p>A letter dated 09.12.2014 was forwarded by the NCTE Hqrs to this office on 19.12.2015 stated as under:-</p> <p><i>"Directorate of Distance Education of Sri Krishnadevaraya University on regular as well as distance modes without any regular faculty and violating the norms prescribed by NCTE.</i></p>

		<p><i>Really it is astonishing</i></p> <p><i>How can a university run a master's program without a teaching fraternity and violating the norms prescribed by the statutory body created by the Parliament of India i.e. NCTE to regulate the standards of Teacher Education.</i></p> <p><i>Are SRC of NCTE and the Central Secretariat of NCTE aware of this. If it is so, what are the steps that are initiated by NCTE to monitor the implementation of NCTE norms.</i></p> <p><i>Has the NCTE relaxed the its quality norms for Teacher Education Institution by permitting Sri Krishnadevaraya University to offer B.Ed and M.Ed programmes in regular and distance mode without appointing regular teaching staff as per the norms.</i></p> <p><i>Finally, I wish to reinvent the quotation by great American comedian and social commentator George Carlin said of the education system in its current form; "they (NCTE) don't want a population that's capable of critical thinking. They (NCTE) don't want well-informed, well educated people capable of critical thinking. That doesn't help them (NCTE). It goes against their (NCTE) interests. They (NCTE) don't want people who are smart enough to sit around the kitchen table and figure out how..."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 283rd meeting held during 2nd & 3rd March 2015, considered the complaint matter, letter dated 09.12.2014 and other related documents, and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Send the complaint to University for comments. 2. Put up in the 285th meeting. <p>A letter was addressed to the Registrar, Shri Krishnadevaraya University, Ananthapur District, Andhra Pradesh on 04.11.2015.</p> <p>On 08.12.2015, a letter dated 27.11.2015, was received by this office from the Registrar, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Ananthapur District, Andhra Pradesh and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>"Remark on the complaint:</i></p> <p><i>Complaint 1. The Center for Distance Education (CDE) S.K.University, Anantapur is not offering the M.Ed Programme.</i></p> <p><i>Complaint 2. The Center for Distance Education (CDE) S.K. University, Anantapur Offers only B.Ed Programme related to teacher education. The B.Ed programme was sanctioned by SRC-NCTE in May 2009 after recruitment of four Lecturers/Assistant Professor and Principal on consolidated pay on 25.05.2009.</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>Complaint 3. The B.Ed and M.Ed courses offered by the University College of Education</i></p> <p><i>are on self-founding basis for which regular staff will be appointed only after the sanction of posts by the Government in 2010 when the university has made appointment in various departments one sanctioned post of Assistant Professor was filled up in the college of Education. Since then no regular teaching staff posts was sanctioned to the college of Education and the University has not taken up appointments in general courses also due to legal issues in the High Court of Andhra Pradesh.</i></p> <p><i>The Government of Andhra Pradesh is going to accord permission for the requirement soon. The University also taking steps to sort-out legal issues in order to recruit fresh staff at the earliest."</i></p> <p>The Southern Regional Committee in its 298th meeting held on 8th to 10th January , 2016 considered the matter and other relevant documents of the institution and decided as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue SCN for inadequate faculty in M.Ed., B.Ed; and B.Ed (DE). <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 03.02.2016.</p> <p>On 25.02.2016, the University submitted a reply to the Show Cause Notice which was considered by SRC in its 307th meeting held on 9th March, 2016 and decided that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The reply is not at all satisfactory. Regular B/Ed & M.Ed are being run by adhoc teachers. The B.Ed (DE) is being handled by teachers attached from other colleges.</i> 2. <i>Withdraw recognition.</i> <p>Withdrawal order was not issued.</p> <p>Meantime, the Registrar, Sri Krishnadevaraya University submitted written representation on 02.05.2016 and 06.05.2016 regarding permission to extend the recognition to run B.Ed and M.Ed courses stating as follows:</p> <p><i>"With reference to the letter 1st cited , your office has issued a Show Cause Notice to our University College of Education regarding the inadequacies of staff and other infrastructure for running B.Ed and M.Ed courses and directed the University College of Education to fulfill the required norms before 28.02.2016. To this effect, a letter of explanation was sent to your office on 22.02.2016 (Ref.2 cited) .But surprisingly , the office of the NCTE in its meeting 307 dated 08.03.2016 resolved to recommend for withdrawal of recognition to our University (Ref 3 cited).</i></p>
--	--	---

	<p><i>In reference 4th cited, your office has sent a letter to our Vice Chancellor quoting a judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court regarding Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Maha Vidyalaya Vs Regional Director, NCTE and extended dated up to 2nd May, 2016 for final recognition.</i></p> <p><i>In this regard, I wish to inform you that the University will fulfill all requirements relating to the staff and other infrastructure facilities as per NCTE norms before the ensuing admission session. Hence I request you to extend recognition to run B.Ed and M.Ed courses both under regular and distance mode. Further, I request you to accord the permission to the University to make the admissions for both B.Ed and M.Ed courses from the academic year 2016-17."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 321st meeting held on 28th & 29th September, 2016 considered the request of the University for reconsideration of 307th meeting decision and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We had decided to withdraw recognition .We have no authority to go back on that decision now. 2. The University, if it is aggrieved by our order, can appeal against it. <p>The SRC has not mentioned from which academic session Withdrawal Order may be issued. Hence, the matter was again placed before SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th – 05th January, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The decision to withdraw recognition was taken on 9.3.2016. The withdrawal will therefore be w.e.f. 2016-17. 6. The main objection was about inadequacy of faculty. Their letter dated 22.2.2016 does not give any reply to meet this objection. 7. Our decision was, therefore, not incorrect. As already stated, we cannot at this stage change that decision. The University can appeal if they wish to. 8. Issue the effective date of withdrawal of recognition. <p>Accordingly, withdrawal order was issued to the University on 24.01.2017.</p> <p>Aggrieved by withdrawal order of SRC, the University preferred an appeal with NCTE-Hqrs and the NCTE Appellate Authority in its order No. F.No.89-215/2017 Appeal/13th Meeting-2017/57077 dated: 21.08.2017 received by this office on 29.08.2017 and stated as follows:</p> <p><i>"AND WHEREAS the Committee also noted that the main ground for withdrawal is inadequacy of the faculty. The Committee noted that the appellant through their letter dt. 24.03.2017 (addressed to the NCTE with an endorsement to the SRC0 and two letters 04.07.2017 submitted during the presentation of the appeal, has explained the steps taken by them to provide the faculty for the B.Ed. (Distance Education) course. In these circumstances, the Committee concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to consider the teaching faculty provided by the appellant for B.Ed (D.E) course and take further</i></p>
--	--

		<p><i>action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The appellant is directed to forward to the SRC their two letters dt. 04.04.2017 with all their enclosures, within 15 days of the receipt of the orders on the appeal.</i></p> <p><i>AND WHEREAS after perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to consider the teaching faculty provided by the appellant for B.Ed (D.E) course and take further action as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014. The appellant is directed to forward to the SRC their two letters dt. 04.04.2017 with all their enclosures, within 15 days of the receipt of the orders on the appeal.</i></p> <p><i>NOW THEREFORE, the Council hereby remands back the case of Sri Krishnadevaraya University, S.V. Puramu, Ananthapuramu, Andhra Pradesh to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 345th meeting held on 21st & 22nd September, 2017 considered the matter and decided to "Process".</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>The appeal committee has directed the appellant to submit their two letter dated 04.04. with all their enclosures to SRC, within 15 days of the receipt of the orders on the ap The University has not submitted the same till date.</p> </div> <p>The University submitted its written representation on 25.04.2017 along with faculty list and stating as under;</p> <p><i>".....I am herewith sending the list of newly appointed Teaching staff of Directorate of Distance Education, S.K. University, Ananthapuram with NCTE 2014 norms. The University had issued appointed orders and appointees are submitted their joining reports and affidavits. The Certificates relating to the educational qualifications and service certificates are also enclosed for your perusal.</i></p> <p><i>Further, it is informed that the Universities of Distance Education of Govt. of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana has already issued notifications for admission into B.Ed course under Distance Mode for the year 2016-17. Hence, I request you to consider our request to renew the recognition to B.Ed course for the academic year 2016-17.</i></p> <p><i>Further it is informed that the S.K. University, Ananthapuram, Andhra Pradesh is a state owned one and is located in a remote poverty stricken area and is in a chronically drought prone district catering to the educational needs of the marginalized and poor sections of the society.</i></p> <p><i>A favourable action is solicited from you at an early date in this regard."</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p>As per decision of SRC, application was processed and placed before SRC in its 347th meeting held on 16th & 17th November, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The University was required by the Appellate Authority to furnish a copy of their letter dated 04.04.2017 (along with its enclosures) within 15 days to us. This has not been done. 2.1 They had only given earlier the Faculty list for B.Ed-DE (500). 2.2 According to the Regulations there should be 10 study centres @ 50 per centre. There are no details given about the study centres. The Faculty list of 10 given appears to be only for the university level. 2.2 (i) The staffing pattern is 1 (prof) 2 Associate (Profs) and, 4 (Asst Profs) for the HQ University. The list given contains 10 names ; but, the composition is different : 1 (Prof), 1 Associate (Prof) and 8 (Asst Profs) ; and, there are 2 repetitions. (ii) According to the Regulations, they should cover Maths, Science language and Social Science. All four areas are covered by the overall group of 1+1+6. 3. The University may be asked to clarify the changes in the staffing pattern. a. As regards their request for recognition from 2016-17, it must be clarified that we are not authorized to give retrospective approvals. b. Even for prospective approvals, they can not get for 2017-18 since the last date (03.05.17), Prescribed by the Supreme Court, for issue of FR (by us) for 2017-18 has also long passed. They can now be considered only for 2018-19. 5.1 Before we can consider further action in this case, we will need also BP, BCC, and, the full details of Faculty. 6. Issue a Notice accordingly. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was issued on 28.11.2017.</p> <p>The institution submitted reply along with documents on 20.12.2017 .</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The Faculty list given by them is seen. 2.The Faculty list is in order. 3.The list of 10 study centres also requires verification: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The 10 centres should be 'eligible' by operating the B.Ed programme themselves for 5 years. (ii) They should be recognised TEIs as can be verified from their NCTE recognition code nos. (iii) They should not already be committed to serve as Study Centres of any other University. 4.Issue SCN accordingly
30	APS09407 B.Ed	E.S. Subramaniam Memorial College of Education, Hospital Road, Podhatterpet, Pallipat Taluk, Thiruvallur District-631208, Tamil Nadu.

<p>2 Units E.S. Subramaniam Memorial College of Education, Thiruvallur, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>SRC NCTE, granted recognition to E.S. Subramaniam Memorial college of Education, Hospital Road, Podhatterpet, Pallipat Taluk, Thiruvallur District-631208, Tamil Nadu for conducting B.Ed course of one year duration with an intake of 100 students on 10.10.2008.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014, letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations, 2014 and seeking consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The institution has submitted affidavit on 01.05.2015.</p> <p>Accordingly, revised order was issued to the institution for conducting B.Ed., course on 13.05.2015, with an intake of two basic units of 50 students each, with condition that the institution shall create additional facilities that include (a) additional built-up area, (b) additional infrastructure, (c) additional funds, (d) adhere to staff norms as per Regulations, 2014.</p> <p>The institution has requested to return the FDR's on 30.06.2015. Accordingly, Original FDR's return to the institution on 30.06.2015.</p> <p>The institution has submitted compliance for RPRO on 28.07.2015 and 03.11.2015 along with relevant document.</p> <p>SRC in its 314th meeting held on 27th & 28th May 2016 decided as under;</p> <p><i>"For cases of B.Ed (2 Units) in the existing institution, where RPRO, has been issued, we have to cause inspection to check adherence to the 2014 Regulations. This action will have to be completed by July 2016 so that revised Formal Recognition can be issued w.e.f. 2016-17 to enable them to make admission in time.</i></p> <p><i>Action to check the documents in these cases (about 1885 in number) will take time. Instead of Waiting for that action to be completed for placing them before the SRC, to save time, VT Inspections can straightaway be ordered. VT Inspection Report can be considered along with examination of the documents.</i></p> <p><i>Regional Director is authorized to initiate action accordingly. The institution concerned may be alerted about such action so that they will be prepared to receive the Visiting Teams. They may also be advised to keep in readiness latest approved Faculty Lists for Submission to the VTs."</i></p> <p>The inspection intimation was sent to the institution through online module. VT members names were generated through online VT module for inspection during the period 24.10.2016 to 14.11.2016.</p> <p>W.P.No. 38819 of 2016 filed by the institution in the Hon'ble High Court of Madras.</p>
--	--

		<p>A letter was addressed to Shri M.T Arunan on 25.01.2017 along with brief of the case.</p> <p>A court order dated 01.08.2017 in W.P.No 28660 of 2004 and W.P.M.P.No. 34790 of 2004 in the High Court of Judicature at Madras were received by this office on 14.09.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the relief sought for in this writ petition has been granted for subsequent academic years and therefore, nothing survives in this writ petition to be adjudicated upon further.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>2. Recording the above said submission made by the learned counsel for petitioner, this writ petition is dismissed as anfractuous. No. costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.”</i></p> <p>The Committee considered and noted the above matter.</p>
31	<p>APS08948 B.Ed 1 Unit Rasi College of Education, Namakkal, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rasi College of Education, No.25/1B, Thottiya Patti, C.S Puram Post, Rasipuram Taluk, Namakkal District, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Venkateshwara Educational and Charitable Trust, Namakkal District, Tamil Nadu submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Rasi College of Education, No.25/1B, Thottiya Patti, C.S Puram Post, Rasipuram Taluk, Namakkal District, Tamil Nadu for B.Ed course. The recognition was granted on 11.12.2007 for B.Ed course with an annual intake of 100 students.</p> <p>On 31.12.2014, letters were issued to all existing institutions regarding notification of new Regulations, 2014 seeking for consent on their willingness for fulfilling the revised norms and standards before 31.10.2015.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its willingness affidavit on 27.01.2015 as per regulations 2014. Accordingly, revised recognition order was issued to the institution on 13.05.2015 with a condition that the institution has not shifted to its own premises as stipulated in its formal recognition order dated 13.07.2005.</p> <p>The institution has submitted the compliance for RPRO on 31.07.2015, the same was processed and placed before the SRC in its 316th meeting held on 28th - 30th July 2016, and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Their contention that this is a case of ‘own property’ can not be accepted. The building is theirs. But, the land clearly is on lease for 30 years.</i> 2. <i>The Trust can run the College on this land until the lease period runs out. Thereafter, they should either get free hold title to the land or shift the college out.</i> 3. <i>EC and LUC are in order.</i> 4. <i>BP is in order. According to it, built-up area is adequate.</i>

5. BCC is not given.
6. Original FDRs and latest Faculty List are not given.
7. Inspection fee not paid.
8. Collect fee and cause inspection.
9. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents; and, check in particular adequacy of built-up area to accommodate B.Ed (2 units) of the 2014 pattern ie., total intake of $(100+100)=200$

As per the decision of SRC, inspection intimation was sent to the institution through on-line VT module, VT Members Names were generated through On-line VT module, The institution in its letter dated 09.08.2016 received on 16.08.2016, submitted a affidavit and requesting for One Unit (50 intake) in B.Ed Course.

Visiting Team report was received on 06.09.2016 along with Documents and DD of Rs 1,50,000/- as inspection fee.

The SRC in its 341st meeting held on 15th to 16th June, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-

- 1.1 Request for reduction from 2 units to 1 is accepted. But, issue the order after they submit the Resolution of the Trust and proof of 'no dues certificate' from the employees.
- 1.2 Clarify that one unit will mean 50 + 50 in the 2 years B.Ed programme should not admit more than 50 in 2017-18 in the first year. They should have faculty as per the norms for 100 students (coming from the first year of 2 units) to complete the 2nd year of the B.Ed programme. Call for the Faculty details for handling the classes accordingly.
2. They own the building. But, the land is on 30 Year lease.
3. They can run the college at this location until the lease period runs out. Thereafter, either they should buy the land or move out to their own land else where.
4. Luc is in order.
5. EC is in order.
6. BP is in order Built up area shown is 3517 Sq mt. It is adequate.
7. BCC is in order. Built up area shown is 3517 Sqmt. It is adequate.
8. FDRs are required in original, in Joint account with a 5-year validity @ 7 + 5 lakhs per programme.
9. Faculty list
 - (i) They need 1+15. They have only 1+14.
 - (ii) They have given the Faculty list in photocopy, not in original.
 - (iii) It is not in format.
 - (iv) Principal is qualified.
 - (v) In Persp. Only one Asst. prof (Psy.) is there. The other 3 positions are vacant. They need 2 in Scl. Sc. and 1 in (Social/Phil)
 - (vi) In Pedagogy, out of 8, 7 are qualified in accordance with the norms. One

		<p>Asst. Prof (Scl. Sc.) is required to fill up the 8th post.</p> <p>(vii) There is no Asst. Prof (FA). The Asst. Prof in position of Perf Arts is not qualified. Asst Prof (Phy.Ed.) qualified.</p> <p>(viii) Out of 14 Asst. Profs., 3 are in Commerce, Comp.Sc., and Msc (I.T.). These are not according to norms. They will need to be replaced.</p> <p>10. Issue SCN accordingly. Send a copy for information to the University.</p> <p>11. Put up in Aug 17.</p> <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 29.06.2017.</p> <p>The request for reduction of two units to one unit was placed before SRC in its 343rd meeting held on 1st to 2nd August, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <p>1. The request for reduction from 2 units to 1 unit is accepted subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>The request for reduction of intake strength from 2 units to 1 unit is accepted subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(ii) Admissions in 2017-18 will be limited to one unit of 50. The affiliating Universities will please ensure that this is strictly observed.</p> <p>(iii) Notwithstanding the restriction of admission in the first year course to 50, there will be no reduction in the faculty strength of 1+15, as prescribed in the 2014 Regulations because of the continuing workload in the 2nd year course. The affiliating Universities will please ensure that this is strictly observed.</p> <p>(iv) The faculty strength can be reduced to 1+9 w.e.f. 2018-19.</p> <p>This arrangement will come into force with immediate effect because of the urgency of admissions relating to proximity of counseling. But, it will be subject to subsequent production of the under listed documents by the institutions concerned.</p> <p>(i) Resolution of the sponsoring society.</p> <p>(ii) NOC of the Affiliating University.</p> <p>(iii) No Dues Certificate relating to the Teaching faculty.</p> <p>(iv) No Dues Certificate relating to the non-Teaching Faculty.</p> <p>2. These cases will be processed for RPRO purposes separately, subsequently.</p> <p>3. Issue order for the reduction of strength accordingly and resubmit for RPRO processing.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Non-submission of SCN reply and requesting for one unit was placed before SRC in its 348th meeting held on 05th to 06th December, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No reply has been received. 2. Remind. Give them time till 27.12.2017. 3. Put up on 28.12.2017. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 12.12.2017. In response to the office SCN dated 29.06.2017 the institution has submitted reply on 26.12.2017 along with documents.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have completed all the formalities. 2.1. The intake-reduction from 2 units to 1 unit is accepted. 2.2. Issue a formal order. 3. They have stated that they reduced the enrolment in 2016-17 itself and that, therefore, there will be only one unit strength in 2017-18. That being so, the conditions relating to phased reduction of faculty need not apply. 4.1. We need not impose the usual faculty conditions. 4.2 Just verify the 2016-17 enrolment position from the University. 5. Process for RPRO after March. 6. Issue a letter accordingly.
32	<p>SRCAPP2016 30223 BSc.B.Ed Arul College of Education, Villupuram, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>Arul College of Education, Pali Village, Pali Main Road, Ulundurpet Taluk, Pali City, Villupuram District-606104, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Arul Educational Trust, Ulundurpet Village, 35 Parivallal Street, Ulundurpet Taluk & City, Villupuram District-606107, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Arul College of Education, Pali Village, Pali Main Road, Ulundurpet Taluk, Pali City, Villupuram District-606104, Tamil Nadu for offering B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.10.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.12.2016 and Reminder II on 11.01.2017. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed. As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application of the institution was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and placed before SRC.</p> <p>SRC in its 328th meeting held during 30th to 31st January, 2016 considered the scrutiny of the application and decided as under :-</p>

1. NOC of TNTEU is only for B.A. B.Ed.(2 units).
2. Process for B.A.B.Ed.(2 units).
3. Title is clear. Land area is adequate.
4. Latest EC is required. The entry about 'lease' needs to be clarified. The Sale Deed, however, is clear. They must clarify the position.
5. LUC is clear.
6. BP is in order.
7. BCC is in order.
8. FDRs not given.
9. Cause composite inspection.
10. There is another case of this Trust(SRCAPP201630206) in which V.T. inspection has been ordered. Ask the same Team to cover this case SRCAPP201630223) also along with the existing B.Ed. case.

In view of the above decision of SRC to cause composite inspection and to send the same VT members for inspection in respect of both the applications (SRCAPP201630223 and SRCAPP201630206), a clarification was sought from Mr. Ibrahim Islam as there is no provision in the online system to send the same VT members to two applications with different application -IDs

On 02.01.2017, an e-mail is received from Mr. Ibrahim Islam stating as under:-

“In case of old applications [wherein we are scheduling is done through online route]. There are options for adding multiple courses under the same VT schedule. You may use the +/- button to add courses for which inspections need to be schedule. Kindly refer to the screen shot below. Also in the comment box you can provide special instructions to the VT members In addition there is a provision for uploading reference documents for VT Member, wherein you can upload the details of the institute [applications form, credential documents need to be verified etc]

“In case of online applications; there are two situations (a) Institute has submitted the application under one single form for multiple courses (b) Institute has submitted multiple applications for multiple courses.

a) In case of multiple applications it would not be possible as for each application there is a separate application ID/No including payment and other details. Technically it will not be able to merge under one single record as each of these applications are treated as a separate entity.

b) In case an institute has submitted for multiple courses under a single application form then system will handle it automatically.

Note :- As per the reply received from Mr. Ibrahim, there is no provision in the online mode for sending the same VT members for two applications with different applications IDs .

As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations, 2014 inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode during 20.02.2017 to 12.03.2017. The visiting Team

		<p>Members Dr.Roopamala Raju Koneri and Shivaji Balaku Desai gave their acceptance for the visit in online mode on 10.02.2017.</p> <p>Inspection of the institution was conducted on 27.02.2017 to 28.02.2017 and the hard copy of the VT Report was received on 02.03.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February to 3rd March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title is clear. Land area is adequate. 2. LUC is in order. 3. (i) BP & BCC show 4 blocks. Block I is shown to have Ground Floor, First Floor & Second Floor. But, CD shows, Second Floor is still in early stages of construction. (ii) BCC shows Block I to have only Ground Floor & First Floor. (iii) Block III details are not properly covered in CD. (iv) Block – IV has onl toilets. 4. EC covers only one Sy.No.21/2, Sy.Nos. 21/1B & 21/1C are not covered. 5. With ref. to observations made in (3) & (4) above, the built-up area is not adequate for B.Ed.(2 units), B.A.B.Ed.(2 units) and B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit). They must explain. They should give a clearer CD. Covering all the blocks properly. 6. FDRs are not in original; only photocopies. Also, in single account; not Joint account. 7. The FDRs given are just photocopies of the FDRs given for B.Sc.B.Ed. they have to give FDRs(7+5 lakhs) for each unit of each course separately. 8. Issue SCN accordingly. 9. Examine the details carefully again in the B.Sc.B.Ed. case(30206) and B.Ed.(2 units) [1900] also. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, a show cause notice was sent to the institution through online mode on 07.03.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN (Hardcopy) on 20.03.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 333rd meeting held on 24th March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their replies are satisfactory. 2. The details now provided are in order. 3. Only, FDRs @ 7+5 lakhs 'per unit' have to be given. 4. Issue LOI for B.A. B.Ed.(1 unit). 5. As already decided, Issue LOI for B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit) <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, LOI issued to the institution on 07.04.2017, the institution has submitted the written representation on 24.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 337th meeting held on 25th – 26th April, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TNTEU has reportedly refused to clear the Faculty list on the ground that they are not prepared to start the B.A.B.Ed. course in 2017-18. This inspite of their NOC given earlier.
--	--	---

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The College has requested for B.Sc.B.Ed.(2nd Unit) in place of B.A.B.Ed.(1 Unit). 3. Since we have examined the details in the B.A.B.Ed. case, there is no need to go into them again. 4. Cancel the LOI for B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit). 5. Issue LOI for B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit) i.e., the second basic unit after the first basic unit approved in case no.30206. <p>As per the decision of SRC, LOI was sent to the institution on 02.05.2017 and the institution has submitted the LOI reply on 02.05.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st – 02nd May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their reply to LOI is seen. 2. The Faculty list given is a total reproduction of the faculty list given in the earlier case of BSc.B.Ed – 1 unit (30206). 3.1 According to the Regulations the Faculty list for BSc.B.Ed (2 units) must have 1 + 15 ie, 1 common Principal, 4 Persp. Asst. Profs, 8 Pedagogy Asst. Profs, 1 A.P (F.A), 1. AP (PA), 1 AP (Phy.Ed). 3.2 They have already given a Faculty list of 1 + 9 in the earlier BSc.B.Ed (1 unit) case (30206). In this case, therefore, they should give only 2 Asst. Prof (Persp) & 4 Asst Prof (Pedagogy) more. 3.3 By merely repeating the earlier list, they have not met this requirement. 4. Issue SCN accordingly. 5.1 The earlier BSc.B.Ed – 1 unit case (30206) has already been cleared for FR. The FDRs given by them are claimed to be (and, do appear to be) originals. Issue the FR. <p>Before issuance of SCN, based on the website information of the SRC decision, the institution has submitted SCN reply on 03.05.2017 (hard copy).</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Formal Recognition order was issued to the institution on 02.05.2017 (SRCAPP201630206-BSc.B.Ed).</p> <p>The SRC in its 338th meeting held on 1-3rd May 2017 considered the SCN reply (SRCAPP201630223-BSc.B.Ed) directly and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They were to give a Faculty list of 6 new Assistant Professors. 2. The Faculty list now given by the contains the same 6 names which were found to be unacceptable. 3. In any case, this communication has been delivered on 3.5.2017, i.e., long after midnight of 2.5.17. It cannot, therefore, be accepted. 4. Reject the application. 5. Return the FDRs. 6. Close the file. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC Rejection order was issued to the institution on 09.05.2017.</p> <p>The institution has filed W.P.No.12948 of 2017 in the Hon'ble High Court of Madras on</p>
--	--	---

		<p>17.05.2017.</p> <p>A letter was addressed to the Advocate Sh. J. Harikrishna along with brief of the case on 23.05.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail dated 22.05.2017 received from the institution along with court order in W.P.No.12948 of 2017.</p> <p>The court order dated 18.05.2017 received by this office on 31.05.2017 in W.P.No.12948 of 2017 in the Hon'ble High court of Madras and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“.....Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that an e-mail was sent on 02.05.2017 at 7.00p.m., which was delivered instantly, But, on the other hand, in the decision of 338th meeting of SRC-NCTE, it has been observed that the same was delivered only on 03.05.2017 i.e., long after mid night of 02.05.2017 and therefore, the same cannot be accepted therefore, the learned Senior Counsel would submit that for the reasons stated above, the claim of the petitioner cannot be rejected and hence, he sought for a direction to the 1st respondent to reconsider the claim of the petitioner.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>Learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent on the other hand submitted that the petitioner's application would be considered afresh.</i> 4. <i>Learned counsel appearing for the learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent is recorded and the 1st respondent is hereby directed to consider the same and pass appropriate orders in the manner known to law within a period of two weeks.</i> 5. <i>The writ petition is disposed of with the above direction. No costs. (Certified Court Order not received)”</i> <p>The same was placed before 340th meeting of SRC 08th to 09th June, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In deference to the Court order, the case is reconsidered. 2. The following points are relevant in this regard: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) It is not correct for the applicant to say that the TNTEU is the only authority to decide on the merits of the Faculty list. The SRC(as part of the NCTE) will have the last word. It is not open for the learned counsel of the TNTEU to unilaterally commit that the case will be considered afresh. (ii) When their original case for B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit) – no.30223 was considered for Faculty list, two Faculty Members(vis., Asst. Prof. in English and Asst. Prof. in Tamil) were rejected as not relevant to the course in reference. When the TNTEU refused to start the B.A.B.Ed. course, as requested by the applicant, the 1 unit considered for B.A.B.Ed. was shifted to B.Sc.B.Ed.as the 2nd unit. They had already an approved Faculty list of 1+9 for B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit). In terms of the NCTE Regulations, for the 2nd unit they had to add 6 more Faculty members. In this list of 6, they had 'repeated' the 2 names(of Asst. Prof. in English and Asst. Prof. in Tamil) that had already been rejected when the case was considered for the first unit. (iii) There is no confusion about receipt of the list of 6 by e-mail on 2.5.17. This
--	--	--

		<p>list was considered and rejected for 'repeating' the names that had already been rejected. The hard copy given in the morning on 3.5.17 was of the same list of 6 that had already been rejected in the evening of 2.5.17. Even if it was a new list with necessary rectifications, we could still not have accepted it as it was received long after midnight of 2.5.17. Accepting a new list in the morning on 3.5.17 would have amounted to violating the time-limit prescribed by the Supreme Court for issuance of FR w.e.f. 2017-18. That being so, we humbly state that there was no lethargy on our part in application of mind that would have resulted in any perversion of justice.</p> <p>(iv) In the given circumstances, and the prevailing instructions, it will not be within the power of this committee to reconsider this case for 2017-18 even if all the conditions are fulfilled. As it happens, in this case, the 2 infirmities in the Faculty list still remain.</p> <p>(v) The only option available to the applicant is to file an appeal with the Appellate Authority. But, even the Appellate Authority may not be able to ignore the 2 infirmities in the Faculty list; and, in view of the Supreme Court directive, consider this case for 2017-18.</p> <p>(vi) The practical course for the applicant, therefore, will be to remove the infirmities in the Faculty list and apply afresh whenever the NCTE issues a Notification inviting applications.</p> <p>3. In the result and for the reasons given above, and as directed by the Hon. High Court, this case is rejected in accordance with the applicable law.</p> <p>The approved Faculty list was received by this office on 09.06.2017 from the TNTEU.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 16.06.2017.</p> <p>Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC the University preferred an appeal to NCTE-Hq, as required by NCTE-Hq the brief of the case along with original file of the institution was sent on 12.09.2017.</p> <p>The Appellate Authority vide No.89-562/E-10999/2017 Appeal/19th Meeting - 2017 dated 07.12.2017 was received by this office on 14.12.2017 and 15.12.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>"..... AND WHEREAS from the point of validity of inclusion of two Asst. Professors for English and Tamil duly approved by the affiliating University for the B.Sc. B.Ed. Course the appellant has not only furnished sufficient justification for their inclusion but also cited the instances of two institutions which were granted recognition for B.Sc. B.Ed course by the SRC, accepting the inclusion of teacher faculty in languages.</i></p> <p><i>AND WHEREAS in the above circumstances, the Committee Concluded that the matter deserved to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to consider all the submission of the appellant, regarding inclusion of two language faculty members in the total facult required for two units of the B.Sc. B.Ed. Course, in the light of the provisions of para 1.1 (Preamble) of the Norms and Standards for the 4-years integrated course and the fact that the appellant, at the time of application, was running B.Ed. Course only and take further action regarding grant of recognition for the second unit of B.Sc. B.Ed. as per the</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>NCTE Regulations, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>AND WHEREAS after perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, documents available on records and considering the oral argument advanced during the hearing, the Committee concluded that the matter deserves to be remanded to the SRC with a direction to consider all the submission of the appellant regarding inclusion of two language faculty members in the total faculty required for two units of the B.Sc. B.Ed course in the light of the provisions of para 1.1(preamble) of the Norms and Standards for the 4-year integrated course and fact that the appellant, at the time of application, was running B.Ed. course only and take further action regarding grant of recognition for the second unit of B. Sc. B.Ed. as per the NCTE Regulations, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>NOW THEREFORE, the Council hereby remands back the case of Arul College of Education, Pali Ulundurpet Taluk Pali Main Road, Ulundurpet, Tamil Nadu to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 350th meeting held on 21st & 22nd December, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The appellate order is noted. 2. Please reopen the case and process. 3. This involves some basic issues relating to Regulations governing qualifications of faculty. Therefore, put up in the next meeting when other members will also be available. 4. The petitioner has cited 2 earlier cases in which the SRC had taken decisions allowing such qualifications for faculty members. Link those 2 cases. Put up on 28.12.2017. <p>As per the decision of SRC, the documents are processed.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The case is reopened with reference to the appellate order. 2. The Faculty list is examined afresh. 3. The list is found to be in order when considered in conjunction with the BSc.B.Ed (1 unit) earlier sanctioned (SRCAPP201630206). 4. Issue FR for BSc.B.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2018-19.
33	<p>SRACPP2468</p> <p>BSc.BEd</p> <p>2 Units</p> <p>Senthil College of Education, Puducherry</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

		<p>submitted hard copy of the application on 05.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter was sent to State Government for recommendation on 12.06.2015, followed by Reminder-I on 22.02.2016 and reminder II sent on 30.11.2016.</p> <p>Sub-clause (3) of clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was found deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>The matter was placed before SRC for in its 292nd meeting held on 29-30 Sept, 2015 and the Committee considered and decided to issue show Cause Notice for rejection of application in the following ground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non Submission of NOC issued by the affiliating body along with application. <p>Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 21.10.2015. The institution submitted written representation on 19.11.2015 attached NOC dated 17.11.2015 for the below stating that <i>Pondicherry University has NO OBJECTION to Senthil College of Education, Puducherry to start new Under Graduate course viz. four year Integrated B.Ed Programme (i) B.Sc.B.Ed (Mathematics), (ii) Ba.B.Ed (English), (iii) B.Sc.B.Ed (Comp.Sci) and for the additional intake of 50 students in the existing B.Ed course from the aca. Eyar 2016-17 subject to obtaining recognition of the course by NCTE:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Senthil College of Education, Puducherry falls under the jurisdiction of Pondicherry University.</i> 2. <i>Pondicherry University only will conduct the examination for four year Integrated B.Ed course and the existing B.Ed programme.</i> <p><i>This NOC was issued only for the purpose of producing the same to NCTE and does not imply grant of affiliation by the University which would be considered only on fulfilment of affiliation procedure and affiliation conditions of the University including existence of</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>qualified faculty and infrastructure as per UGC/NCTE/University norms.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 295th meeting held on 28th-30th November and 01st December 2015 considered the documents submitted by the institution and decided to issue SCN.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>The SRC in its 300th meeting held on 29th -30th January, 2016 decided as follows: <i>“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”.</i></p> <p>Government Pondicherry University vide letter No 018891/CS(Edn.I)/E11/2015 Puduchery dated 27.11.2015 issued NOC to Senthil College of Education Puducherry for Starting BA.B.Ed and B.Sc B.Ed (two units of Four year Integrated Course) with intake of 50 students each.</p> <p>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;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>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.</p> <p>The SRC in its 305th meeting held on 25th & 26th February, 2016 considered the VT report and other relevant documents and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate built up area 2. CD is working 3. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Before issuance of show cause notice, the institution submitted its written representation on 01.03.2016.</p> <p>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;</p>
--	--	--

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3. That being so, the two new applications-B.Sc;B.Ed and B.Ed-AI-are not maintainable.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The SRC in its 317th meeting held on 27th & 28th July, 2016 considered the show cause notice reply and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Before issuance of letter to the institution, the institution submitted written representation on 05.08.2016.</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their contentions about the built-up-area requirements are not correct. 2. They need 2000 (for D.El.Ed-2 units) + 2000 (for B.Ed-2 units) +500 (for B.Sc B.Ed-1 unit)+500 (for B.Ed-A.I-1 unit) 3. They have only 3772 sq.mtrs. This will suffice only for D.El.Ed(2 units) +B.Ed (1 unit) or vice versa. 4. There is no scope for any new course. The existing courses themselves have to be the preuned. 5. Issue SCN accordingly <p>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;</p> <p><i>"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</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p>would come forward as detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.El.Ed., from the academic year 2012-13 onwards. We have not admitted any student in D.El.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. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. B.Sc., B.Ed., (Maths)) – 1 unit 2. B.Sc., B.Ed., (Computer Science) – 1 unit 3. B.A., B.Ed., (English) – 1 unit <p>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.”</p> <p>The SRC in its 325th meeting held on 19th to 20th December, 2016 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The request for B.Ed-AI (1 unit) withdrawal is accepted. 2. Refund FDRs, if any. 3. Close the case. 4. They have also reported that they would be separately submitting, withdrawal letter for D.El.Ed (2 units). When it is received, we can issue a formal order about withdrawal. 5. After action in the 2 cases described above, we can process the applications for the 3 courses-BA B.Ed (1 unit), B.Sc.B.Ed (2 units). <p>As per the decision of the SRC, Recognition withdrawal order was issued to the institution on 13.01.2017 for SRCAPP2466/B.Ed-AI course for 1 unit.</p> <p>The institution has submitted representation on 30.01.2017 stating as under:-</p> <p>“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</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are in receipt of the order No.F.No.SRO/NCTE/SRCAPP2466/B.Ed-AI/PO/2016-17/91061, dt 13.01.2017 communicating the decision of your office to accept our proposal of withdrawal of B.Ed AI (1 unit).
--	--	---

		<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Copy of the recognition order of NCTE, Bangalore. b) Copy of the recognition order available in the website of http://srcncte.in/granted%20&20withdrawn.htm c) Copy of recently downloaded print cut of our website. d) Original NOC from the principal, DIET, Puducherry. e) Resolution of the society for the Closure of the Programme. f) Statement about the reason for the closure and completion of the programme are available in the certificate issued by the principal, DiET, Puducherry. g) Proof of settlement of all claims of faculty/staff (Declaration countersigned by principal, DIET, Puducherry. h) Copy of Pan card Society which has been running the Senthil Teacher Training Institute. <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. B.Sc, B.Ed (Maths)- 1 Unit. 2. BSc, B.Ed (Computer sciene) – 1 unit. 3. B.A, B.Ed (English) – 1 unit. <p>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.</p> <p>5. The original order granted NOC by the Government of Puducherry and Pondicherry University have already been submitted to your office.</p> <p>6. Our college has been inspected twice by two different V.T teams.</p> <p>7. Our college is accredited by NAAC with 'B' Grade.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th to 07th February, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
--	--	--

	<p>formalities have been complied with. The request is accepted. Issue withdrawal of recognition order.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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 :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) <p>Based on website information, the institution has submitted a representation in respect of the decision of 330th meeting of SRC which is as under :-</p> <p>"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.</p> <p>As per the minutes cited (5) above, the points No.7 and 8 are reproduced below for ready reference.</p> <p>Point No.7, according to the NCTE(HQ) clarification received now, no TEI can be given more that 2 units of B.Ed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The above decision needs reconsideration on the following grounds;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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),</p>
--	--

		<p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Noted2. 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. <p>In view of the above, an e-mail was sent to NCTE-Hqrs seeking clarification in the matter on 21.02.2017.</p> <p>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 :-</p> <p><i>"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."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February to 3 March, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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:-<table><tr><td>(i)</td><td>B.Ed.(2 units)</td><td rowspan="2">}</td><td rowspan="2">2000 sq.mts. (required)</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>to continue.....</td></tr><tr><td>(ii)</td><td>D.El.Ed.(2 units)</td><td rowspan="2">}</td><td rowspan="2">2000 sq.mts. (saved)</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>to stand withdrawn as already ordered.....</td></tr></table>	(i)	B.Ed.(2 units)	}	2000 sq.mts. (required)		to continue.....	(ii)	D.El.Ed.(2 units)	}	2000 sq.mts. (saved)		to stand withdrawn as already ordered.....
(i)	B.Ed.(2 units)	}	2000 sq.mts. (required)											
	to continue.....													
(ii)	D.El.Ed.(2 units)	}	2000 sq.mts. (saved)											
	to stand withdrawn as already ordered.....													

		<p>(iii) B.Ed.-AI(1 unit)..... 500 sq.mts. (saved)</p> <p>(iv) B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit)..... 1500 sq.mts. (New) (required)</p> <p>(v) B.Sc.B.Ed.-AI(1 unit)... 500 sq.mts. (New) (required)</p> <p>(vi) B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit)..... 1500 sq.mts. (New) (required)</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>5.1 B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit) will require 1500 sq.mts.</p> <p>5.2 B.Sc.B.Ed.-A.I.(1 unit) will require 500 sq.mts.</p> <p>5.3 B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit) will require 1500 sq.mts.</p> <p>5.4 In other words, there will be a shortfall of 1000 sq.mts.</p> <p>6. Let them see this corrected position; understand the mismatch of built-up areas and make their choice of courses.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>The SRC in its 333rd meeting held on 24th March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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). 3. Built-up area available is adequate. 4. Issue LOI for B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units). <p>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.</p> <p>The LOI reply was placed before SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st to 2nd May, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their LOI reply is seen. 2. The Faculty list is examined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.
--	--	--

		<p>3. FDRs have been given.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>5. Issue SCN accordingly.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The institution has submitted again SCN reply on 07.06.2017. The SCN reply was placed before SRC in its 343rd meeting held on 01st to 02nd August 2017, considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The case now relates only to B.Ed.(2 units) Existing and B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units) New. 2. We will process the new application for B.Sc.B.Ed. in general. No subject specification will be indicated. As stated in the NCTE Regulations, it is for the affiliating University to decide how many students will be allocated for which subjects. As directed by the NCTE(HQ), we will confine our processing to the B.Ed. part of B.Sc.B.Ed. 3. That being so, whether the University issues NOC for B.Sc. B.Ed. in general or B.Sc. B.Ed. subject wise is not of our concern. That is a matter to be settled between the University and the applicant. 4.1 The Faculty list is to be approved by the University before our recognition. The list submitted by the applicant, with the approval of the University, will be taken by us to be in the context (and part) of the applicant's case under consideration. 4.2 To be specific, the approved Faculty list submitted in this case will have to be for B.Sc.B.Ed. Even if the endorsement reads as 'approved for B.Ed.'. 5.1 Faculty list for B.Sc.B.Ed.: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) They have a total of 17. (ii) The list is approved by the University. (iii) In Perspectives Group, 4 are required whereas they have only 3. One Asst. Prof. from Pedagogy of Social Science can be shifted to fill up this gap. (iv) In the Pedagogy group, For 'Maths' as against 3 required, only 2 are there. One Asst. Prof. (Maths-Pedagogy) is required. 5.2 Faculty list for B.Ed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The list available is very old. Many members would have even superannuated. (ii) Latest approved list is required. 6. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 09.08.2017.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>The institution submitted its written representation on 16.08.2017 along with Pondicherry University letter dated 07.08.2017 the institution has submitted again its written representation on 21.09.2017.</p> <p>The same was placed before SRC in its 346th meeting held on 24th to 25th October, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The representation of the college is seen. The difficulty posed by the stand taken by the University is noted. 5. We have to clarify the issues, the legal position thereof, and the sequence of actions to be taken. 6. Let us write to the University as follows; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The legal position is that the Faculty list has to be approved before the NCTE accords Recognition to a programme. (ii) There should be no problem for the University to approve the Faculty list before affiliation' because under law, the University shall grant affiliation once a programme is granted recognition by NCTE. (iii) The LOI clearly states that the programme in reference. If an Institution is given recognition for B.Ed., the Faculty approved for it cannot be confused with the Faculty requirements of another programme of BSc.B.Ed for which LOI is issued to the same institution. 4. The 'excess' FDRs collected in this case may be refunded. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of the SRC, a letter was sent to the Registrar, Pondicherry University on 07.11.2017.</p> <p>A letter dated 10.11.2017 received by this office on 14.11.2017 from the Secretary, Senthil College of Education regarding Correction in LOI for B.Sc. B.ed and stating as under:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"I am enclosing a copy of the letter cited (2) above and to state that the copy of the letter has been sent to the following address:</i></p> <p><i>The Registrar, Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Karapakkam, Chennai – 6000297.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>In this connection I humbly submit to state that our Senthil College of Education, Pondicherry is affiliated to the Pondicherry University (Central University), Puducherry. Therefore the copy of the aforesaid LOI of our college would have been sent to the Registrar, Pondicherry University, R.V. Nagar, Kalapet, Puducherry 605 014.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Hence I request you sir to kindly arrange for sending the aforesaid LOI of our college directly to The Registrar, Pondicherry University, R. V Nagar, Kalapet, Puducherry 605 014 urgently so that the University may consider our request for approval to the staff already selected for B.Sc.B.Ed. programme.</i></p> <p>The institution has submitted written representation on 11.12.2017 and stating as under:-</p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>"I am to refer to the letter (2) cited above and to submit 2 sets of Staff lists (I List- 17 Staff & II List -15 staff) of our Senthil College of Education, Ponducherry which are approved by the Pondicherry University for the proposed B.Sc.B.Ed (2 units) and the existing B.Ed Programmes (2 units) in our college.</i></p> <p><i>I am also enclosing copies of the letter (3) & (4) cited above for favour of information and record. All the suggestion of the SRC, NCTE, Bangalore have been fulfilled.</i></p> <p><i>In the circumstance stated above, I request you Sir/Madam to kindly issue recognition order for starting B.Sc.B.Ed (2 units) Programme in our Senthil College of Education, Puducherry from the academic year 2018-19 onwards".</i></p> <p>The same was placed before SRC in its 351st meeting held on 28th to 29th December, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their LOI reply is examined. 2. Faculty list of 1+17 for Bsc.Bed (2 units) is in order. 3. Faculty list of 1 + 15 for B.Ed (2 units) has a short fall of 2 Assistant Professor- Mr. Kannan (MSc.Computer Science) is not qualified and Mr.R. Satish Chintala (M.Com) is also not qualified. 4. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Before issuance of the Show Cause Notice, based on the website information of the SRC decision, the institution submitted reply on 29.12.2017 along with documents.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their reply dated 29.12.2017 is seen. 2. Issue FR for BSc.B.Ed (2 units) w.e.f. 2018-19. 3. Remind for faculty list of B.Ed (2 units) APS02970
34	SRCAPP2589 M.Ed 1 Unit CSI College of Education, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala	<p>CSI College of Education, Plot No.422/4,419/6, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District-695502, Kerala.</p> <p>Society for Higher Education of SIUC Community of South Kerala Diocese of Church of South India, Plot No.419/6422/4, Cheruvarakonam Street, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluka, Thiruvananthapuram District - 695502 applied for grant of recognition to CSI College of Education, Plot No.422/4,419/6, Parassala Village and Post, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District-695502, Kerala for offering M.Ed course of 2 years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 28.05.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 03.06.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 05.06.2015, followed by Reminder- I on 12.06.2015 and Reminder- II on 30.11.2015.</p>

		<p>The Sub clause (7) of clause 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</p> <p>The SRC in its 295th meeting held on 28th - 30th November & 1st December, 2015 considered the matter, documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LUC is to be given. 2. BP approved by competent authority is to be given. 3. EC is to be given. 4. Society Registration certificate and Bye-laws to be given. 5. BCC should be produced during VT Inspection. 6. FDRs should be given later. 7. Cause Composite Inspection. 8. Ask VT to particularly check on the deficiencies and collect all documents. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a composite inspection was conducted on 04.02.2016 and the Visiting team report was received on 05.02.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 302nd meeting held on 09th to 11th February, 2016 considered the VT report and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Video. 2. BCC not in format. 3. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>As per decision of SRC, based on website information, the institution submitted show cause notice reply on 03.03.2016 and 21.04.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 311th meeting held on 25th April, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“The building is good. BCC has also been issued by competent authority But it is not in the prescribed format, Obtain a proper BCC and issue LOI for M.Ed (1 unit).”</i></p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, LOI and letter was issued to the institution on 25.04.2016 for submission of BCC.</p> <p>On 02.05.2016 and 04.06.2015 a letter was received by this office from the institution along with BCC and photocopy of the FDRs.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>The institution submitted reply to the LOI on 28.06.2016 and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>“As per our application for M.Ed Course (Application ID:SRCAPP2589) an inspection team visited our college during 1st week of February and based on the VT report a Letter of Intent Prior to grant of recognition was issued subject to the appointment of qualified staff. For staff appointment a selection committee was constituted with Dr.G.R.Santhosh Kumar, Chairman, Board of Studies (Education), University of Kerala as University Nominee, Rev.D. Jacob, Treasurer, CSI, south Kerala Diocese as Management Representative, Proof Jacob Mathew, Former Principal, Government college of Teacher Education, Thiruvananthapuram as Management Nominee and Dr. Sajith C Raj, Principal, CSI college of Education, Parassala as its member. Based on the interview held on 09th June, 2016, Two Professors, Two Associate Professors and Six Assistant Professors were selected and appointment as M.Ed Faculty. The list of selected candidates was forwarded to the University of Kerala along with their original documents for Approval/Endorsement which is being processed by the university.</i></p> <p><i>All the other conditions from 3 to 7 as specified in the letter of intent are being fulfilled by us and is ready for your kind perusal. It is known from the University that the Process of Approval/ Endorsement of staff appointment may take nearly 2 months.</i></p> <p><i>Since the institution has fulfilled all the requirements of LOI except approved staff list which is only due to the delay in processing by the university, I humbly request your good self to be kind enough to extend the date of submission of approved staff list at least to 2 months from this date enabling us to obtain recognition to start the course during the academic year 2017-2018.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 317th meeting held during 28th to 30th July, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty list is not approved. 2. Original FDRs – not given. 3. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly. <p>Based on the website information of the SRC decision, the institution has submitted a reply on 12.08.2016 along with original FDRs.</p> <p>As per decision of SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 29.09.2016, The Institution submitted Show cause notice reply on 19.10.2016.</p> <p>The SRC, in its 323rd meeting held on 16th to 18th November, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They want time to submit Faculty list. 2. Give time till 31.12.2016.
--	--	--

		<p>As per the decision of the SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 29.11.2016. The institution has submitted representation on 30.12.2016 and stating as under :-</p> <p>“The Faculty list for the proposed M.Ed course in CSI College of Education, Parasala was submitted to the University of Kerala and was placed in the sub-committee of the syndicate which usually meets prior to the Syndicate meeting. Two defects were noticed by the sub- committee and both of them were rectified by the college immediately. The revised faculty list will be placed in the next syndicate meeting for final approval. A letter from the Registrar of the University of Kerala in this regard is enclosed. As we have already rectified all the other defects noticed by NCTE, I request your good self to be kind enough to extend the time limit for the submission of approved faculty list so that we could get the recognition from NCTE for the M.Ed course for the academic year 2017-18”.</p> <p>The SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th to 07th February, 2017 considered the matter and decide as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have given them enough time to give the faculty list. 2. We cannot wait indefinitely. 3. Reject the application. 4. Return FDRs, if any. 5. Close the file. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, Rejection order was issued to the institution on 17.02.2017.</p> <p>Aggrieved by the rejection order of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE Hqrs and the Appellate Authority vide No. F.No.89-277/E-1894/2017 Appeal/12th Meeting-2017 dated 10.08.2017 received by this office on 29.08.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>“.....Appeal Committee noted that a Letter of Intent (LOI) dated 25.04.2016 was issued to appellant institution inter alia requiring the appellant institution to submit list of faculty duly approved by the affiliating body. Appeal Committee further noted in response to a Show cause Notice (SCN) dated 29.09.2016, the appellant made a written request to SRC vide its letter dated 18.10.2016 and 28.12.2016 to extend the time limit for submission of approved faculty list. SRC considered the request made by appellant institute vide its letter dated 18.10.16 and extended the time limit for submission of the list upto 31.12.2016. The request made by appellant vide its letter dated 28.12.2016 was not taken cognigence of for granting further extension on the ground that enough time has already been given.</i></p> <p><i>AND WHEREAS during the course of appeal presentation on 30.06.2017, appellant appraised the Appeal Committee that the University of Kerala has approved the list of faculty on 12.04.2017. Appeal committee therefore, decided to remand back the case to</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>SRC for consideration of the list of faculty which appellant institution should submit to SRC within 15 days of the issue of Appeal orders.</i></p> <p><i>AND WHEREAS after perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, Appeal committee concluded to remand back the case to SRC, Bangalore with a request to consider the faculty list which the appellant institution should submit within 15 days of the issue of Appeal orders.</i></p> <p><i>NOW THEREFORE the council hereby remands back the case of CSI college of Education, Parassala, Cheruvakonam, Neyyattinkara, Kerala to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 345th meeting held on 21st to 22nd September, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided to Process.</p> <p>The application and faculty list submitted by the institution was processed and placed before SRC in its 346th meeting held on 24th to 25th October, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We issued LOI on 25.04.2016 for M.Ed (1 unit) 2. They have given the reply only now. 3. Faculty list is approved. One Faculty member, Prof and HOD (Psy.) Dr. Ida Nancy has only 54% in P.G. (Psy) degree. She is, therefore, not qualified. 4. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>As per the decision of the SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 31.10.2017. The institution has submitted reply to the SCN on 17.11.2017.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Their reply, citing the UGC ordinance on the point, is seen. 2.Their contention is accepted. 3.1. FDRs have not been given. 3.2. Issue FR for M.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2018-19 after collecting the FDRs in order. 4. Issue SCN accordingly.
35	<p>APS02406 B.Ed 2 Units Sharana Basaveshwar a College of Education, Gulbarga, Karnataka</p>	<p>Sharana Basaveshwara College of Education, Brahmpur, Gulbarga-585103, Karnataka.</p> <p>Sharana Basaveshwara Vidya Vardhaka Sangha, Gulbarga District, Karnataka had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to Sharana Basaveshwara College of Education, Brahmpur, Gulbarga-585103, Karnataka for Secondary(B.Ed) Course of one year duration from the academic session 2005-06 with an annual intake of 100 students and was granted recognition on 21.12.2005.</p> <p>On 28.01.2015, the institution has submitted an affidavit for offering B.Ed course with</p>

		<p>an intake of 100 students. The revised order was issued to the institution on 16.05.2015 with an intake of 100 students (two basic units of 50 each). The institution has submitted revised order reply on 21.07.2016.</p> <p>A letter is received by this office on 26.10.2017, 02.11.2017 and 09.11.2017 is as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“With respect to the above subject our estimated institute got permission to successfully commence and carry the Sharanbasav University, Kalaburagi from the Government and also from NCTE (National Council For Teacher Education) APSO code is APS0 No. 2406 under Gulbarga University, Kalaburagi and under the Government of Karnataka Act of 78, 2012 Bangalore dated 08.02.2013 and regarding this issue we have sent two time letter’s to concerned department National Council For the Teacher Education O/C Ref no. 34065 dated 20.09.2017, O/C Ref no 41627/17 dated 26.10.2017 and O/C Refno. 43815/17 dated 02.11.2017 and there is no response from the Concerned department.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">As we have received B.Ed admission notification from the Karnataka. So, I kindly request you to look into the matter and resolve the issue as early as possible and permit me for the academic year admission to our university.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">An approval letter of Under Secretary to Government, Higher Education Department(Universities-2) dated 29.07.2017 is submitted as documentary proof.</p> <p>The SRC in its 349th meeting held during 15th – 16th December, 2017, considered the request of the institution and gave instruction to RD as:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “Very badly presented. 2. The transfer from Gulbarga University to Sharanabasava University is more urgent than the RPR0 issue. 3. What has the Gulbarga University to say? Are they agreeable to this shift? Is it warranted by the Jurisdiction of new Private University? 4. Who has ordered the transfer is there a State Government notification about the affiliation? 5. Let us settle this transfer issue first in the next meeting on 21.12.2017. The RPRo issue can be taken up thereafter. 6. Put up accordingly on 21.12.2017. ” <p>Accordingly, an e-mail was addressed to the institution on 19.12.2017 requesting to give clarification on transfer of University issue.</p> <p>On 20.12.2017, an e-mail from the institution was received by this office is as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“As above your reply we are sending clarification of your following questions.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Kindly find the attachment copy of NOC by the Gulbarga University and also to Sharanabasava University Affiliation.”</p> <p>The SRC in its 350th meeting held during 21st – 22nd December, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Principal of the college has sent a reply forwarding a letter (in kannada) given by the Gulbarga University (Purportedly) expressing their No Objection to the proposed transfer. 2. We should also have the consent of the new private University (i.e, the Sharana Basaveswara Univesity) to affiliate this college. 3. We have to be sure that the new University is not a Unitary University that can not áffiliate’ Colleges. In any case, normally such new Private Univ.s have a 5-year moratorium on affiliation of (other) Colleges. 4.1. Let us refer the matter to the Karnataka Higher Education Council for advice. 4.2. Write about both the colleges. <p>Note:-</p> <p>In the request letter of the institution dated 09.11.2017, the name of the university is mentioned as “Sharanbasav University”. But it is wrongly typed as “Sharanabasaveshwara University” in the agenda 350th meeting of SRC.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The case is reconsidered. 2. In view of the G.O. issued by the Dept of Higher Education of the State Government., we need not write to the Higher Education Council. 3. They have pointed out a spelling mistake in our order. Accordingly, change the name of the University to Sharanabasav University. 4. Issue a letter formally approving the shift from Gulbarga University to Sharanabasav University.
36	<p>APS01558 D.El.Ed 1 Unit RSV College of Education, Haveri, Karnataka</p>	<p>RSV College of Education, (Sri Swamy Vivekananada D.Ed College), c/o Ranebennur Taluka Education Society, Ranebennur-581115, Haveri District, Karnataka.</p> <p>Miranda Education Society, Bangalore, Karnataka had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE for grant of recognition to RSV College of Education, (Sri Swamy Vivekananada D.Ed College), c/o Ranebennur Taluka Education Society, Ranebennur-581115, Haveri District, Karnataka for Elementary(D.Ed) Course of two and half years duration from the academic session 2004-05 with an annual intake of 50 students and was granted recognition on 23.12.2004 with a condition to shift own premises/ building within three years from the date of recognition (in case the institution is started in rented premises).</p>

	<p>The institution had submitted annual proposal for shifting of premises on 18.10.2007 along with Rs. 40,000/- vide Receipt No. 13380 dated 25.10.2007 towards inspection fee for shifting of premises.</p> <p>On 27.07.2009, the institution had submitted a letter along with documents regarding shifting the institution to the permanent building.</p> <p>A letter was issued to the institution on 02.03.2011 to convey that the inspection for shifting of premises under Section 17 of NCTE Act will be carried out 28th March – 01st April, 2011.</p> <p>The inspection was carried out on 29.03.2011. The inspection report had been received along with VCD on 01.04.2011.</p> <p>The SRC in its 205th meeting held on 18th – 19th May 2011 considered written representation of the institution and decided to issue Show Cause Notice.</p> <p>Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 15.06.2011. The institution submitted its written representations on 14.07.2011 and 29.07.2011.</p> <p>The SRC in its 210th meeting held on 22nd – 23rd August, 2011 considered the reply of the institution, VT Report and all the relevant documentary evidences and decided to serve Final Show Cause Notice under Section 17 of NCTE Act.</p> <p>Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 13.10.2011. The reply of the institution was received on 11.11.2011.</p> <p>The SRC in its 215th meeting held on 12th – 13th December, 2011 considered the VT Report of the institution, VCD and other related documents, clarification from the institution vide letter dated 11.11.2011 and decided to continue recognition accorded to RSV College of Education(Sri Swamy Vivekananda D.Ed College) c/o Ranebennur Taluka Education Society, Ranebennur-581115, Haveri District, Karnataka for conducting D.Ed course. Continued recognition order was issued on 14.02.2012.</p> <p>The institution has submitted a request letter for closure on 07.06.2017 is as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Sub:- Permission to withdraw of recognition order for R.S.V. College of Education [D.Ed.] [Code: APS01558].</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“With reference to the above cited subject, I would like to bring to your kind notice that we are closing our R.S.V College of Education [D.Ed. – Sri Swamy Vivekananada College of Education Ranibennuru]. Due to lack of students and no more students allotted by the centralized admission cell from the academic year 2013-14. Therefore, we are requested to kindly withdraw our college from the academic year 2016-17 vide recognition order F.No.APS01558-D.Ed./KA/2011-12/37436 dated 14.02.2012 sanctioned by the Regional Director, NCTE, SRC, Bangalore.”</p> <p>The institution has submitted following documents:-</p>
--	---

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A letter of Declaration from General Secretary, Miranda Education Society. 2. Online application for closure 3. Resolution Copy 4. No Due Certificate from the Staff 5. Photocopy of FDR's of Rs 300000 and Rs. 500000 <p>The SRC in its 349th meeting held during 15th – 16th December, 2017 considered the request of the institution for closure and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "NOC of SCERT not given. Ask them to give. 2. All other formalities have been completed." <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 27.12.2017.</p> <p>On 14.11.2017 and 20.12.2017, the institution has submitted the following documents:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NOC from D.S.E.R.T, Bangalore. 2. A letter from Under Secretary to government, primary & secondary Education Department (General) dated 08.11.2017. 3. Original FDR's of Rs 300000 and Rs. 500000 4. Resolution copy 5. No Due Certificate from the Staff <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have completed all the formalities. 2. Their request for permission to close is accepted. Issue the permission w.e.f. 2017-18. 3. Withdraw recognition for D.El.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2017-18. 4. Return FDRs, if any. 5. Close the file.
37	APS00005 B.Ed 2 Units Sri Vidyodaya College of Education for Women, Tirupathi, Andhra Pradesh	<p>Sri Vidyodaya College of Education for Women, 2-2-232, Brundavan Road, Tirupathi – 517507, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Sri Vidyodaya College of Education for Women, 2-2-232, Brundavan Road, Tirupathi – 517507, Andhra Pradesh had applied for grant of recognition to B.Ed course of one year duration from the academic session 2002 – 2003 to the Southern Regional Committee on 08.09.2000.</p> <p>The institution was refused recognition vide this office order dated 30.07.2003. Aggrieved by the refusal order of SRC, the institution filed an appeal before the appellate authority.</p> <p>Further no action is seen in the file.</p>

		<p>The institution submitted two requests on 27.09.2013 and 09.01.2014 with a request to return the fixed deposit receipt of Rs. 5 lakhs submitted to this office on 08.12.2010.</p> <p>On 07.08.2014, a fax is received by this office regarding the appellate authority order reversing the rejection order of SRC dated 30th July, 2003.</p> <p>The appellate authority order F.No.89-133/2003/Appeal dated 17.12.2003 is as under :-</p> <p><i>“Smt.C.Brinda Prasad, President & Correspondent, Sri. Vidyodaya College of Education for Women, A.P. presented the case of the appellant institution on the 21st October, 2003. In the appeal as well as during the personal presentation it has been submitted that the Commissioner of Higher Education, Hyderabad has approved 1 + 7 teaching staff on the 21st February ,2003 and the Registrar of affiliating University .(ASP University ,Tirupati has counter signed the same ; at the time of visit of experts, two faculty members could not be present due to personal reasons but they are ready to join; two instructor for art and two instructors for IT literacy were appointed long back and they are still available : four educational journals are being subscribed, spacious five storied building located in the midst of an educational institution for women has been taken on lease for a period of five years. It laboratory is equipped with 10 personal computers and other accessories and a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs has been deposited for 60 months on the 19th March , 2001.</i></p> <p><i>The Council noted that the institution was visited for the second time on 2nd June 2003. The visiting team observed that while necessary infrastructural/instructional facilities have been created, the building has asbestos roof. Further, the Committee noted that the institute has submitted list of teachers verified by the University and the State Government.</i></p> <p><i>The Council, after careful consideration of all aspects of the matter has come to the conclusion that appeal of the institution deserves to be accepted. The order of SRC</i></p> <p><i>reversed and recognition granted to Sri Vidyodaya College of Education for Women, Tirupathi for B.Ed course with an intake of 100 seats from 2003-04 subject to the condition that before commencing the course, the institution shall submit a final list of Principal and teachers including instructors duly countersigned by the University authorities, as the earlier list was approved way back in February, 2003.</i></p> <p><i>The Council reverses the order appealed against.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 273rd Meeting held during 30th September, 2014 and 1st October, 2014 considered the matter, fax dated 07.08.2014 received in this office regarding the appellate authority order reversing the rejection order of SRC dated 30th July, 2003. The Committee decided and advised to SRC as under;</p>
--	--	---

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Write to NCTE (H'qrs) pointing out these facts and the attendant violation of the Act and seek advice.</i> 2. <i>Ask for copies of the documents to rebuild the case."</i> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed to the Member Secretary seeking advice in the matter and documents of the institution to rebuild the case.</p> <p>Reply from the appellate authority is awaited.</p> <p>In the meantime on 19.12.2014, as per the direction from NCTE (HQ), a letter seeking consent on the willingness of the institution for considering their application as per Regulations 2014 was sent to the institution. As the institution had not submitted the affidavit another reminder letter was sent to the institution on 18.02.2015.</p> <p>On 28.02.2015, the institution has submitted an affidavit expressing willingness for the application to be processed as per Regulations, 2014.</p> <p>The following are observed from the file:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>A fax (appellate authority order dated 17.12.2003)was received by this office on 07.08.2014 and there is no number/from address displayed to trace out who has sent the fax.</i> 2. <i>The appellate authority order dated 17.12.2003 was not available in the file and as per records, the order was not brought to the notice of SRC till date. It was also observed from the file that the institution has not submitted approved staff list as per the condition specified in the appellate authority dated 17.12.2003</i> 3. <i>As per the decision of 273rd Meeting of SRC, a letter is addressed to the Member Secretary, NCTE-HQ seeking advise in the matter. Reply from the appellate authority is awaited.</i> 4. <i>On 28.02.2015, the institution has submitted an affidavit on Rs. 100/- stamp paper expressing adherence to Regulations, 2014.</i> <p>The SRC in its 284th meeting held on 09th – 10th April, 2015 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remind NCTE (HQ) for clarifying the position. 2. Withhold issue of RPRO until such clarification. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was addressed t oNCTE-Hqrs on 27.05.2015 with a request for clarification on the appellate authority order dated 17.12.2003, received by</p>
--	--	---

		<p>this office on 07.08.2014 by fax.</p> <p>On 24.09.2015, the institution has submitted a written request for issuance of revised order which is as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“We have been running our institution from 2003-2004 till date 2014-15 sincerely and without any issues. Inspite of that and submitting the affidavit and the necessary papers, we have not received orders for the academic year 2015-16. Therefore, we request you to kindly issue the orders as soon as possible.”</i></p> <p>Another letter was addressed to NCTE – Hqrs on 05.10.2015 seeking clarification on the appellate authority order dated 17.12.2003, received by this office on 07.08.2014.</p> <p>Reply has not been received from NCTE – Hqrs so far.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its representation on 08.08.2017 along with the approved photocopy of Faculty List.</p> <p>The SRC in its 345th meeting held on 21st & 22nd September, 2017 considered the matter and Committee decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No records are available about this institution. Only some stray pieces of information are available. 2.1 We can not treat this as a new case because the last date for application is over. 2.2 We can only treat this as a RPRO case. But, for that there should be information about its continued functioning. 2.3 Let us ask the S.V. Univ whether they have any affiliation details about this institution. 3 Simultaneously, ask the Institution / Society to submit all relevant documents to consider the possibility of this being processed as a RPRO case. 4 There is reference about ‘asbestos’ roofing. Find out whether it is still there. 5.1 As regards infrastructure, the information is that they have a big building on a 5 year lease. What is the position now? 5.2 No documents about title are there. Obtain. 6 Put up in Nov.17 <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution and S.V. University on 12.10.2017.</p> <p>The University has not submitted any reply till date.</p> <p>Now, the institution submitted its reply along with documents on 14.11.2017 and stating as under;</p>
--	--	--

".....we had sought your good office to secure the RPRO and the updating of your website indicating our recognition.

Subsequently, we had come down to your office personally and submitted our plea. And your Section Officer, who was appraised of the matter, advised us to get the following details for further process.

1. Information about continued functioning.

- a. We have enclosed the various letters between us and the NCTE indicating continued functioning.*
- b. We have also enclosed mark sheets issued to the students who cleared the exams conducted by the S.V. University.*

2. Asbestos Roofing to be avoided, Infrastructure details.

- a. We have enclosed photographs showing the current facilities of the building including Classrooms, Seminar Room, Office Room, Library, Science Labs and other such facilities.*
- b. The photographs also indicate the roofing which is RCC.*

3. Title of the land.

- a. We enclosed copies of the lease deed by which we have title to the land, from the Sri Swamy Hathiramee Mutt.*

Please note that we have continued operating with the affiliation of the Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupathi since 2003, after having obtained recognition from NCTE, New Delhi, vide order dated 17.12.2003, SF.No.89-133/2003/Appeal with an approved annual intake of 100 students for the B.Ed course.

As you are well aware we have been a complaint institution adhering to all regulations of the NCTE and till date have not received an adverse order or mention on any account.

As already communicated to your office we have not been in a position to take in students for the academic year 2015-16 as well as 2016-17, as we have not received any orders from your side.

We once again request you to clarify the misconception prevalent that the 2014-15 batch is not within the recognized list of institution and also issue fresh RPRO.

Your co operation is critical for our students who have passed out with mark sheets and provisional certificates. These candidates have secured jobs and their career would be put to jeopardy if the recognition were not forthcoming

		<p><i>from your office.”</i></p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The title is now established. They have produced a government order 2008 extending the original lease of 10 years by 20 years. This meets the NCTE requirements. 2.The roofing is certified to be ‘RCC’ and not ‘asbestos’. 3.1. The only issue that remains is about continuous running till 2015. Remind the University to certify continued functioning of the college up to 2015 w.r.t. the affiliation and enrolment information. 3.2. Remind NCTE (HQ) to verify from their Appeals Register and advise us whether their case was allowed in appeal on 17.12.2003. 4. Issue letters accordingly.
38	<p>SRCAPP14617 B.Ed BSV B.Ed College, Chittoor, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>BSV B.Ed College, Plot/Khasara No. 11-2B, Plot No. 1, Street No. 1, Punganuruvandlapalle Village, Basinikonda Post Office, Madanapalle Taluk and City, Chittoor District-517325, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Rajiv Gandhi Foundation, Plot No. 1, 1st Street, Basinikonda Post Office, Punganuruvandlapalle Village, Madanapalle Taluk and City, Chittoor District-517325, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to BSV B.Ed College, Plot/Khasara No. 11-2B, Plot No. 1, Street No. 1, Punganuruvandlapalle Village, Basinikonda Post Office, Madanapalle Taluk and City, Chittoor District-517325, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.Ed course of Two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 29/06/2015. The institution has submitted hard copy of the application on 06/07/2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 09/07/2015 Followed by recommendation 08/10/2015 and reminder II on 14/12/2015.</p> <p>The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p><i>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decide that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 296th meeting held during 15th to 17th December, 2015 considered the matter documents submitted by the institution for D.El.Ed-AI (SRCAPP14605) & B.Ed (SRCAPP14617) courses along with hard copy of application and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Society Registration Certificate to be submitted 2. Building Completion Certificate and Encumbrance Certificate to be

		<p>submitted</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. English version is to be submitted for all documents, affidavit is to be submitted 4. Blue print of the Building Plan to be submitted 5. Built up area inadequate for two programmes 6. Original Fixed Deposit Receipts to be submitted 7. Ask VT to obtain relevant Land and Building documents 8. Cause Composite inspection 9. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a composite inspection was conducted on 25.01.2016 and VT report along with documents and CD received on 28.01.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 300th meeting held on 29th – 31st January, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue LOI for B.Ed (1 Unit) 2. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished . 3. Only if these are given on or before 3.3.16 can 4. issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue LOI for D.El.Ed –AI (1 Unit) 2. For D.El.Ed (basic unit) and D.El.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 5. issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible <p>As per decision of SRC, LOI was sent on 02.02.2016.</p> <p>Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 15.06.2016 a copy of joint surprise check proceedings along with list of colleges received by CBI, Bangalore regarding a surprise check was conducted at the office. • As directed by CBI, the original file was taken from this office. <p>The Committee considered noted the matter.</p>
39	<p>SRCAPP2016 30083 BA.B.Ed BSc.B.Ed 2Units Vallalar College of</p>	<p>Vallalar College of Education, Karthikeyapuram Village, Melpatti Road, Gudiyattam Taluk, Karthikeyapuram City, Vellore District-635806, Tamilnadu</p> <p>Sri Meenachi Margabanthu Trust, Kamatchiamman pet , Pavala Street, Gudiyattam Taluk & City, Vellore District-632602,Tamilnadu applied for grant of recognition to Vallalar College of Education, Karthikeyapuram Village, Melpatti Road, Gudiyattam Taluk, Karthikeyapuram City, Vellore District-635806,Tamilnadu for offering</p>

Education, Vellore, Tamil Nadu	<p>B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 14.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Tamilnadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application was scrutinized online along with hard copy and place before SRC in its 326th Meeting held during 4th and 5th January, 2017. The Committee decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.A. NOC is given. 1.B. They have D.El.Ed.(1 unit) & B.Ed.(2 units). They want B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. (2 units). 2. They should clarify whether they want B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit) + B.Sc. B.Ed.(1 unit) or B.A.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Sc. B.Ed.(2 units). 3. Land document is in order. 4. LUC is in order. 5. EC is in order. 6. BP is in order. 7. BCC is in order. Built-up area available (2640 sq.mts.) is inadequate w.r.t. requirement(4500 sq.mts). 8. NOC is given. 9. Cause composite inspection for D.El.Ed.(1 unit), B.Ed.(2 units) and B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed.(2 units). 10. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents. <p>As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations, 2014, the decision of the Committee to cause composite inspection was communicated to the V.T. Members through on-line mode on 12.01.2017.</p> <p>The V.T. Members have given their acceptance for inspection of institution during 23.01.2017 to 12.02.2017.</p> <p>On 19.01.2017, an e-mail has been received from Shri.M.Ramalingam,Chairman, Vallalar College of Education, Gudiyattam, Vellore District, Tamilnadu requesting for postponement of inspection as under :-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“ I submit that as per the decision of the Trust, we request the honorable Regional Director to postpone the visit of the visiting team to our institution as we have yet to fulfill the instructional and facilities and due to same unavoidable circumstance . Kindly cooperate and do the needful.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 328th meeting held on 31st January, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p>
--------------------------------------	---

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The request for postponement is accepted. But, since VT inspection has already been ordered, if the VT has moved, the institution must bear the cost of another VT inspection. 2. It should also be noted that, by this postponement, the institution runs the risk of losing the opportunity for getting an FR w.e.f. 2017-18. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 07.12.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 07.12.2017.</p> <p>Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 07.02.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection. 2. Issue SCN.
40	<p>SRCAPP2016 30078 M.Ed 1 Unit Annai Madha College of Education, Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>Annai Madha College of Education, Edaicheruvai Village, Trichy Main Road, Thittagudi Taluk, Edaicheruvai City, Cuddalore District-606106, Tamil Nadu</p> <p>Christhuva Madhakalvi Kalacharam Samuga Niruvanam, Thittagudi Village, No.50 West Street, Thittagudi Taluk & City, Cuddalore District-606106, Tamil Nadu had applied for grant of recognition to Annai Madha College of Education, Edaicheruvai Village, Trichy Main Road, Thittagudi Taluk, Edaicheruvai City, Cuddalore District-606106, Tamil Nadu for offering M.Ed course of two years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 31.05.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 15.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for M.Ed course in the State of Tamilnadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application has been scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and documents. The matter was placed before SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th to 06th January, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have B.Ed.(2 units). They want M.Ed.(1 unit). 2. NAAC certificate not given. 3. NOC is given. 4. Land document – one page is missing. Sy.Nos. are same as for B.Ed. Land area is 0.60 acre. 5. LUC is given. 6. EC – latest EC required.

	<p>7. BP is in order.</p> <p>8. BCC in original is required. Built-up area is adequate for B.Ed. (2 units) and M.Ed. (1 unit).</p> <p>9. Cause composite inspection for B.Ed.(2 units) and M.Ed.(1 unit).</p> <p>10. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, and as per Regulations, 2014 inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode. VT Members names were generated through online VT module for inspection during the period on 08.02.2017 to 28.02.2017.</p> <p>On 27, 28.02.2017 and 03.03.2017 an e-mail was received from the VT members Mr. Dr. Devinder Pratap Asija & Dr. Brijesh Kumar Pandey and stating as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“I, Dr. Brijesh Kumar Pandey VT ID. 409132 and Devinder Pratap Asija VT ID. 409043 have been appointed as the Visiting Team Member for Annai Madha College of Education, Edaicheruvai-Tehsil-Tamil Nadu ID:SRCAPP201630078. But I would like to your notice that since the day I received this below email i.e. 31st Jan, 2017. We have been constantly trying to contact the concerned person Mob: 94434339586. The mobile is either switched off or out of coverage area or the concerned person does not pick up the phone. Thus the phone goes unanswered. When the phone got connected he did not fix up the date of inspection on the pretext that he is not feeling well and is in the Hospital. In view of the above it is very humbly requested that NCTE may very kindly co-ordinate and fix up the date of inspection”.</p> <p>As per directed an email sent to the institution on 15.03.2017 and stating as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Para 7(7) of the notification of NCTE, 2014 specifically mentions that inspection shall not be subject to the consent of the institution, rather the decision of the SRC to cause inspection shall be communication to the institute with the direction that the inspection shall be caused within stipulated time.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>In view of the above you are requested to co-operate with the VT member to Cause inspection within the stipulated time else it will be viewed seriously.</i></p> <p>The institution submitted reply through email on 22.03.2017. The SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th & 31st March, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“The request for extension of time for VT inspection is accepted subject to the clear understanding that they will lose the opportunity of being considered for FR w.e.f. 2017-18 because of the 2nd May (extended) time – limit prescribed by the Supreme Court.”</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 05.04.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 05.04.2017.</p> <p>Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 05.04.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection. 2. Issue SCN.
--	---

41	<p>SRCAPP2016 30127 BA.B.Ed BSc.B.Ed GET Integrated College of Education, Vellore, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>G E T Integrated College of Education, Plot No.30/1 & 30/2, V S Puram Village, Paradarami P.O, Vellore City & District-632603,Tamilnadu</p> <p>Guruvappa Naidu Educational Trust, V S Puram Village, Paradarami P.O, Vellore City & District-632603,Tamilnadu had applied for grant of recognition to G E T Integrated College of Education, Plot No.30/1 & 30/2, V S Puram Village, Paradarami P.O, Vellore City & District-632603,Tamilnadu for offering B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 14.06.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 14.06.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 22.06.2016 followed by Reminder I on 01.10.2016 and Reminder II on 02.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations was over. Hence, the application was processed. As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Tamilnadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and the same was placed before the Committee.</p> <p>The SRC in its 326th meeting held during 4th to 5th January, 2017 considered the scrutiny of the application and decided as under :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title is in order. 2. LUC is in order. 3. EC refers to other Sy.Nos. also. There is a reference to 5 year lease which has been replaced by Gift Deed. 4. BP is in order. 5.1. BCC is in order. Built-up area is adequate for B.Ed.(2 units), M.Ed.(1 unit) and B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. (2 units) 5.2. They should clarify whether they want B.A. B.Ed. (1 unit) + B.Sc. B.Ed.(1 unit) or B.A. B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Sc. B.Ed.(2 units) 6. Fee paid. 7. Cause composite inspection. <p>As per the decision of 326th meeting of SRC and as per Regulations, 2014, the decision of the Committee to cause composite inspection of the institution was communicated to the V.T. Members through on-line mode on 13.01.2017.</p> <p>On 15.01.2017, one of the VT Members has given acceptance for the visit of the institution. The visit schedule was during 24.01.2017 to 13.02.2017.</p> <p>On 22.01.2017, the other VT Member has rejected the visit of the institution.</p> <p>On 23.01.2017, a letter dated 20.01.2017 was received by this office from G.E.T. College of Education seeking postponement of inspection which is as under :-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“ We request the honorable Regional Director to kindly postpone the visit of the visiting team to our institution as we have yet to fulfill the instructional and</i></p>
----	---	---

		<p><i>infrastructural facilities due to some unavoidable circumstances. Kindly cooperate and do the needful."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 328th meeting held on 321st January, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The request for postponement is accepted. But, since VT inspection has already been ordered, if the VT has moved, the institution must bear the cost of another VT inspection. 2. It should also be noted that, by this postponement, the institution runs the risk of losing the opportunity for getting an FR w.e.f. 2017-18. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 07.12.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 07.12.2017.</p> <p>Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 07.02.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection. 2. Issue SCN.
42	<p>SRCAPP2016 30198 BA.B.Ed 1Unit BSc.B.Ed 1Unit Arasu College of Education for Women, Karur, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>Arasu College of Education for Women, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu</p> <p>Dr. P. N. Educational and Charitable Trust, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Arasu College of Education for Women, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu for offering B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2016.The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.08.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.10.2016 and Reminder II on 11.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations was over. Hence, the application was processed. As per public notice for 2017-18, there was no ban for B.A.B.Ed.,B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and the same was placed before the Committee.</p> <p>The SRC in its 327th Meeting held during 19th & 20th January, 2017 considered the scrutiny of the application and decided as under :-</p>

1. NOC received
2. Title is there. Land area is adequate.
3. They have to clarify whether they want B.A.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Sc. B.Ed.(2 units) or B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit) + B.Sc. B.Ed.(1 unit).
4. LUC is there.
5. EC is not in original. Shows land is mortgaged.
6. BP is approved. Built-up area shown 2543.19 sq.mts.
7. BCC is approved. Built-up area shown is 2017.02 sq.mts. It is not clear whether the building is common for the existing B.Ed.(2 units)-APS08517 and this application for B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed.(SRCAPP2016). If it is the same, then, the built-up area is inadequate. They must clarify the position.
8. FDRs – not given.
9. Issue SCN accordingly.

Accordingly, a Show Cause Notice was sent to the institution through online mode on 20.01.2017.

The institution submitted reply to the Show Cause Notice along with relevant documents in hard copy on 27.01.2017 and in online on 30.01.2017.

SRC in its 329th meeting held during 6th to 7th February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:-

1. In this case, a lot of work remains to be completed.
2. This case is not at all likely to materialize for consideration or issue of FR before 3.3.2017.
3. The agenda note is also incomplete. Their reply to our SCN is also not complete.
4. Put up with a complete agenda note in April.

The institution has submitted additional documents as Show Cause Notice Reply in hard copy on 07.02.2016.

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

1. These two cases have many things in common, same location, same Sy. No.s, same type of building, the 2 units linked in a L-shaped structure, same existing courses (i.e B.Ed , 2 units), same proposed courses (i.e B.A.B.Ed 1 unit + B.Sc.B.Ed – 1 unit).
2. But, EC (dt 24.1.17) is differently shown. For one the no is 104 and for the other it is 105. Why should there be two different ECs for the same Sy.No.s, it is not clear.
3. There is one EC covering Sy.No. 867 for which there are no documents. The relevance of this EC needs to be explained.
4. The built-up area required in each case is 5000 sq.mtrs (2000 sq.mtrs for B.Ed 2 units + 1500 sq.mtrs for B.A.B.Ed – 1 unit + 1500 sq.mtrs for B.Sc.B.Ed – 1 unit)
5. The built-up area shown to be available for Arasu College is only 2543.19 sq.mtrs which is very inadequate. They cannot make up by additional construction because the Building Plan permits only 2543.19 sq.mtrs of built-up

	<p>area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The built-up-area shown to be available for the Ponkalamman case is 4560.21 sq. mtrs (2543.19 +2017.02 sq. mtrs). This is inadequate against the requirement of 5000 sq. mtrs . But, it is not clear wherefrom the extra 2017.02 sq. mtrs come since both the building units are shown to be of the same size and shape. In this case also, they cannot make up for the deficit through addl. construction because the Building Plan permits only 2543.19 sq. mtrs of built up area. 7. According to NCTE(HQ), we cannot give more than 2 units of B.Ed to a TEI since that is the stipulation in the Regulations. Both these TEIs already have 2 units of B.Ed. Whether the 2 units of B.Ed in the 2 integrated courses proposed will add to the already existing 2 units or not is not clear. We may have to seek clarification from NCTE(HQ). 8. All in all, these two cases are too complex. Various legal and documentary issues need to be resolved. We will have to get a composite inspection organized with a detailed list of points for verification by VT. 9. Cause such a composite inspection. 10. Since the computer programme reportedly is not amenable for issuing such guidelines to VT members, RD is advised to write separate letter to the VT members giving guidelines strictly according to the minute of the SRC. <p>As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations 2014 inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode. VT Members names were generated through On-line VT module for inspection during the period on 12.03.2017 to 01.04.2017, as per the decision of SRC 330th meeting decision was informed to the VT members through on-line on 02.03.2017.</p> <p>Now, the institution has submitted a letter through on-line on 27.03.2017, stated as under:-</p> <p><i>“...With reference cited above the subject we would like to submit the following grounds.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Our institution is granted to conduct the examination center of Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamilnadu and also Tamil University, Thanjavur, Tamilnadu.</i> <i>2. The academic Examination work for theory as well as practical is going on in our center (College).</i> <p><i>We request you to kindly postpone the inspection formalities until the examination is over, May 2017.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th & 31st March, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The request for extension of time for VT inspection is accepted subject to the clear understanding that they will lose the opportunity of being considered for FR
--	--

		<p>w.e.f. 2017-18 because of the 2nd May (extended) time – limit prescribed by the Supreme Court.”</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 05.04.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 05.04.2017.</p> <p>Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 05.04.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection. 2. Issue SCN.
43	<p>SRCAPP2016 30201 BA.B.Ed 1Unit BSc.B.Ed 1Unit Ponkaliasma n College of Education, Karur, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>Ponkaliasma College of Education, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Dr. P. N. Educational and Charitable Trust, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Ponkaliasma College of Education, Panduthakaranpudur Village, Karur-Salem Bye pass, Manmangalam Taluk, Karur City & District-639006, Tamil Nadu for offering B.A.B.Ed., B.Sc.B.Ed integrated course of four years duration for the academic year 2017-18 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2016. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.07.2016.</p> <p>As per Regulations, a letter to State Government for recommendation was sent on 27.08.2016 followed by Reminder I on 12.10.2016 and Reminder II on 11.11.2016. The period of 90 days as per Regulations is over. Hence, the application was processed.</p> <p>As per public notice for 2017-18, there is no ban for B.A.B.Ed., B.Sc.B.Ed course in the State of Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>As per the direction, the application of the institution along with the hard copy was scrutinized online along with hard copy of the application and placed before SRC in its 327th meeting held on 19th to 20th January, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NOC is given. 2. Title is there. 3. They have to clarify whether they want B.A.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.Sc.B.Ed.(2 units) or B.A.B.Ed.(1 unit)+B.Sc.B.Ed.(1 unit). 4. LUC is there. 5. EC is not in original. Shows land is mortgaged. 6. BP is approved. Built-up area shown is 2543.13 sq.mts. 7. BCC is approved. Built-up area shown in 2017.02 sq.mts. It is not clear whether the building is common for the existing B.Ed.(2 units) –APS08517- and this

	<p>case(SRCAPP30201). If it is the same, then, the built-up area is inadequate. They must clarify the position.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. FDRs not given. 9. Issue Show Cause Notice accordingly. 10. They have 4 cases –APS08517, APS08321, SRCAPP30198 and SRCAPP30201. We must see all together. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution through online mode on 20.01.2017.</p> <p>The institution has submitted a reply in online mode and in hard copy on 10.02.2017. The institution has not uploaded supporting documents in online.</p> <p>The SRC in its 330th meeting held on 12th & 13th February, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>These two cases have many things in common, same location, same Sy. No.s, same type of building, the 2 units linked in a L-shaped structure, same existing courses (i.e B.Ed, 2 units), same proposed courses (i.e B.A.B.Ed 1 unit + B.Sc.B.Ed – 1 unit).</i> 2.1 <i>But, EC (dt 24.1.17) is differently shown. For one the no is 104 and for the other it is 105. Why should there be two different ECs for the same Sy.No.s, it is not clear.</i> 2.2. <i>There is one EC covering Sy.No. 867 for which there are no documents . The relevance of this EC needs to be explained.</i> 3. <i>The built-up area required in each case is 5000 sq.mtrs (2000 sq.mtrs for B.Ed 2 units + 1500 sq.mtrs for B.A.B.Ed – 1 unit + 1500 sq.mtrs for B.Sc.B.Ed – 1 unit)</i> 4.1 <i>The built-up area shown to be available for Arasu College is only 2543.19 sq.mtrs which is very inadequate. They cannot make up by additional construction because the Building Plan permits only 2543.19 sq.mtrs of built-up area.</i> 4.2 <i>The built-up-area shown to be available for the Ponkalamman case is 4560.21 sq. mtrs (2543.19 +2017.02 sq. mtrs). This is inadequate against the requirement of 5000 sq. mtrs. But, it is not clear wherefrom the extra 2017.02 sq. mtrs come since both the building units are shown to be of the same size and shape. In this case also, they cannot make up for the deficit through addl. construction because the Building Plan permits only 2543.19 sq. mtrs of built up area.</i> 5. <i>According to NCTE(HQ), we cannot give more than 2 units of B.Ed to a TEI since that is the stipulation in the Regulations. Both these TEIs already have 2 units of B.Ed. Whether the 2 units of B.Ed in the 2 integrated courses proposed will add to the already existing 2 units or not is not clear. We may have to seek clarification form NCTE(HQ).</i> 6.1 <i>All in all, these two cases are too complex. Various legal and documentary issues need to be resolved. We will have to get a composite inspection organized with a detailed list of points for verification by VT.</i> 6.2 <i>Cause such a composite inspection.</i>
--	---

		<p>7. <i>Since the computer programme reportedly is not amenable for issuing such guidelines to VT members, RD is advised to write separate letter to the VT members giving guidelines strictly according to the minute of the SRC</i></p> <p>As per the decision of SRC and as per Regulations 2014 inspection of the institution was scheduled through online mode. VT Members names were generated through On-line VT module for inspection during the period on 12.03.2017 to 01.04.2017, as per the decision of SRC 330th meeting decision was informed to the VT members through on-line on 02.03.2017.</p> <p>A letter dated 27.03.2017, an email was received by this office on 27.03.2017 from P.K. College of Education and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>"With reference cited above the subject we would like to submit the following grounds.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Our institution is granted to conduct the examination centre of Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu and also Tamil University, Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu.</i> <i>2. The academic examination work for theory as well as practical is going on in our center (college).</i> <i>3. We request you to kindly postpone the inspection formalities until the examination is over, may 2017".</i> <p>The institution request was placed before the SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th to 31st March, 2017. The committee observed the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The request for extension of time for VT inspection is accepted subject to the clear understanding that they will lose the opportunity of being considered for FR w.e.f. 2017-18 because of the 2nd May (extended) time –limit prescribed by the Supreme Court. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, the inspection of the institution was cancelled through online mode on 05.04.2017. The same was communicated through online to the institution and VT members on 05.04.2017.</p> <p>Further, the institution has not submitted any reply or request.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The College has not responded after our communication dated 05.04.2017 about postponement of the VT Inspection. 2. Issue SCN.
44	<p>SRCAPP1487 1</p> <p>SRCAPP1498 0 BA.BEd BSc.BEd B.Ed.M.Ed</p>	<p>Excel College of Education, No. 368/8, Pallakkapa Street, Pallakkapalayam Village, Sankari West Post, Thiruchengode Taluk, Komarapalayam City, Namakkal District-637303, Tamil Nadu.</p> <p>Sri Rengaswamy Educational Trust, No. 368/8, NH-47, Salem Main Road, Pallakkapalayam Village, Sankari Post, Tiruchengode Taluk, Sankari Post, Tiruchengode Taluk, Komarapalayam City, Namakkal District-637303, Tamil Nadu applied for grant of recognition to Excel College of Education, No. 368/8, Pallakkapa Street,</p>

<p>Excel College of Education, Namakkal, Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>Pallakkapalayam Village, Sankari West Post, Thiruchengode Taluk, Komarapalayam City, Namakkal District-637303, Tamil Nadu for offering B.A B.Sc course for four years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 29.06.2015. The institution submitted the hard copy of the application on 13.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A copy of application was sent to State Government for recommendation on 21.07.2015.</p> <p>Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution is deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The institution has not submitted No Objection Certificate. 2. The applicant not signed all pages of the hard copy of on-line application submitted by the institution. <p>The SRC in its 292nd meeting held on 29th-30th September, 2015 on careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other related documents, the regional committee decided to issue show cause notice for rejection of the application on the following ground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non submission of NOC issued by the affiliating body along with application. <p>As per the decision of SRC, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 21.10.2015. The institution has submitted its reply on 07.11.2015.</p> <p>The SRC in its 295th meeting held on 28th -30th November & 1st December, 2015 considered the matter and it has decided that 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.</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, rejection order was issued to the institution on 30.01.2016.</p> <p>Aggrieved by the rejection of SRC, the institution preferred an appeal to NCTE Hqrs and the appellate authority order dated 04.07.2016 has stated as follows:</p>
---	--

		<p><i>“.....AND WHEREAS Sh. G. Ranganathan, Executive Officer, Excel College of Education, Kamarapalayam, Namakkal, Tamilnadu presented the case of the appellant institution on 27.05.2016. In the appeal and during personal presentation it was submitted that “we are accredited by NAAC with “A” grade. We applied for new course online on 30.06.2015 and paid the fees of Rs. 1,50,000/- vide reference given above hardcopy of our application ID SRCAPP14871 was submitted at the office of the Regional Director , SRC on 13.07.2015 by receipt no.1054129. SRC/NCTE issued a Show cause notice referred above for not submitting NOC from the affiliating body. We wrote a letter to the TNTEU, the affiliating body requesting to issue NOC vide reference.</i></p> <p><i>AND WHEREAS appeal committee noted that appellant institution was issued a show cause notice (SCN) dated 21.10.2015 on grounds of non-submission of NOC issued by affiliating body along with application. The appellant in its reply dated 31.10.2015 expressed its inability to get NOC from concerned authority. Other submissions made by the appellant in the appeal memoranda are not of much relevance. Appeal Committee, therefore, decided to confirm the refusal order dated 30.01.2016 issued by SRC Bangalore for the reason stated therein.</i></p> <p><i>AND WHEREAS after perusal of the Memoranda of appeal, affidavit, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, appeal committee concluded to confirm the refusal order dated 30.01.2016 issued by SRC Bangalore for the reason stated therein.</i></p> <p><i>NOW THEREFORE, the council hereby confirms the order appealed against”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 317th meeting held on 28th & 29th July considered the Appellate Authority order and noted.</p> <p>A court notice has been received by this office on 17.04.2017 in W.P.No. 31596 of 2016 dated 06.04.2017 in the Hon'ble High Court of Madras and stating as under;</p> <p><i>“..... this Court directs the first respondent university to consider and pass orders on the petitioner-college’s application dated 22.06.2015 on its own merits and in accordance with law, within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. With the above direction, this writ petition stands disposed of. Costs made easy.”</i></p> <p>SRC NCTE is a Performa party, the direction of court is for first respondent (i.e TNTEU) Chennai</p> <p>The same was placed before SRC in its 336th meeting held on 19th to 20th April, 2017 and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Court order is seen. 2. Their direction is to TNTEU.
--	--	--

		<p>3. There is nothing for us at this stage to act upon. 4. Put up when further developments take place.</p> <p>The institution submitted its written representation dated 20.04.2017 received by this office on 25.04.2017 and 22.05.2017 along documents and NOC dated 17.04.2017 with the request to conduct inspection by visiting Team and approval to start the course from 2017-18.</p> <p>Already brief of the case was sent to the advocate on 05.11.2016. Counter Affidavit also filed in the case on 01.05.2017, 12.05.2017, 18.05.2017 and 30.08.2017 by Advocate, Shri Arjun Harkauli in W.P. © No. 1510 of 2017 in the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. A letter was addressed to the Advocate, Shri Arjun Harkauli in W.P. © No. 1510 of 2017 in the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi filed by the institution along with duly signed one set of Counter Affidavit on 22.05.2017. Final order was not received by this office. An email received from Advocate, Shri. Arjun Harkaulin, Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"With respect to the above captioned matter, it maybe noted that subsequent to the filing of this petition, Excel College of Education has obtained an NOC from the Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University. The same was submitted before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi on 30.10.2017. Kindly see if it will be viable to give recognition to Excel College for the Current session, in view of the fact that all other formalities have been completed by them to your satisfaction.</i></p> <p><i>The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has also observed and asked NCTE to give a considered response in terms of the order passed in the case titled "Rambha College of Education Vs NCTE and Anr." bearing W.P. © No. 3231/2016.</i> <i>You may consider writing to excel College of Education asking them to directly submit the NOC to you.</i> <i>The next date of hearing in the matter is 15.12.2017. Kindly treat this as most urgent and immediate.</i> Another E-mail was received from Advocate, Shri. Arjun Harkaulin on 14.11.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"Kindly have reference to my attached email and the attachments mentioned therein. Kindly call for NOC from Excell College and let me Know the decision of the SRC in the matter for onward communication to the Court. Kindly also let me Know the reasons for refusal if the decision is a refusal if the decision is a refusal or incase recognition is granted by when the same will be issued to Excell College. Kindly treat this as urgent and immediate."</i></p> <p>The same was placed before SRC in its 347th meeting held on 16th to 17th November, 2017 and the Committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <p>1.1 The position relating to NOC was evolving during 2016-17. There were relaxations of the date-line for submission issued by the NCTE (HQ) Even</p>
--	--	---

	<p>SRC adopted some more relaxation for the academic year 2016-17.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2 In the SRC's perception it was unfair to adopt a very rigid approach on this issue. Since the system was still evolving and neither the applicants nor the affiliating bodies were fully clear about the system. Many affiliating bodies were reluctant to give NOC and thereby delayed the process in Tamil Nadu, for example, the TNTEU did not issue even a single NOC. The SRCs took note of this difficulty, and in the larger public interest, decided to give a relaxation further to the relaxations issued by the NCTE (HQ). But, such a further relaxation was only for the academic year 2016-17. 2.1 In this case, the two applications were for 2016-17. In the applications for B.Ed-M.Ed (3 year programme), no NOC was given. In the application for BAB.Ed/BSc.B.Ed, the NOC was given on 24.04.2017. 2.2 NOC given for 2017-18 can not be considered for 2016-17. In any case, the applications was rejected much earlier. 2.3 For B.Ed-M.Ed, the college wants the SRC to issue the NOC. This is not possible ; only the affiliating body has to give the NOC. 3. In any case, there is no point in pursuing this matter now because the last date prescribed by the Supreme Court for issue of FR for 2017-18 is long over. That being so, it is not possible to do anything in this case "on its own merits and in accordance with law". 4. Inform the applicant accordingly. 5. Keep the lawyer informed. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 17.11.2017 with a copy marked to our advocate. Our Advocate, Hon'ble High Court of Delhi submitted letter through e-mail received by this office on 08.12.2017 and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>"This is in reference to the letter no. F. No. SRO/ NCTE/ SRCAPP14871/ B.A.B.Ed.B.Sc.B.Ed/TN/2017-18/SRCAPP14980/B.Ed.,M.Ed/95650 dated 17.11.2017 addressed to the Vice Chairman, Excel College of Education and W.P.(C) No. 1510/2017 titled "Excel College of education vs NCTE & Anr" pending adjudication before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.</i></p> <p><i>With respect to the above captioned matter/letter, I seek the following clarifications:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Is the NOC issued to Excel College of Education specific to any academic year, if not, now that Excel College of Education has an NOC can they, subject to the examination of documents by NCTE, be granted recognition for the academic year 2018-19?</i> 2. <i>If recognition is granted to Excel College of Education for the academic year 2018-2019, can the NCTE consider granting recognition to Excel College based on the existing file or is there a requirement for fresh filing of documents?</i> 3. <i>Kindly clarify the meaning of "FR" used in point no.3 [last date prescribed by supreme Court for issue of FR] in the above mentioned letter".</i> <p>The SRC in its 349th meeting held on 15th & 16th December, 2017 the committee considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The answers to the lawyers questions are as follows:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Yes; NOC specifically cites academic year 2017-18.
--	--

	<p>(ii) In this case, however, the NOC now produced cannot be acted upon because the application of the college already stands rejected.</p> <p>(iii) 'FR' means 'formal recognition'.</p> <p>As per the decision of the SRC, A letter was addressed to the Advocate Shri.Arjun Harkauli on 15.12.2017.</p> <p>A letter dated 27.12.2017 received by this office on 01.01.2018 from the Excel College of Education regarding Submission of the order of the Honourable High Court of Delhi-requested for the conduct of inspection by VT and for the approval to start the course from 2018-19 and stating as under:-</p> <p><i>With regard to aforesaid subject this is to inform that our institution has challenged the refusal ordered sated 30.01.2016 issued by SRC Bangalore, and appeal order dated 04.07.2016 passed by NCTE Delhi whereby recognition for conducting B.A.,B.Ed./BSc.,B.Ed & B.Ed-M.Ed course has been declined. After hearing the matter Hon'ble court was pleased to pass the following order of which the operating portion is as under:-</i></p> <p><i>"The counter affidavit of respondents have been perused. They have negated the prayer sought by the petitioner. This court is not inclined to grant any relief to the petitioner except to the effect that the petitioner on moving an appropriate application before the competent authority may seek recognition for the aforementioned course for the next academic session which would be for the year 2018-19. The application could be filed by the petitioner would shall be disposed of by respondent /Southern Regional Committee expeditiously."</i></p> <p><i>Hence, as per the aforesaid direction of the Hon'ble court I am enclosing here with NOC issued by the affiliating university along with order of Hon'ble Delhi court with this application.</i></p> <p><i>You are requested to process my application for BA.,B.Ed/B.Sc.,B.Ed & B.Ed-M.Ed course for the academic session 2018-19.</i></p> <p>Court order dated 15.12.2017 from the High court of Delhi as under:-</p> <p><i>"Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 04.07.2016 passed by the National Council for Teacher Education/respondent No. 1 wherein his application seeking recognition for conducting B.Ed/M.Ed Course had been declined. This was for the reason that the petitioner had no No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the concerned authority. The Regional Committee had also rejected the plea of the petitioner for the aforementioned reasons and this was endorsed by the appellate body / respondent No. 1. The relevant extract of the order of respondent No. 1 reads herein under as:-</i></p> <p><i>And whereas Appeal Committee noted that appellant institution was issued as Show Cause Notice (SCN) dated 21.10.2015 on grounds of non-submission of N.O.C issued by affiliating body along with application. The appellant in its reply dated 31.10.2015 expressed its inability to get NOC from concerned authority. Other submissions made by the appellant in the Appeal Memoranda are not of much relevance. Appeal Committee, therefore, decided to confirm the refusal order dated 30.01.2016 issued by S.R.C Bangalore for the reason stated therein.</i></p> <p><i>Admittedly, the petitioner has obtained his NOC on 19.04.2017 which is much</i></p>
--	--

		<p>after the order dated 04.07.2016.</p> <p><i>The counter affidavit of respondents have been perused. They have negated the prayer sought by the petitioner. This court is not inclined to grant any relief to the petitioner except to the effect that the petitioner on moving an appropriate application before the competent authority may seek recognition for the aforementioned course for the next academic session which would be for the year 2018-19. The application could be filed by the petitioner would shall be disposed of by respondent / Southern Regional Committee expeditiously.</i></p> <p><i>Judgment of National Council for Teacher Education and Anr vs Rambha College of Education; LPA No. 535/2017 will thus not apply to the facts of the present case.</i></p> <p><i>Petition disposed of in the above terms”.</i></p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Court order is noted. 2. The Court has observed, “....the petitioner on moving an appropriate application before the Competent authority may seek recognition for the afore noted course for the next academic session which would be for the year 2018-19. 3. “An appropriate application” in this case would be an application filed in response to a Notification issued by the NCTE inviting such applications. The letter dated 27.12.2017 from the college can not amount an “appropriate application in this context. 4. That being so, we can not process their case further . 5. Their request, therefore, not accepted. They can apply as and when NCTE (HQ) issues a Notification again inviting applications. 6. Return FDRs, if any. 7. Close the file
45	<p>SRCAPP1484 4 B.P.Ed 1 Unit Jonah College of Physical Education, Nalgonda, Telangana</p>	<p>Jonah College of Physical Education, Plot No. 978/A1/2, NH-65, Aitipamula Village & Post, Kattangoor Taluk, Nalgonda District-508205, Telangana</p> <p>Ahad Educational and Charitable Society, Plot No. G-6,52,59, Laxmi Avenue Apartments, Balajinagar Village, Nizampet Post, Qutubullapur Taluk, Rangareddy District-500090, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Jonah College of Physical Education, Plot No. 978/A1/2, NH-65, Aitipamula Village & Post, Kattangoor Taluk, Nalgonda District-508205, Telangana for offering B.P.Ed course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30/06/2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 06/07/2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of</p>

	<p>State Govt. was sent on 14/07/2015 followed by Reminder I on 14/11/2015. Reminder II on 17.12.2016</p> <p>The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 296th meeting held on 15th-16th December, 2015 considered the documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Blue print of building plan is not submitted.2. BCC & EC is not submitted.3. Original FDRs to be submitted4. Ask VT to obtain relevant Land and Building documents.5. Cause Composite Inspection. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 14.01.2016.</p> <p>The VT member has submitted a letter dated 03.02.2016 stating as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The Management also not Co-operative with V.T members and not submitted Questionnaire.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 301st meeting held on 05th-06th February, 2016 considered the matter and decided to issue Show Cause Notice for rejection.</p> <p>Before issuance of show cause notice the institution has submitted its reply on 13.02.2016 stating as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“I am herewith submitting that we have submitted our proposals for the establishment of a B.Ed and B.P.Ed course institutions in the name and style of Jonah College of Teacher Education (B.Ed) and Jonah College of Physical Education (B.P.Ed) from the academic year 2016-17.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Due to unavoidable circumstances the some works of construction of buildings is under process and it will be competed in soon, and in this connection we request you to kindly process our application for the forthcoming academic year.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Hence, I request you to madam, kindly consider and do favorable action in this regard.”</i></p>
--	---

	<p>The SRC in its 304th meeting held on 19th-20th February 2016 considered the matter and it has decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any postponement at this stage will push them to the bottom of the list which may expose them to the vulnerability of missing the 3rd March, 2016 date line. Ask them whether they still wish to press for the postponement. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 17.03.2016. The institution has submitted its reply on 24.03.2016 and stating as follows:</p> <p><i>"I am herewith submitting that we have submitted proposals for the establishment of B.Ed & B.P.Ed institutions in the name and style of Jonah College of Teacher Education and Jonah College of Physical Education. It is bring to your kind notice that madam, due to unfavorable circumstances; the construction of college buildings is still under process and will be completed by the last week of October 2016. We have invested a large amount for our proposed institutions and still not able to start the said courses for this 2016-17.</i></p> <p><i>In this connection, I request you to madam please consider the fact and constitute VT to inspect our institution in the month of November/December 2016.</i></p> <p><i>Hence I request you to madam, Kindly do favorable in this regard".</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 308th meeting held on 28th – 30th March, 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <p><i>"Request for more time to conduct of inspection is accepted subject to the understanding that if they do not complete all formalities by 2 May, 2016, then, they will lose the opportunity of Formal Recognition getting w.e.f. 2016-17."</i></p> <p>Accordingly, a letter to the institution conveying the decision of the SRC 308th meeting sent on 16.05.2015. The institution has not replied.</p> <p>The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th – 05th January, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This is a case of visiting team inspection being held up because of the institution's unwillingness. We had given them time till May 2016. They have not cared to respond even till now. We cannot indefinitely hold up such cases. Let us go ahead with the Visiting team inspection. Cause composite inspection. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents. <p>Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members through online on 21.01.2017. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 08.02.2017</p>
--	--

		<p>and the VT report along with CD received on 13.02.2017.</p> <p>The documents were processed and placed before the SRC in its 331st meeting held on 22nd February, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grant of recognition retrospectively is not within SRC's powers. FR for 2016-17, in any case, cannot be given after 2.5.16 because of the Supreme Court order. 2. NOC normally should specify the year. But, even in its absence, with reference to its date of issue, we have been working out the year of commencement of recognition. In all the cases cited by the College in their online reply to our SCN. The NOCs do have the dates of issue. <p>As per the website information, the institution has submitted representation on 27.02.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February – 03rd March, 2017 considered the matter and decided under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subsequent addition of date to the NOC cannot be accepted. 2. The reply to Show Cause Notice is rejected. 3. Reject the application. 4. Return FDRs, if any. 5. Close the file. <p>Accordingly, Rejection order was issued to the institution on 06.03.2017.</p> <p>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.89-195/2017 Appeal/7th Meeting-2017 dated: 01.05.2017 received by this office on 02.05.2017 stated as follows:</p> <p><i>“...appeal committee noted that applicant had filed a Writ Petition No. 12247/12281 of 2017 Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad and the Hon'ble court vide dated 12.04.2017 had directed that Appellate Authority to dispose of the appeal within 2 weeks.</i></p> <p><i>Appeal Committee noted that impugned refusal order dated 06.03.2017 is on the ground that subsequent addition of date in the NOC cannot be accepted. Appeal Committee noted from the relevant regulatory file that NOC of affiliating body was submitted by the appellant institution along with printout of the application. By submitting NOC with the application, appellant has fulfilled the provision of clause 5(3) of NCTE Regulation, 2014. Subsequently when SRC noticed that NOC does not bear a date, a Show Cause Notice (SCN) was issued on this ground. Appellant rectified the deficiency by getting the date mentioned on the relevant document. There is no change in the NOC issued by affiliating body. Appeal Committee considers that there is no justification in refusing recognition on this ground. Appeal Committee is also aware that SRC of its own has reviewed its own decisions of refusing recognition on grounds of belated NOC</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>and Subsequently accepting the NOC which were issued much after the cut of date. Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 06.03.2017 and remands back the case for further processing of the application.</i></p> <p><i>On perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, Appeal Committee concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 06.03.2017, and remand back the case to SRC for further processing of the application.</i></p> <p><i>After perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to SRC for further processing of the application.</i></p> <p><i>The Council hereby remands back the case of Jonah College of Teacher Education (Ahad Educational), Aitipamula, Kattangoor, Nalgonda, Andhra Pradesh to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st – 03rd May, 2017 considered the matter and decided to "Process."</p> <p>On 16.05.2017, a court order received from the High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad, for the State of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh in W.P.Nos: 12247 and 12381 of 2017. The letter stated as under;</p> <p>COMMON ORDER:</p> <p><i>"these two writ petitions are being disposed of by this common order as they relate to challenge made to the order passed by the respondent on 06.03.2017 rejecting the request of the petitioners for grant of recognition to run B.Ed., and B.P.Ed., programmes as sought vide applications, dated 06.07.2015, submitted physically and through on-line, dated 30.06.2015.</i></p> <p><i>The only ground, as could be seen from the letter of rejection, is non-mentioning of the date and academic year in the 'No Objection Certificate' and the petitioners appear to have complied with all other conditions. But, the learned counsel for the respondent submits that since there is a provision for Appeal, the said lapse can be considered on the representation of the petitioners by the appellate authority.</i></p> <p><i>In view of the same, the writ petitions are disposed of giving liberty to the petitioners to file an Appeal as expeditiously as possible and after filing of the said Appeal, the same shall be disposed of by the appellate authority within two weeks therefrom in accordance with law.</i></p> <p>As per decision of SRC, application was processed and placed before SRC in its 339th meeting held on 22nd & 23rd May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p>
--	--	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The Appellate Authority has directed to accept the NOC as corrected by the issuing authority. Accordingly, it is accepted. 5. Title is clear. Land area is adequate. 6. LUC is in order. 7. EC is in order. 8. BP & BCC are in order. Built-up area is adequate. 9. FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @7+5 lakhs for each programme. 10. Issue LOI for B.P.Ed.(1 unit of 100). 11. It may be clarified to them that, after 2.5.17 time limit prescribed by the Supreme Court, it will not be possible for us to grant FR w.e.f. 2017-18. <p>As directed, a letter regarding clarification on FDR was sent to NCTE-Hqrs on 16.06.2017 and followed by reminder on 13.07.2017.</p> <p>The reply from NCTE-Hqrs not received till date.</p> <p>Accordingly, LOI was sent to the institution on 08.09.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No reply has been received to our LOI dated 08.09.2017. 2.1. Give further time till 31.03.2018. 2.2. Make it clear that if the reply, satisfying all the norms and standards, is not received before 28.02.2018 it will not be possible for us to consider their case for FR w.e.f. 2018-19 because of the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit of 3 March 2018.
46	SRCAPP1491 2 B.Ed 2 Units Jonah College of Teacher Education, Nalgonda, Telangana	<p>Jonah College of Teacher Education, Plot No. 978/A1/2, NH-65, Aitipamula Village & Post, Kattangoor Taluk, Nalgonda District-508205, Telangana</p> <p>Ahad Educational and Charitable Society, Plot No. G-6,52,59, Laxmi Avenue Apartments, Balajinagar Village, Nizampet Post, Qutubullapur Taluk, Rangareddy District-500090, Telangana applied for grant of recognition to Jonah College of Teacher Education, Plot No. 978/A1/2, NH-65, Aitipamula Village & Post, Kattangoor Taluk, Nalgonda District-508205, Telangana for offering B.Ed course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30/06/2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 06/07/2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of</p>

	<p>State Govt. was sent on 14/07/2015 followed by Reminder I 28/08/2015 and Reminder II on 21/10/2015.</p> <p>The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 293rd meeting held on 29th 31st October, 2015 considered the matter and it has decided that <i>“submit in the next meeting along with a note on the B.P.Ed case”</i></p> <p>As directed the matter was placed before SRC in its 296th meeting held on 15th-16th December, 2015 considered the documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Blue print of building plan is not submitted.2. BCC & EC is not submitted.3. Original FDRs to be submitted.4. Ask VT to obtain relevant Land and Building documents.5. Cause Composite Inspection. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 14.01.2016.</p> <p>The VT member has submitted a letter dated 03.02.2016 stating as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The Management also not Co-operative with V.T members and not submitted Questionnaire.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 301st meeting held on 05th-06th February, 2016 considered the matter and decided to issue Show Cause Notice for rejection.</p> <p>Before issuance of show cause notice the institution has submitted its reply on 13.02.2016 stating as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“I am herewith submitting that we have submitted our proposals for the establishment of a B.Ed and B.P.Ed course institutions in the name and style of Jonah College of Teacher Education (B.Ed) and Jonah College of Physical Education (B.P.Ed) from the academic year 2016-17.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Due to unavoidable circumstances the some works of construction of buildings is under process and it will be competed in soon, and in this connection we request you to kindly process our application for the forthcoming academic year.</i></p>
--	--

		<p><i>Hence, I request you to madam, kindly consider and do favorable action in this regard."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 304th meeting held on 19th-20th February 2016 considered the matter and it has decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any postponement at this stage will push them to the bottom of the list which may expose them to the vulnerability of missing the 3rd March, 2016 date line. Ask them whether they still wish to press for the postponement. <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the institution on 17.03.2016. The institution has submitted its reply on 24.03.2016 and stating as follows:</p> <p><i>"I am herewith submitting that we have submitted proposals for the establishment of B.Ed & B.P.Ed institutions in the name and style of Jonah College of Teacher Education and Jonah College of Physical Education. It is bring to your kind notice that madam, due to unfavorable circumstances; the construction of college buildings is still under process and will be completed by the last week of October 2016. We have invested a large amount for our proposed institutions and still not able to start the said courses for this 2016-17.</i></p> <p><i>In this connection, I request you to madam please consider the fact and constitute VT to inspect our institution in the month of November/December 2016.</i></p> <p><i>Hence I request you to madam, Kindly do favorable in this regard".</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 308th meeting held on 28th – 30th March, 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <p><i>"Request for more time to conduct of inspection is accepted subject to the understanding that if they do not complete all formalities by 2 May, 2016, then, they will lose the opportunity of Formal Recognition getting w.e.f. 2016-17."</i></p> <p>Accordingly, a letter to the institution conveying the decision of the SRC 308th meeting sent on 16.05.2015. The institution has not replied.</p> <p>The SRC in its 326th meeting held on 04th – 05th January, 2017 considered the matter and deiced as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This is a case of visiting team inspection being held up because of the institution's unwillingness. We had given them time till May 2016. They have not cared to respond even till now. We cannot indefinitely hold up such cases. Let us go ahead with the Visiting team inspection. Cause composite inspection. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents.
--	--	--

	<p>Accordingly, inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members through online on 21.01.2017. The inspection of the institution was conducted on 08.02.2017 and the VT report along with CD received on 13.02.2017.</p> <p>The documents were processed and placed before the SRC in its 331st meeting held on 22nd February, 2017. The Committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grant of recognition retrospectively is not within SRC's powers. FR for 2016-17, in any case, cannot be given after 2.5.16 because of the Supreme Court order. 2. NOC normally should specify the year. But, even in its absence, with reference to its date of issue, we have been working out the year of commencement of recognition. In all the cases cited by the College in their online reply to our SCN. The NOCs do have the dates of issue. <p>As per the website information, the institution has submitted representation on 27.02.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 332nd meeting held on 28th February – 03rd March, 2017 considered the matter and decided under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subsequent addition of date to the NOC cannot be accepted. 2. The reply to Show Cause Notice is rejected. 3. Reject the application. 4. Return FDRs, if any. 5. Close the file. <p>Accordingly, Rejection order was issued to the institution on 06.03.2017.</p> <p>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.89-193/2017 Appeal/7th Meeting-2017 dated: 01.05.2017 received by this office on 02.05.2017 stated as follows:</p> <p><i>“...appeal committee noted that applicant had filed a Writ Petition No. 12247/12281 of 2017 Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad and the Hon'ble court vide dated 12.04.2017 had directed that Appellate Authority to dispose of the appeal within 2 weeks.</i></p> <p><i>Appeal Committee noted that impugned refusal order dated 06.03.2017 is on the ground that subsequent addition of date in the NOC cannot be accepted. Appeal Committee noted from the relevant regulatory file that NOC of affiliating body was submitted by the appellant institution along with printout of the application. By submitting NOC with the application, appellant has fulfilled the provision of clause 5(3) of NCTE Regulation, 2014. Subsequently when SRC noticed that NOC does not bear a date, a Show Cause Notice (SCN) was issued on this ground. Appellant rectified the deficiency by getting the date mentioned on the</i></p>
--	--

	<p><i>relevant document. There is no change in the NOC issued by affiliating body. Appeal Committee considered that there is no justification in refusing recognition on grounds of belated NOC and subsequently accepting the NOC which were issued much after the cut of date. Appeal Committee decided to set aside the impugned order dated 06.03.2017 and remands back the case for further processing of the application.</i></p> <p><i>On perusal of the Memoranda of Appeal, affidavit, documents on record and oral arguments advanced during the hearing, Appeal Committee concluded to set aside the impugned order dated 06.03.2017, and remand back the case to SRC for further processing of the application.</i></p> <p><i>After perusal of the memorandum of appeal, affidavit, documents available on records and considering the oral arguments advanced during the hearing, the Committee concluded that the appeal deserves to be remanded to SRC for further processing of the application.</i></p> <p><i>The Council hereby remands back the case of Jonah College of Teacher Education (Ahad Educational), Aitipamula, Kattangoor, Nalgonda, Andhra Pradesh to the SRC, NCTE, for necessary action as indicated above."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st – 03rd May, 2017 considered the matter and decided to "Process."</p> <p>On 16.05.2017, a court order received from the High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad, for the State of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh in W.P.Nos: 12247 and 12381 of 2017. The letter stated as under;</p> <p>COMMON ORDER:</p> <p><i>"these two writ petitions are being disposed of by this common order as they relate to challenge made to the order passed by the respondent on 06.03.2017 rejecting the request of the petitioners for grant of recognition to run B.Ed., and B.P.Ed., programmes as sought vide applications, dated 06.07.2015, submitted physically and through on-line, dated 30.06.2015.</i></p> <p><i>The only ground, as could be seen from the letter of rejection, is non-mentioning of the date and academic year in the 'No Objection Certificate' and the petitioners appear to have complied with all other conditions. But, the learned counsel for the respondent submits that since there is a provision for Appeal, the said lapse can be considered on the representation of the petitioners by the appellate authority.</i></p> <p><i>In view of the same, the writ petitions are disposed of giving liberty to the petitioners to file an Appeal as expeditiously as possible and after filing of the said Appeal, the same shall be disposed of by the appellate authority within two weeks therefrom in accordance with law.</i></p>
--	--

		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>The writ petitions are accordingly disposed of. Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending in these writ petitions, shall stand closed."</i></p> <p>As per decision of SRC, application was processed and placed before SRC in its 339th meeting held on 22nd & 23rd May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Appellate Authority has directed to accept the NOC as corrected by the issuing authority. Accordingly, it is accepted. 2. Title is clear. Land area is adequate. 3. LUC is in order. 4. EC is in order. 5. BP & BCC are in order. Built-up area is adequate. 6. FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @7+5 lakhs for each programme. 7. Issue LOI for B.Ed.(2 units). 8. It may be clarified to them that, after 2.5.17 time limit prescribed by the Supreme Court, it will not be possible for us to grant FR w.e.f. 2017-18. <p>Accordingly, LOI was sent to the institution on 08.09.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.No reply has been received to our LOI dated 08.09.2017. 2.1. Give further time till 31.03.2018. 2.2. Make it clear that if the reply, satisfying all the norms and standards, is not received before 28.02.2018 it will not be possible for us to consider their case for FR w.e.f. 2018-19 because of the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit of 3 March 2018.
47	APS02913 APS04732 BSc.BEd BA.B.Ed Tagore Government College of Education, Andaman & Nicobar Islands	<p>The original files has been transferred from ERC to this office vide letter No. AN-S/E-1/96/855 dated 28.04.2003 pertaining to the institution (Tagore Govt. College of Education for B.Ed No: AN-S/E-1/96 and B.Sc.B.Ed No: AN-SO/N-1/2001). The institution was granted recognition by the ERC for Integrated course from the academic session 2002-2003.</p> <p>APS02913/B.Sc. B.Ed :</p> <p>Tagore Government College of Education, M.G.Road, Middle Point, Port Blair-744101, Andaman and Nicobar Islands.</p> <p>Tagore Government College of Education, M.G.Road, Middle Point, Port Blair -744101, Andaman & Nicobar Island had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE on 31.12.2005 for grant of recognition with an additional intake of 10</p>

		<p>for B.Sc.B.Ed (Mathematics) Integrated course of four years duration from the academic session 2004-05.</p> <p>A letter addressed to the Principal, Tagore Government College of Education, Andaman & Nicobar Islands with copy marked to Regional Director, NCTE, SRC Bangalore, from the Registrar, Pondicherry University, regarding grant of Provisional Affiliation to start Integrated courses of four years duration in B.Ed (English) and B.Sc.B.Ed (computer science) at Tagore Govt. College of Education, Port Blair, for the academic year 2003-2004 with the remarks in para 12 (i & ii) stating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The College should not have started the course without getting prior affiliation order from the University. ii) This Provisional Affiliation Order is valid only for this academic year 2003-2004. The College shall apply for renewal of affiliation six months prior to the commencement of the next academic year. <p>VT Inspection of the institution was conducted on 23.05.2005 and VT report was received by this office on 24.05.2005.</p> <p>The SRC in its 92nd meeting held during 26th – 27th May, 2005 considered the VT report and decided as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“to accord recognition to the additional intake of 10 students for B.Sc.B.Ed (Mathematics) Integrated course thus making a total of 20 for B.Sc.B.Ed from the from the academic session 2005-06.”</p> <p>Accordingly, Formal recognition order was issued to the institution on 08.07.2005 with an additional intake of 10 students thus making a total of 20 students.</p> <p>APS04732/B.A. B.Ed :</p> <p>Tagore Government College of Education, Port Blair, M.G.Road, Middle Point, Andaman & Nicobar Island-744101 had submitted an application to the Southern Regional Committee of NCTE on 27.12.2005 for grant of recognition for B.A.B.Ed Course of four years Integrated course duration from the academic session 2006-07.</p> <p>A letter was issued to the institution on 09.06.2006 to complete the deficiencies has been noticed in the application. The institution has submitted reply to this office on 17.07.2006. Accordingly VT was scheduled for inspection.</p> <p>Inspection of the institution was conducted on 12.08.2006. The SRC in its 117th meeting held during 13, 14 & 19th September, 2006 considered the VT report and decided to accord recognition to the additional intake of 10 students from the academic session 2006-07.</p> <p>On 27.09.2006, the institution has submitted a letter for rectification in the minutes of 117th meeting of SRC. Accordingly, the recognition order was issued to the institution on 06.10.2006.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The institution has submitted a letter with a request to increase the total annual intake from 30 to 40 students. Accordingly, the revised recognition order was issued to the institution with an intake of 40 students on 03.11.2006.</p> <p>The institution has submitted a letter with request for extension of Provisional affiliation for the B.Ed and B.Ed Integrated courses at Tagore Govt. College of Education on 01.10.2014.</p> <p>The SRC in its 274th meeting held during 30th – 31st October, 2014 considered the request of the institution and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Staff is not regular issue show cause notice.”</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 16.01.2015. The institution has submitted written representation on 10.02.2015.</p> <p>The SRC in its 283rd meeting held during 02nd – 03rd March, 2015 considered the written representation and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“We do not have the power to relax Regulations and give extra time to recruit faculty. Refer to NCTE (HQ) for advice since this pertains to Central Govt. Institution.”</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC, a letter was issued to the Hqrs, on 01.10.2015. On 13.03.2017, 10.04.2017 & 11.04.2017 a letters were received by this office from the institution with request to issue of recognition order as per the new Regulations of NCTE.</p> <p>The institution has submitted a letter to Registrar Pondicherry University and the same copy was received by this office on 17.04.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 337th meeting held during 25th – 26th April, 2017 considered a letter of the institution dated 17.04.2017 and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 “This case has been put up because of the reference to some SRC discussion on the subject in the 335th meeting. 2 Ordinarily, Regulators do not act on ‘endorsed’ communications. The person sending this letter, if at all, should have addressed the RD, SRO, with whatever request he had to make. 3 Be that as it may, three facts have to be stressed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. This matter was not on the agenda of the 335th meeting at all. ii. There was no discussion on the subject in the meeting. iii. No ‘assurance’ as claimed was given by anyone. 4 The letter in reference has apparently been prompted by a figment of the sender’s imagination. 5 No action is needed on this letter. File it without any further attention. 6 Inform the Pondicherry University concerned with a copy to the college in
--	--	--

		<p style="text-align: center;">Port Blair.”</p> <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to Pondicherry University on 27.04.2017.</p> <p>A letter dated 16.06.2017 is received by this office from the Principal, Tagore Government College of Education, Port Blair, with request to issue of revised Recognition orders as per NCTE regulations 2014 on 22.06.2017 . The SRC in its 345th meeting held during 21st – 22nd September, 2017 considered the request of the institution and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 In view of the clarification issued by the NCTE (HQ), recognition of the Institution / courses is cleared to have continued from 2005-06 for BSc.B.Ed (Maths) and from 2007-08 for BA.B.Ed. 1.2 This decision will also govern the BSc.B.Ed course started with approval of the Pondicherry Univw.e.f. 2002-03. 2 These will, therefore, be treated as RPRO cases. But, it will be too late now to issue a RPRO. 3 Going by the existing enrolment position, they will have only 1 unit in each course. 4 That being so, there will be no need to inspect. 5. They have given the Affidavit to come under the NCTE Regulations, 2014. 6.1 We have to issue fresh FR for B.Sc.B.Ed (Maths) and BSc.B.Ed (Comp. Sc) as one merged course of BSC.B.Ed w.e.f. 2018-19 only. The nomenclature must change to omit the mention of subjects. There will be no new admissions specifically for BSc.B.Ed in Maths, English, Computer Sc., etc. 6.2 Likewise, we will have to issue fresh FR for BA.B.Ed (Eng) Only, the nomenclature must change to omit the mention of the subject. 6.3 But, we can issue these only when they submit the latest approved Faculty list in accordance with the 2014 Regulations for the 2 courses. 6.4 They are separately operating a B.Ed course (2 units). While submitting the Faculty lists for the other 2 courses, therefore, they should submit the Faculty list for B.Ed also. 7. Issue SCN accordingly 8. Inform the Affiliating University. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, a show cause notice was issued to the institution on 28.09.2017.</p> <p>A copy of the letter dated 16.10.2017 is received by this office on 20.10.2017 from Dean (I/c), CDC, Pondicherry University addressed to The Principal, Tagore Government College of Educatin is stated as under:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“Hence, the college alone is responsible for the future of the students admitted to the Four year Integrated course without the recognition of NCTE and affiliation from the University and the University in no way will be held responsible.”</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The institution has submitted, a letter along with revised staff list on 17.11.2017 and 20.11.2017.</p> <p>An e-mail is received by this office from the Principal, Tagore College of Education on 04.12.2017 is as under:-</p> <p>“Kindly refer to this office letter no. 3-187/Genl/TGCE/2015/471 dated 16.06.2017 requesting to issue recognition orders for Four Years Integrated Courses in B.Sc.B.Ed(Maths), B.Sc.B.Ed (Computer Science) and B.A.B.Ed (English) as per the revised norms of NCTE 2014 as Pondicherry University had insisted to get these orders vide their letter no. PU/EW-1/22/2017-18/46 dated 7.06.2017.</p> <p>Accordingly, the matter was considered in the SRC's 345th meeting held in 21st and 22nd September 2017 and the decision was communicated through a show cause notice no.95137 dated 28.09.2017, the gist of which is reproduced below. The reply to this show cause notice has already been submitted to you.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“The case may be treated as RPRO case but it is too late to issue RPRO and there is no need to inspect. Further the College was directed to submit approved faculty list in accordance with 2014 Regulations to issue fresh FR for B.Sc.B.Ed one unit and B.A.B.Ed one unit w.e.f.2018-19”</p> <p>The matter was immediately informed to the Registrar, Pondicherry University. The list of faculty members duly countersigned by Secretary (Edn.) has also been submitted to the University along with a compliance report.</p> <p>The Pondicherry University is still insisting to get formal orders from NCTE for 2017-18 for B.Sc.B.Ed (Maths), B.Sc.B.Ed (Computer Science) and B.A.B.Ed (English) and they will not allowed to register the candidates who have admitted to the above course during the year 2017-18 for Admission and Semester Examinations of November/December 2017 unless a clarification is issued from SRC.</p> <p>I am therefore to request you to clarify that the recognition for 2017-18 stands so that the candidates admitted to these course during 2017-18 could appear November-December 2017 examinations of Pondicherry University.</p> <p>Since the examinations have already begun, the matter may be treated as most urgent.”</p> <p>The SRC in its 348th meeting held during 05th -06th December, 2017 considered the Show Cause Notice reply and decided as under:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “The decision about final recognition under the 2014 Regulations will be given after they clarify the issues relating to the Faculty list.
--	--	---

	<p>2. In the meanwhile, for purpose of admission to the University Exams, they will be allowed to continued on the existing pattern.</p> <p>3.1 However, since there can be no subject wise B.A.B.Ed or B.Sc.B.Ed, new admissions during 2017-18 can not have the old subject wise nomenclatures for courses.</p> <p>3.2 Students in the second third and fourth years of the courses during 2017-18 will however, be allowed to complete their courses with the old nomenclatures.”</p> <p>As per the decision of SRC a letter was issued to the institution on 12.12.2017.</p> <p>On 12.12.2017, Tagore Government College of Education forwarded a letter to the Dean and copy to the Regional Director, SRC,NCTE which is as under:-</p> <p>“With reference to the subject cited above regarding recognition of NCTE for the students admitted to B.Sc..Ed (Matsh), B.Sc.B.Ed (Computer Science) and BA.B.Ed (English) during the academic year 2017-18 for granting affiliation by the University to enable them to appeal November / December 2017 examinations, the matter was taken up with SRC, NCTE vide this office letter no. 3-187/Gen/TGCE/2015/1002 dated 4th December, 2017 and the SRC.</p> <p>As per the request made by the College the matter was taken up in the SRC’s 348th meeting held on 05th December 2017 which is available in the SRC’s website.</p> <p>The decision taken in the above meeting of SRC on the relevant point for admission of first year students for November/December 2017 examinations in the above course is reproduced below:</p> <p><i>“In the meanwhile, for purpose of admission to the University Exams, they will be allowed to continue on the existing pattern”</i></p> <p>I am further to inform you that all the points raised by you regarding extension of provisional affiliation for the said course raised vide your letter no. 46 dated 7.6.2017 had been clarified and point-wise compliance report has also been given vide this office letter no. 3-187/Genl/TGCE/2015/470 dated 16.06.2017 along with requisite fee (copy enclosed). However, inadvertently, copy of a different Affidavit was enclosed in this letter. Hence, I am submitting the correct Affidavit along with this letter.</p> <p>The reply for subsequent query made by you on the matter vide your letter no. PU/AW-1/22/2017-18/25 dated 16.10.2017 has also been submitted to you vide this office letter no. 3-196/TGCE/2015/940 dated 15th November 2017</p> <p>It is therefore requested to extend provisional affiliation to B.Sc.B.Ed (Maths), B.Sc.B.Ed (Computer Science) and B.A.B.Ed (English) for the academic year 2017-18 as approved by SRC, NCTE. Copy of the Decisions of 348th meeting of SRC, NCTE is enclosed and the candidates may be allowed to register their names for the ensuing examinations.”</p>
--	--

		<p>On 03.01.2018, an email was received from Tagore Government College of Education by this office which is as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Recently the Vice Chancellor, Pondicherry University had visited the College on 28.12.2017. The pending matter of recognition of Integrated Courses in B.Sc B.Ed (Maths), B.Sc B.Ed (Computer Science) and B.A B.Ed (English) was discussed with the Vice Chancellor and Dean, College Development Council (CDC) and placed the NCTE’s order dated 12.12.2017 before them but they did not agree with point No. 2 & 3.1 of the decision of 348th SRC meeting, as there is ambiguity between point No 2 & 3.1”</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant college had represented that, in view of the exigencies on the admission front, they had to go ahead with admissions without waiting for final orders in this case. 2.1. In the event, we had to provide for some leeway to meet the University requirements. This has, possibly, given scope for some confusion. 2.2. We admit the apparent contradiction between points (2) and (3.1) of our order dated 5-6 December 2017. 3.1. In the circumstance, we ratify the action taken by the college to continue with the existing pattern for purposes of admissions in 2017-18. 3.2. The College can not, however, carry on this facility indefinitely. Admissions to the programmes in reference shall be made without reference to subject-wise nomenclatures for the programmes w.e.f 2018-19.
48	<p>SRCAPP1422</p> <p>3 D.El.Ed</p> <p>2 Units</p> <p>Vijaya Sarada College of Diploma in Education, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Vijaya Sarada College of Diploma In Education, Plot No. 87/2B, Kantepudi Village, Sattenapalli Taluk & City, Kattavaripalem P.O, Guntur District-522438, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Nalanda Educational Society, Plot No. 87 2B, Siddharthnagar Road, Kantepudi Village, Kattavaripalem P.O, Sattenapalli Talu and City, Guntur District-522438, Andhra Pradesh has applied for grant of recognition to Vijaya Sarada College of Diploma In Education, Plot No. 87/2B, Kantepudi Village, Sattenapalli Taluk & City, Kattavaripalem P.O, Guntur District-522438, Andhra Pradesh for offering D.El.Ed course of two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 29.06.2015. The institution has submitted hard copy of the application on 13.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014. A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 21.07.2015 Followed by recommendation 04.09.2015 and reminder II on 27.10.2015.</p> <p>The Sub Section (7) of Section 7 of Regulations, 2014 for processing of applications stipulates as under:</p>

	<p>“After consideration of the recommendation of the State Government or on its own merits, the Regional Committee concerned shall decided that institution shall be inspected by a team of experts called visiting team with a view to assess the level of preparedness of the institution to commence the course”.</p> <p>The SRC in its 294th meeting held on 14th -16th November, 2015 considered the documents submitted by the institution along with hard copy of application and it has decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BP issued by competent authority and FDRs are to be submitted. 2. Apprise the applicant of these deficiencies for necessary action. 3. Ask the VT to collect all relevant documents and check for removal of deficiencies. 4. Cause composite inspection. <p>As per the decision of SRC inspection intimation was sent to the institution and VT members on 16.01.2016. The Inspection of the institution was conducted on 28.01.2016 and VT report along with documents received on 02.02.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 301st meeting held on 05th& 06th February, 2016 the committee considered the VT report and all relevant documents and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue SCN for Building Plan not issued by competent authority. <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 17.03.2016.</p> <p>The institution has submitted its reply along with documents on 05.03.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 308th meeting held on 28th – 30th March, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue LOI for D.El.Ed(2 units) 2. FDRs in Joint account should be furnished 3. Only if these are given on or before 02.05.16 can issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f.2016-17 academic year be possible. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, LOI was sent to the institution on 05.04.2016.</p> <p>The institution submitted LOI reply along with documents on 02.05.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 313th meeting held on 02nd & 03rd May, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The linked cases (14224 & 14220) have not given any reply to the LOIs. 2. In the event, this case of D.El.Ed (2 units), which is otherwise eligible for clearance for issue of Formal Recognition w.e.f. 2016-17 has to be held in abeyance until final decisions in the linked cases.
--	--

		<p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC a letter was sent to the institution on 01.06.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st – 03rd May, 2017 considered the SRCAPP14220/B.Ed LOI reply and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proper Faculty list in original has been furnished. 2. FDRs have been given. 3. Issue FR for B.P.Ed. (1 unit) w.e.f. 2017-18. 4. The connected D.El.Ed.(2 units) case can now be reopened for issue of FR for D.El.Ed. (2 units) w.e.f. 2017-18. 5.1 FDRs have to be given in original in joint account, with 5 – year validity @7+5 lakhs for each unit of each course. 5.2 They have given only one set. Issue FR; and, issue Notice for one more set of FDRs. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent on 05.05.2017.</p> <p>The institution submitted its written representation on 31.05.2017 and through mail on 01.06.2017 and stating as follows;</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“.....we are here with request to you we are unable to drawn another set of FDRs for the cause of economical problems. Hence I request you please consider 7 lakhs and 5 lakhs FDRs and issue formal recognition order only for 1 unit D.El.Ed course.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 342nd meeting held on 05th & 06th July, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NCTE(HQ) have now amended the Regulation to state that FDRs are now required only @ 7 + 5 lakhs per programme and not for each unit of a programme. 2. Ask them whether they still want to reduce from 2 units to 1 unit. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC letter was sent to the institution on 12.07.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No reply has been received to our letter dated 12.07.2017. 2. We need not wait further for a reply. Let us proceed to act on their request for reduction from 2 (units) to (1 unit). 3. Issue FR accordingly for D.El.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2018-19
49	SRCAPP1476 2 M.Ed 1 Unit	St. Andrews College of Education, Khasara No. 547/2B, Plot No. 113/114, Syndicate Bank Colony Village, Chittinagar Post, Vijayawada Taluk & City, Krishna District - 520001, Andhra Pradesh

St. Andrews College of Education, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh	<p>A P Girijana Sevak Sangham, No. 5-7/8-98/19, 6th Line K L Rao Nagar Road, Vijayawada Village, Post, Taluk & City, Krishna District-520009, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to St. Andrews College of Education, Khasara No. 547/2B, Plot No. 113/114, Syndicate Bank Colony Village, Chittinagar Post, Vijayawada Taluk & City, Krishna District-520001, Andhra Pradesh for offering M.Ed course of 2 years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 30.06.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 14.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A letter for recommendation of State Govt. was sent on 22.07.2015, followed by Reminder-I on 14.09.2015 and letter to institution for furnishing information on 'Composite' character on 14.09.2015. The Institution has not replied for Composite Character.</p> <p>As directed, the application was processed and placed before SRC in its 296th meeting held on 15th to 16th December 2015, and the committee considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Original Fixed Deposit Receipts to be submitted 2) Ask VT to obtain relevant Land and Building documents 3) Cause Composite inspection 4) Contiguity of land for existing and proposed programme is to be shown <p>Accordingly, as per the decision of SRC, inspection intimation was sent to the institution on 16.01.2016.</p> <p>The institution submitted its written representation on 08.02.2016 and stating as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"We humbly submit that our Chairman of A.P Girijana Seva Sangham is out of country. Therefore, we are unable to produce original documents which were his custody. Our chairman reaching India, our society meet you and request you regarding inspection. It is required some time."</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 302nd meeting held on 09th – 11th February 2016, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request for postponement is accepted. Time is given till Sep.16. 2. It is made clear that this delay will result in missing the time-limit. Of March 16 for final decisions relating to academic year 2016-17. <p>No letter communicating SRC's decision has been sent to the institution.</p> <p>The matter was placed before SRC in its 323rd meeting held on 16th – 18th November</p>
---	--

		<p>2016 and the Committee considered and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The decision dated 9-11 February 2016 to cause inspection unfortunately has remained unimplemented. 2. Cause inspection now. 3. Ask VT to collect all relevant documents. <p>The inspection of the institution was constituted through online module during 12.02.2017 to 04.03.2017.</p> <p>The letter received from VT member on 20.02.2017 and stated as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“...I have been appointed as VT member for St. Andrews College of Education, in Andhra Pradesh. I contacted the concern person mentioned by NCTE. They are not willing for inspection. Mr. M K Thirapathi Rao, from the college informed me that all the people in management has gone out of India, so right now inspection is not possible. I sent them this mail on 10th Feb. But they did not reply to my mail.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 331st meeting held on 22nd February, 2017, considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The VT member has reported that the institution is not interested in the inspection.</i> 2. <i>Issued SCN accordingly for rejection.</i> <p>Accordingly, as per SRC decision, show cause notice was issued to the institution on 23.02.2017. The institution has not submitted any reply till date.</p> <p>The SRC in its 334th meeting held on 30th & 31st March, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The request for extension of time for VT inspection is accepted subject to the clear understanding that they will lose the opportunity of being considered for FR w.e.f. 2017-18 because of the 2nd May (extended) time – limit prescribed by the Supreme Court. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 12.04.2017.</p> <p>The institution has not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The SRC in its 340th meeting held on 08th & 09th June, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They do not seem to be interested in the VT Inspection. 2. Give them a final extension of time till 31.7.17. 3. Organize VT Inspection in early Aug. 17. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC, a letter was sent to the institution on 15.06.2017.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have not replied to our letter dated 15.06.2017. 2. They have consistently been blocking the VT Inspection. 3. We can not go on like this without any meaningful progress. 4. Issue SCN for rejection.
50	<p>SRCAPP1455 6 B.Ed 2 Units Abu Sawood B.Ed College, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Abu Sawood B.Ed College, Plot No.357/3, Bastipadu Village and Post office, Kallur Taluk, Kurnool District - 518002, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>Abu Sawood Educational Society, Plot No.87-520, Sri Nagar Colony, Kurnool Village B-Camp Post office, Kallur Taluk, Kurnool District - 518002, Andhra Pradesh had applied for grant of recognition to Abu Sawood B.Ed College, Plot No.357/3, Bastipadu Village and Post office, Kallur Taluk, Kurnool District - 518002, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.Ed course of Two years duration for the academic session 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 29.06.2015. The institution submitted hard copy of the application on 13.07.2015.</p> <p>The Institution submitted No Objection Certificate Dated 29.06.2015 issued by the Rayalaseema University along with the hard copy of application.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A copy of the application was sent to State Government for recommendation on 21.07.2015 and Reminder-I on 05.10.2015 and Reminder-II on 18.01.2017.</p> <p>The Sub-clause (3) of clause 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution was found deficient as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The application is not duly signed by the applicant on all pages as per Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014.</i> <p>The SRC in its 292nd Meeting held during 29th to 30th September, 2015 considered the matter and decided as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“ The 1128 cases, in which digital signature is not available on each page in the applications received online, have to be seen as violating Regulations 5.3 of the</i></p>

	<p><i>2014 Regulations. But, it has to be recognized in this context that the said omission was due to a technical difficulty of there not being a provision in the on-line application system to upload digital signatures. In our opinion, it will not be correct to hold them responsible for not uploading digital signatures when the system had no scope for such uploading because of a technical snag. Accordingly, we condone this omission and admit the applications for processing”</i></p> <p>A letter seeking information on composite character of the institution was sent on 05.10.2015. The institution submitted reply on 05.11.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed for causing inspection and placed before SRC in its 295th meeting held on 28th – 30th November, & 01st December, 2015. The Committee considered the matter and decided to “<i>await show cause notice reply</i>”.</p> <p>The SRC in its 323rd meeting held on 16th – 18th November, 2016 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue SCN for stand-alone status of B.Ed course. <p>Accordingly, Show Cause Notice was issued to the institution on 05.12.2016. The institution has submitted its Show cause notice reply along with document on 28.12.2016.</p> <p>The SRC in its 329th meeting held on 06th & 07th February, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The B.Ed.(2 units) case can be considered at the new site proposed subject to shifting of the D.El.Ed.(1 unit) to the new site. 2. Land at the new site measures 2 acres. Title is clear. Land area is adequate. 3. LUC is in order. 4. EC is given. 5.1 BP is in order. 5.2 BCC – not submitted. 6 NOC is given. 7 Cause composite inspection for B.Ed.(2 units) and D.El.Ed.(1 unit), 8 Ask VT to collect all relevant documents. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC inspection of the institution was noticed through online mode on 18.02.2017 and inspection of the institution was fixed between 28.02.2017 to 20.03.2017.</p> <p>Now, an email received by the VT member on 11.04.2017 and stating as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“.....as per telephonic talk with you, I forwarded message Dr. Mohammad Hasan, the visit schedule is 16.02.2017 and 17.03.2017. I am requested to you please arrange the alternate VT member in place of Dr. Mohammad Hasan, so I completed the assignment given by you.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 335th meeting held on 11th & 12th April, 2017 considered the VT member representation and the Committee decided as under:</p>
--	---

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We had ordered VT inspection. 2. One Member has reported that he is not able to contact the other. 3. May be, the Tel.No. given is not correct. Please try to contact him from here. <p>Failing that, we can consider ordering VT inspection afresh.</p> <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC Regional Director contacted the institution and stated as under;</p> <p><i>“....contacted with the institution, he informed that they are willing for V.T. They also informed that Dr. Suresh Pachauri was in contact with institution and Dr. Mohammad Hasan could not go for inspection due to bad health. We may appoint fresh VT with approved of SRC”.</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 338th meeting held on 01st – 03rd May, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this case, because of ill-health of one of the VT members, the VT inspection could not be conducted. 2. The College has been ready for the inspection. We have to order inspection afresh. 3. Unfortunately, because of this lapse, the applicant will lose a whole academic year. 4. Be that as it may, let us progress the process by ordering VT inspection afresh. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC inspection of the institution was generated through online mode on 08.05.2017 and inspection fixed between 12.05.2017 & 01.06.2017. Inspection of the institution was conducted on 03.06.2017 and VT report along with documents and original CD received on 07.06.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 342nd meeting held on 05th & 06th July, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title is clear. Land area is adequate for both the courses. (4052 sq.mts. available; 3000 required). 2. LUC is in order. 3. EC is only for the area covered (0.65 acre) by the Sale Deed. There is no EC for the area (0.35 acre) covered by the Gift Deed. Total area required is 0.72 acre. 4. BP is a photocopy in small size. Duly approved original Blue print is required. 5. BCC is in order. Built-up area is adequate; and, according to the BP. 6. FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7+5 lakhs for each programme. 7. Obtain Latest Faculty list for D.El.Ed. Once we are able to decide about permission to shift the D.El.Ed.(1 unit) course, we can issue LOI for B.Ed.(2 units). 8. Issue SCN accordingly. <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC show cause notice was sent on 12.07.2017.</p> <p>The institution submitted reply along with documents on 02.08.2017.</p> <p>The SRC in its 346th meeting held on 24th & 25th October, 2017 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All documents are in order.
--	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. All deficiencies have been rectified. 3. Faculty list of D.El.Ed (1 Unit) is in order. 4. Permit shifting of D.El.Ed (1 Unit) 5. Issue LOI for B.Ed (2 Units) <p>Accordingly, as per decision of SRC LOI was sent to the institution on 02.11.2017.</p> <p>The institution not submitted reply till date.</p> <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their reply to our LOI dated 02.11.2017 has not been received. 2. Give further time till 20.02.2018. 3. Put up soon thereafter.
51	<p>SRCAPP1452 5 B.Ed Emmaneal College of Teacher Education, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh</p>	<p>Emmanuel College of Teacher Education, Plot.No. 82/1,2A, Near NH-09, Kethanakonda Village & Post, Ibrahimpatnam Taluk & Town, Krishna District-521456, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>United Christian Church of India, Plot No. 1-10/1, Karuna Nagar Street, Kethanakonda Village & Post, Ibrahimpatnam Taluk & Town, Krishna District-521456, Andhra Pradesh applied for grant of recognition to Emmanuel College of Teacher Education, Plot No. 82/1, 2A, Near NH-09, Kethanakonda Village & Post, Ibrahimpatnam Taluk & Town, Krishna District-521456, Andhra Pradesh for offering B.Ed course for two years duration for the academic year 2016-17 under Section 14/15 of the NCTE Act, 1993 to the Southern Regional Committee, NCTE through online on 29.06.2015. The institution has submitted the hard copy of the application on 10.07.2015.</p> <p>The application was processed as per NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedures) Regulations, 2014 notified by NCTE on 01.12.2014.</p> <p>A letter was sent to State Government for recommendation on 16.07.2015.</p> <p>Sub-section (3) of Section 5 of Regulations, 2014 under Manner of making application and time limit stipulates as under:-</p> <p><i>“(3) The application shall be submitted online electronically along with the processing fee and scanned copies of required documents such as no objection certificate issued by the concerned affiliating body. While submitting the application, it has to be ensured that the application is duly signed by the applicant on every page, including digital signature at appropriate place at the end of the application.”</i></p> <p>On careful perusal of the original file of the institution and other documents, the application of the institution is deficient as per Regulations, 2014 as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution has not submitted NOC from affiliating body. <p>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.</p> <p>Accordingly, Show cause notice was issued to the institution on 21.10.2015. The institution has submitted its written representation on 18-11-2015</p> <p>The SRC in its 295th Meeting held on 28th-30th November & 1st December, 2015 considered the matter and decided as under;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reply to the SCN is not satisfactory. They have admitted the deficiency. We cannot wait indefinitely from them to produce the NOC. Accordingly to the

		<p>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. Before issuance of rejection order a letter received from the institution on 18.12.2015 & 15.12.2015 along with court order in W.P.No. 15670 of 2015 dated 23.11.2015 stating as follows:</p> <p><i>“The counsel for petitioners does not press this Writ Petition as far as 1st petitioner is concerned. The counsel for petitioners further states that petitioner nos. 2, 3 and 4 have submitted representations dt. 07.05.2015, 11.05.2015 and 07.05.2015 to 1st respondent requesting for issuance of ‘No Objection Certificate’ for starting B.Ed course, since the 4th respondent is insisting on production of such a ‘No Objection Certificate’ but no orders were passed thereon.</i></p> <p><i>2. None appears for 1st respondent.</i></p> <p><i>3. Having regard to the submission of counsel for petitioners, the 1st respondent is directed to dispose of the representations dt. 07.05.2015, 11.05.2015 and 07.05.2015 respectively submitted by petitioner nos. 2 to 4 to it seeking ‘No Objection Certificate’ for starting B.Ed course within a period of two (02) weeks from today, and communicate its decision to petitioner nos. 2 to 4.</i></p> <p><i>4. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of with the above directions, No order as to costs.</i></p> <p><i>5. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, in this Writ Petition shall stand closed.”</i></p> <p>The SRC in its 293rd Meeting held on 29th-31st October, 2015 considered the D.El.Ed course (SRCAPP14520) and decided to as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This D.El.Ed application will become ‘composite’ only in conjunction with the B.Ed application. 2. The B.Ed application is on hold because of a Show Cause Notice for non-supply of NOC. 3. Further, consideration of this case can be possible only after a final decision in the B.Ed case. 4. Keep this application ‘on hold’. <p>The SRC in its 297th meeting held on 27th & 28th December, 2015 considered the matter and decided to “Noted.”</p> <p>NOTE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per 295th SRC decision Rejection Order was not issued to the institution. • SRCAPP14520/D.El.Ed course was rejected on 16.05.2016. <p>The Committee considered the above matter decided as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The B.Ed application was rejected in our November-December 2015 meeting. Unfortunately that order was not issued. 2. When the linked D.El.Ed case was rejected in May 16, the B.Ed case became
--	--	---

		<p>ineligible on grounds of being 'stand alone'. It should have been rejected then.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Be that as it may, issue a formal rejection order for B.Ed (1 unit).4. Return FDRs, if any.5. Close the file.
--	--	--