



\$~J

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Judgment reserved on: 07.05.2026
Judgment pronounced on: 29 .05.2026

+ **W.P. (C) 3746/2026**

BANSUR MAHAVIDHYALAYA & ANR

....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Trideep Pais, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Sahil Ghai, Mr. Anuj Kishore Saxena,
Mr. Sahil Khurana, Ms. Sakshi Jain, Ms
Saloni Ambastha, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR

....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Shivom Sethi
Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

J U D G M E N T

1. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioners under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:

“i. Declare that public notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025, seeking institutes to apply afresh for transition, are not applicable upon the Petitioner Institute; and/or



- ii. Direct the Respondents to decide on merit the Petitioners' application dated 05.03.2024 for transition from 4-year Integrated BA/B.Sc.-B.Ed. to 4-year ITEP under National Education Policy 2020; and/or
- iii. Alternatively, direct the Respondents to open the online web portal for submission of such application by the Petitioner for transition from 4-year Integrated BA/B.Sc.-B.Ed. to 4-year ITEP or to accept such application in physical form; and/or
- iv. Alternatively, allow the Petitioner to transition from 4-year integrated B.A. B.ED./ B.SC. B.ED. programme to the 4-year ITEP and accordingly direct the Respondents to issue such recognition to the Petitioner."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

2. Petitioner No. 1 is a Higher Educational Institute established in 2003 imparting a wide variety of courses such as B.A., M.A., B.Sc., M.Sc., BBA, B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed.
3. The respondent No. 1 is the National Council for Teacher Education, a statutory body established under the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 ("**1993 Act**") and is responsible for regulation and proper maintenance of norms and standards in the teacher education system.
4. The respondent No. 2 is the Western Regional Committee of the respondent No. 1 responsible for recognition of Institutions offering courses or training in teacher education under Chapter IV of the 1993 Act in the State of Rajasthan.



5. After fulfilling the mandated criteria, the petitioner No. 1 was granted permission to offer four-year integrated B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. courses in 2017 with an annual intake of 100 students and the same was duly recognised by the respondent authority *vide* recognition order dated 02.05.2017.
6. The Government of India introduced the National Education Policy, 2020 in furtherance of which the respondent No. 1 published a gazette notification being NCTE-Regl. 011/80/2018-MS (Regulation)-HQ dated 26.10.2021 wherein Integrated Teacher Education Programme (“**ITEP**”) was introduced.
7. The respondent No. 1 further issued a gazette notification being NCTE-Regl. 022/16/2023-Reg. Sec.-HQ dated 25.01.2024 amending and inserting Rule 6A which was incorporated in Appendix-15 of National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2014 *vide* National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Amendment Regulations, 2024. The said rule allowed transition of existing Institutions offering four year integrated B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. course into 4-year ITEP course.
8. In furtherance of the said gazette notification, the respondent No. 1 initiated the transition process for the academic session 2025-26 and opened the application portal for this purpose from 05.02.2024 to 05.03.2024.
9. The petitioner No. 1 had duly filled the application being application No. 2526202402061063 and submitted the same on 05.03.2024 in terms of the Public Notice dated 05.02.2024. The petitioner No. 1 deposited the requisite processing fee of Rs. 1,50,000/-.



10. Subsequently, the respondent No. 1 extended the timeline for submission of online application for academic session 2025-26 till 20.05.2024 *vide* Public Notices dated 15.03.2024, 22.04.2024 and 20.05.2024.
11. Due to the delay on the part of the respondents in deciding the applications for transition from the 4-year Integrated B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. programme to the 4-year ITEP, several stakeholders submitted representations seeking extension of the existing programme so as to avoid a zero-session. Considering the delay, the respondent No.1 issued Public Notice dated 06.05.2025 extending the transition timeline till academic session 2026-27 and permitting Institutions recognized under the omitted Appendix-13 of the NCTE Regulations, 2014 to continue admissions in the existing programmes for academic session 2025-26. By a separate notice, the respondent No. 1 notified that online applications for academic session 2026-27 were invited from 06.05.2025 to 27.05.2025.
12. The respondent No. 1 further issued a Public Notice dated 25.08.2025 on account of multiple representations pending from various Institutions, a final opportunity was provided to the Institutions to apply afresh on the NCTE Portal. On 12.09.2025 another Public Notice was issued informing that the online NCTE portal to provide the final opportunity to all Institutions to apply afresh online is fixed from 15.09.2025 to 05.10.2025.
13. It is the case of the petitioner No. 1, that the petitioner No. 1 made several attempts to apply on the online portal however, was unable to process its application due to technical glitches. The petitioner No. 1 even tried reaching out to the helpline provided by the respondent No. 1 however no resolution was provided. On the very next day, petitioner also wrote an



email dated 06.10.2025 to the respondents apprising them of the difficulties in submitting the application and the technical glitches, however received no response. The representatives of the petitioner No. 1 institute also personally visited the office of respondent No. 1 where they were assured that the portal would open soon as there were several other institutes who faced similar issues.

BACKGROUND OF LITIGATION

14. Since the portal did not open as assured by the respondent No. 1, petitioner No. 1 filed a writ petition being ***W.P. (C) 19683/2025*** titled ***Bansur Mahavidhyalaya & Anr. v. National Council for Teacher Education and Anr.*** wherein *vide* order dated 12.01.2026 this Court directed the respondent No. 1 to decide the pending application filed in furtherance of the Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 for transitioning into ITEP course.
15. The respondents filed ***LPA No. 71/2026*** titled ***National Council for Teacher Education and Anr. v. Bansur Mahavidhyalaya and Anr.*** wherein the Hon'ble Division Bench *vide* order dated 16.02.2026 set aside the order dated 12.01.2026 and remanded back the matter to this Court restoring the writ petition to its original number.
16. Meanwhile, on 12.02.2026 the respondent No. 1 through the National Testing Agency issued a Public Notice inviting applications for National Common Entrance Test 2026 to apply for admissions in 4 year ITEP Course. The online submission of form was scheduled between 12.02.2026 to 10.03.2026 and the tentative date for examination was fixed for 17.04.2026. The respondents also published a list of Central and State Universities offering 4 year ITEP Course wherein the name of



petitioner No. 1 Institution was not included.

17. After the matter was remanded back to this Court the petitioner No.1 sought to withdraw the petition with liberty to file a fresh in terms of the order dated 16.02.2026. Hence, the present petition.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

18. Mr. Trideep Pias, learned senior counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioner No. 1 is a Multi-disciplinary Higher Educational Institute. The parent notification dated 26.10.2021 categorises being Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions as 'HEIs' and Stand-alone Teacher Education Institutions as 'TEIs'.
19. He further states that the Public Notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 are only applicable to TEIs and not HEIs. The said Public Notices specifically direct only the TEIs to apply afresh, including those Institutions whose transition applications were rejected by the respondent No. 1. The petitioner No. 1 Institution is not a TEI nor its application has been rejected by the respondent No. 1. Thus, the impugned Public Notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 cannot be made applicable upon the petitioner No. 1 and the application of the petitioner No. 1 should be adjudicated on merits. Even though the notices are not applicable to the petitioner No. 1, petitioner No. 1 still made serious attempts to apply afresh which was unsuccessful due to technical glitch in the portal.
20. He states that the General Body decision, as reflected in the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025, demonstrates that the only objective sought to be served by inviting fresh applications was ensuring compliance with the new multidisciplinary Institution requirements. Thus, the directions to



apply afresh could not be mechanically extended to all Institutions.

21. He also points out that in the earlier proceedings in the LPA, the Hon'ble Division Bench has not adjudicated the applicability of the impugned notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 to the petitioner No. 1. Rather, the earlier writ was confined to re-opening the portal. The Division Bench has itself recorded that the petitioner No. 1 has not challenged the said Public Notices.
22. Without prejudice to the aforesaid contentions, the learned senior counsel for the petitioner No. 1 alternatively submits that in exercise of its equitable jurisdiction the Court may direct the respondents to reopen the portal or accept the petitioner No. 1's transition application. He also states that the requisite fee has already been paid by the petitioner No. 1 and the petitioner No. 1 Institution has been running for the past 9 years and it shall cause irreparable loss to the petitioner No. 1 if the application of the petitioner No. 1 is not considered.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS

23. Mr. Anuj Kapoor, learned standing counsel for the respondents, vehemently opposes the present writ petition and submits that the same is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed as an abuse of the process of law. It is contended that the present petition is nothing but an attempt to re-agitate issues which already stood concluded in the earlier round of litigation.
24. It is submitted that the liberty granted to the petitioner No. 1 while withdrawing the earlier writ petition was limited to challenge the vires of the Public Notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025. Having failed to assail the vires of the said notices in the present petition, the petitioner



No. 1 cannot seek to re-agitate the same reliefs on altered grounds. Reliance in this regard is placed upon the judgment in ***Rahul Modi v. State of M.P., W.P.(C) 43781/2025*** following the principles laid down in ***Sarguja Transport Service v. STAT, (1987) 1 SCC 5***.

25. He further states that the petitioner No. 1 cannot be permitted to approbate and reprobate as in the earlier writ petition, the petitioner No. 1 had itself proceeded on the basis of the Public Notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 and tried to apply for transition through online portal and had merely sought reopening of the portal on account of alleged technical glitches. Having earlier sought compliance under the very same notices, the petitioner No. 1 is now estopped from contending that the said notices are inapplicable to the petitioner No. 1.
26. He emphasises the argument that plea of non-applicability of the Public Notices is wholly misconceived. Public Notices clearly applied to all Institutions offering the 4-year integrated B.A. B.Ed. and B.Sc. B.Ed. course and seeking transition to ITEP, including the petitioner No. 1 Institution and there exists no distinction between TEIs and HEIs insofar as the requirement of applying afresh is concerned. Even the Hon'ble Division Bench, vide order dated 16.02.2026, has already conclusively held that the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 was applicable to the petitioner No. 1 Institution and that the petitioner No. 1 was not exempted from applying afresh. Thus, the said finding has attained finality and operates as res judicata on the issue of applicability of the Public Notices. Accordingly, this Court is bound by the findings rendered by the Hon'ble Division Bench.
27. It is further submitted that regulatory timelines prescribed by the NCTE



are mandatory and sacrosanct and admit of no exception. Failure to submit a timely application disentitles an Institution from seeking any equitable relief. Thus, once the Petitioner failed to submit an application within the stipulated period, no enforceable legal right survived in its favour and consequently no writ of mandamus can be issued directing the respondents to reopen the portal or entertain the petitioner No. 1's application. Thus, the Court cannot direct the respondents to act contrary to the statutory framework and regulatory schedule framed by the NCTE. The alternate prayer seeking reopening of the portal or acceptance of applications in physical form is also equally untenable, inasmuch as the same would defeat uncertainty in the regulatory framework and cause prejudice to the Institutions which adhered to the prescribed timelines.

28. Reliance in this regard is placed on ***Aditya Institute of Technology v. GNCTD*** and ***Oriental College of Teacher Education v. NCTE, LPA No. 517/2025*** to contend that belated applications cannot be directed to be entertained in exercise of writ jurisdiction.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

29. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties and perused the material on record.
30. In the present matter, controversy is with respect to whether the petitioner No. 1 institute is required to apply afresh in terms of the Public Notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 and whether the Public Notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 is applicable to the petitioner No. 1.
31. Before delving into the merits of the case, the objections against maintainability are being considered. The submission advanced on behalf of the respondents that the liberty granted to the petitioner No. 1 was



confined to a limited challenge to the vires of the Public Notices alone does not hold merit. The learned Division Bench in the order dated 16.02.2026 has categorically recorded that all rights and contentions of the parties are left open to be urged before the learned Single Judge. Thus, the present petition is maintainable.

32. Now, I shall deal with the merits of the controversy.
33. In this regard the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 assumes relevance. The relevant portion of the said Public Notice reads as under:

“6. The matter was again considered by the General Body of the Council in its 67th meeting and the following decision(s) were taken by the Council:

i) The final opportunity be provided to all such TEIs including those institutions of which applications were refused/rejected by giving an opportunity to apply afresh online on NCTE Portal. Those institutions which have earlier submitted Transitions in response to NCTE Public Notice dated 05.02.2024, may be exempted from making payment of processing fee, subject to specifying mentioned the registration number of the earlier application submitted.

ii) The portal be opened as above and public notice be issued with direction to all recognized existing TEIs offering B.Sc. B.Ed./ B.A. B.Ed. course (Prior to omission of the Appendix-13) to apply afresh except the institution which have either been already transited into ITEP or have been



issued Letter of Intent (LOI) by the Regional Committee concerned.

iii) The application of those institutions which do not fulfil the criteria of multidisciplinary institution shall be summarily rejected by the Regional Committee.

7. All the institutions were informed vide Public Notice dated 25.08.2025 that online portal will be opened by NCTE in Mid-September 2025 and advised to be in readiness to apply afresh with all the required relevant papers/documents including proof of being multidisciplinary institution as per Guidelines for Transforming NCTE Recognized Stand-Alone Teacher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Higher Education Institutions available on NCTE Website. This shall be the final opportunity to the institutions offering 4-year Integrated B.Sc. B.Ed./ B.A. B.Ed. programme to transition into 4-year Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP).

(emphasis supplied)

34. The petitioner No. 1 contends that the initial notice dated 05.02.2024 created two distinct classification of Institutions being Multidisciplinary Higher Educational Institutions (“**HEIs**”) and the Stand Alone Teacher Educational Institutions (“**TEIs**”). Proceeding on the basis of the said classifications, it is the case of the petitioner No. 1 that the latter Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 is applicable only to TEIs and has no



applicability to the petitioner No. 1 as it is an HEI. Consequently, as per the petitioner No. 1, they stand exempted from the operation of and directions contained in the notice dated 12.09.2025.

35. In this regard it is relevant to peruse the observations in the order dated 16.02.2026 of the learned Division Bench wherein the order dated 12.01.2026 was set aside. The relevant observations read as under:

“6. For appreciating the prayer made in the Writ Petition, we need to take note of the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 issued by the Appellants for operating of its portal for providing final opportunity to the existing Institutions offering 4-year integrated B.Sc., B.Ed./B.A. B.Ed. courses to apply afresh for transition into 4-year ITEP course. The said Public Notice also mentions a provision inserted in Appendix-15 of National Council for Teacher Education (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations 2014 which provides for a provision for transition to ITEP. Prior to the said Public Notice dated 12.09.2025, Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 providing for transition to ITEP was issued. Whereafter on certain representations, a decision was taken by the Appellants to accord final opportunity to the Institutions seeking transition by giving an opportunity to apply afresh online on the portal of the Appellants. It was further provided that those institutions which have earlier submitted application seeking transition in response to Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 may be exempted from making payment of processing fee subject to



specifying/mentioning the registration number of the earlier application submitted.

7. The Respondent No.1- Institution had made application on 05.03.2024 pursuant to the earlier Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 and thus according to the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025, it was not exempted from applying afresh; the only exemption available to the Respondent No.1- Institution was that it would be exempted from making payment of processing fee. The last date of submission of the application pursuant to the latter Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 was 05.10.2025.

8. The Respondent No.1- Institution has not challenged the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 requiring all Institutions seeking transition to apply afresh. Admittedly, the Respondent No.1- Institution did not submit its application pursuant to the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 prior to the last date i.e. prior to 05.10.2025.

xxxx

10. However, what we notice from the order impugned in this Appeal is that the learned Single Judge, without considering the prayer and the context in which the prayer was made in the Writ Petition, has allowed the Writ Petition and has gone into the extent of directing the Appellants to consider the application made by the Respondent No.1- Institution not pursuant to the Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 but pursuant to the earlier Public Notice dated



05.02.2024. We may note that the need for issuing subsequent Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 had arisen after the process pursuant to earlier Public Notice 05.02.2024 was completed for the reason that several representations were received from the institutions seeking their transition to ITEP. We have already noticed that Public Notice dated 12.09.2025 did not exempt any institution from applying afresh. The only exemption provided therein is that those Institutions which had applied pursuant to the Public Notice dated 05.02.2024 would be exempted from depositing the processing fees. In the aforesaid view of the matter, we are of the opinion that the prayer granted in the Writ Petition by the learned Single Judge exceeds the scope of Writ Petition itself.

(emphasis supplied)

36. The findings returned by the learned Division Bench as aforesaid clearly were with respect to the petitioner No. 1. The observation very categorically states that the petitioner No. 1 Institution is not exempted from applying afresh as the notice dated 12.09.2025 did not exempt any Institution from applying afresh.
37. Thus, the argument of the petitioner No. 1 that the Public Notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 is inapplicable to the petitioner No. 1 in light of categorisation between HEIs and TEIs does not cut much ice. The observations of the Division Bench shall have a binding effect on this Court.
38. In the present petition as well the petitioner No. 1 has not challenged the



validity of the Public Notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 which mandates that all the Institutions are required to apply afresh. Rather, it seems that the petitioner *via* present writ petition is seeking to challenge the observations made against it by the Division Bench in the Order dated 16.02.2026, which are binding upon this Court.

39. In light of the above, the prayer (A) cannot be granted to the petitioner No. 1.
40. With respect to Prayer (B), since it is already discussed that all the Institutions were required to apply afresh, the application dated 05.03.2024 which was submitted pursuant to the notice dated 05.02.2024 cannot be treated as a new application as per the notice dated 12.09.2026.
41. The timelines prescribed by the respondents under the regulatory framework cannot be ordinarily diluted by the Court. The academic schedules are to be strictly adhered to.
42. I also cannot lose sight of the categorical observations of the learned Division Bench in the order dated 16.02.2026. The Division Bench, while interpreting the effect of the Public Notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025, unequivocally observed that no Institution stood exempted from the requirement of applying afresh pursuant to the said notices. There is no ambit of ambiguity left in the requirement that pursuant to the notices dated 25.08.2025 and 12.09.2025 all Institutions, TEIs as well as HEIs have to submit a fresh application and the only exemption available is with respect to the processing fee.
43. In view thereof, the contention now sought to be advanced by the petitioner No. 1 that it being a HEI falls outside the purview of the impugned Public Notices cannot be permitted to be agitated. If there were



any such distinctions between the HEIs and TEIs, the same ought to have been specifically urged before the Division Bench. Having failed to do so, the petitioner cannot now seek to circumvent the binding effect of the observations of the Division Bench which are binding upon the petitioner.

CONCLUSION

44. Hence, the petition is dismissed. However, nothing precludes the petitioner No. 1 from approaching the respondent No. 1 in accordance with law and extant rules and regulations for applying afresh for subsequent academic years.

MAY 29th , 2026/(MU)

JASMEET SINGH, J.