

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA
PRASAD**

WP/2094/2023 WP/1820/2023 WP/1924/2023 WP/1954/2023 WP/1957/2023
WP/1963/2023 WP/1964/2023 WP/1965/2023 WP/1966/2023 WP/1974/2023
WP/2096/2023 WP/2097/2023 WP/2098/2023 WP/2101/2023 WP/2105/2023
WP/2108/2023 WP/2109/2023 WP/2110/2023 WP/2111/2023 WP/2112/2023
WP/2113/2023 WP/2114/2023 WP/2115/2023 WP/2116/2023 WP/2117/2023
WP/2120/2023 WP/2126/2023 WP/2130/2023 WP/2132/2023 WP/2133/2023
WP/2134/2023 WP/2279/2023 WP/2616/2023 WP/2640/2023 WP/2727/2023
WP/2728/2023 WP/2734/2023 WP/2752/2023 WP/3032/2023 WP/3034/2023
WP/3036/2023 WP/3053/2023 WP/3056/2023 WP/3093/2023 WP/3099/2023
WP/3100/2023 WP/3918/2023 WP/3919/2023 WP/3942/2023 WP/3944/2023
WP/4147/2023 WP/4157/2023 WP/4169/2023 WP/4178/2023 WP/4193/2023
WP/4199/2023 WP/4379/2023 WP/4398/2023 WP/4406/2023 WP/4408/2023
WP/4413/2023 WP/4437/2023 WP/4450/2023 WP/5595/2023 WP/5598/2023
WP/5599/2023 WP/5600/2023 WP/5601/2023 WP/5602/2023 WP/5603/2023
WP/5605/2023 WP/5606/2023 WP/5610/2023 WP/5872/2023 WP/6053/2023
WP/6057/2023 WP/6058/2023 WP/6218/2023 WP/6658/2023 WP/7559/2023
WP/35193/2022 WP/35195/2022 WP/35197/2022 WP/35198/2022
WP/35199/2022 WP/37939/2022 WP/42469/2022

The Court made the following COMMON ORDER:

Heard Sri Mathukumilli Sri Vijay, Sri P.Nagendra Reddy, Sri G.Venkateswarlu, Sri Venkateswara Rao Gudapati, Sri C.Subodh & Ms.Y.Anupama Devi, Ld. Counsel for the Writ Petitioners, Sri Butta Vijaya Bhaskar, Ld. Standing Counsel Office Note for Sree Venkateswara University, Sri A.Venkata Durga Rao, Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of Ms.Y.Ratna Prabha, Ld. Standing Counsel for Rayalaseema University, Sri Tenapalli Niranjan, Ld. Standing Counsel for Yogi Vemana University, Ms.M.Manikya Veena, Ld. Standing Counsel for Sri Padmavathi Mahila Viswavidhyalam, Sri B.V.Durga Prasad, Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of Ms.S.Parineeta, Ld. Standing Counsel for APSCME and Sri Venna Hemanth Kumar, Ld. Standing Counsel for NCTE in-part.

2. The present Writ Petitions are filed by various affiliated Colleges/Institutions imparting B.Ed Courses. It is a matter of common knowledge that Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) and Master of Education (M.Ed) Courses are important for training the teachers who work in the Secondary and Higher Secondary schools. The action of various Universities has been challenged by the aggrieved affiliated Colleges/affiliated Institutions, wherein and whereby, by the impugned actions, the Universities have issued Proceedings with regard to the respective affiliated Colleges/affiliated Institutions declaring the current academic year as 'zero academic year' or reduction of students strength on the basis that the affiliated Colleges/affiliated Institutions did not cure the deficiencies pointed out by the various Inspection Committees or on the ground that the admissions were made contrary to the University Regulations or the National Council for Teacher Education (for short the 'NCTE') Regulations.

3. The NCTE has been formed as per the NCTE Act, 1993 (for short 'the Act, 1993'). The NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations, 2009 were issued by the NCTE. Under the Act, 1993, the Regional Committees are also constituted by the NCTE. Section 14 of the Act, 1993 provides for the various standards and norms to be followed by the Colleges/Institutions which are imparting the Courses of B.Ed and M.Ed.

4. The NCTE grants recognition for the College/Institution after complying with the Statute and the Regulations, and basing on the

recommendations made by the respective Regional Committees of the NCTE. The local University in the area in which the Institution is set up is required to grant affiliation for the individual College/Institution. To enable an Institution to admit the students for B.Ed or M.Ed Courses, an Institution is required to possess Certificate of recognition from the NCTE and also an approval of affiliation from the respective University.

5. While the Universities, which are by themselves autonomous bodies, are required to follow their own procedures and schedules for conduct of inspections, grant of affiliation and for conduct of examinations, the admission process for the Courses of B.Ed and M.Ed is one and the same. Notification is given to all the Institutions across the State and the counseling is also a common counseling. Therefore, while the admission for all the Colleges/ Institutions is one and the same, the schedule followed for grant of affiliation is in the hands of the individual universities. Since the universities are autonomous by their very nature, they have the freedom to employ their own schedules for inspections etc., and for curing of deficiencies by the respective Colleges based on the Inspection Reports. Therefore, since the Universities are not following a common time schedule, situations and circumstances have arisen wherein in most of the cases in the present batch, the respective Universities have communicated zero academic year or reduction in strength either few days before the commencement of common counseling of admission of students, or in some cases even after the commencement of the common counseling for admission of students. This peculiar situation is not

only affecting the respective Colleges, but it also has a substantial adverse impact on the career of the students who eventually aspire to become a trained teacher after completing either the B.Ed Course or M.Ed Course. Whatever may be the administrative exigency, this Court has noticed that the adverse impact ultimately befalls upon the admission-seeker who intends to seek admission in a B.Ed course or M.Ed course in a particular Institution. While the Universities have resorted to withdrawal of affiliation or declaring a particular academic year as a zero academic year or by reducing the strength, the aspiring students are made to run from pillar to post in the last minute, having come to know about the peril inflicted upon a respective Institution or College in which the candidate had initially desired to seek an admission.

6. Whatever may be the dispute on the administrative side between the University and the respective Institution, this Court has noticed in a flood of litigations that has come before it that the ultimate sufferers are the admission-seekers. A candidate aspiring to become a teacher in a Secondary School or Higher Secondary School is required to mandatorily possess a qualification in B.Ed/M.Ed as the case may be. For the purpose of recruitment in a Government School in the State of Andhra Pradesh, the Government undertakes to conduct a common examination called the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET). The persons who are qualified in the TET are also subject to a process of competitive screening for recruitment in Government Schools undertaken by the Government of Andhra Pradesh through the annual District Selection Committees (DSCs). Whenever the Government issues Notification

either for conduct of TET or DSC, this Court has experienced a flood of litigation from various candidates on the ground that the cut off date for making an application may be extended on account of irregular time schedules within which they have either acquired the B.Ed or M.Ed certificates or are yet to acquire B.Ed or M.Ed certificates. In other words, since various Universities have been conducting the examinations without following a single procedure, the candidates are unable to complete the Courses commonly within a particular time. One of the reasons for not completing the courses within a particular time is due to delayed admissions. This Court has noticed that the admission process is being delayed due to various factors, some of which are delineated below:

- i) The dates for grant of recognition and grant of affiliation are not being followed by the Universities in accordance with the directions given by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya Vs. State of U.P : (2013) 2 SCC 617.***
- ii) When the Inspection Committee, which is constituted and sent by the respective University, prepares a Report pointing out certain deficiencies, the University is obligated to ensure that the same Committee once again visits the Institution within a reasonable time and verify whether the defects which were earlier pointed out are cured by the Institution or not. In most of the cases before this Court, it has been noticed that the Universities are not sending the same Committee Members for verification, who had inspected and

pointed-out defects earlier, to see whether the defects pointed-out by the earlier Committee have been cured or not. Even when a new Committee has been sent, the said Committee is expected to verify whether the individual College/Institution has cured the defects which were earlier notified or out. Without doing so, this Court has noticed that the new Inspection Committee is pointing out new defects and directing the Institution to cure those defects as a condition either for grant of affiliation or for permitting the admissions for the current academic year. In some of the cases, this Court has noticed that the Universities are delaying in sending the Inspection Teams or Verification Teams.

7. Under all these circumstances, the casualty is the time schedule with regard to the grant of recognition by the NCTE or the affiliation by the respective University and consequently on the process of admission.

8. The Hon'ble Apex Court, has taken note of various circumstances in ***Chairman, Bhartia Education Society and Another Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh : (2011) 4 SCC 527***. The Hon'ble Apex Court, held in Para Nos.19, 22 & 24 as under:

"19. The purpose of "recognition" and "affiliation" is different. In the context of the NCTE Act, "affiliation" enables and permits an institution to send its students to participate in the public examinations conducted by the examining body and secure the qualification in the nature of degrees, diplomas, certificates. On the other hand, "recognition" is the licence to the institution to offer a course or training in teacher education. Prior to the NCTE Act, in the absence of an apex body to plan and coordinate development of teacher education system, respective regulation and proper maintenance of the norms and standards in the teacher education system, including grant of "recognition" were largely exercised by the State Government and universities/boards. After the enactment of the NCTE Act, the functions of NCTE as "recognising authority" and the examining bodies as "affiliating authorities" became crystallised, though their functions

overlap on several issues. The NCTE Act recognises the role of examining bodies in their sphere of activity.

22. Sub-section (6) of Section 14 no doubt mandates every examining body to grant affiliation to the institution on receipt of the order of NCTE granting recognition to such institution. This only means that recognition is a condition precedent for affiliation and that the examining body does not have any discretion to refuse affiliation with reference to any of the factors which have been considered by NCTE while granting recognition. For example, NCTE is required to satisfy itself about the adequate financial resources, accommodation, library, qualified staff, and laboratory required for proper functioning of an institution for a course or training in teacher education. ***Therefore, when recognition is granted by NCTE, it is implied that NCTE has satisfied itself on those aspects. Consequently, the examining body may not refuse affiliation on the ground that the institution does not have adequate financial resources, accommodation, library, qualified staff, or laboratory required for proper functioning of the institution. But this does not mean that the examining body cannot require compliance with its own requirements in regard to eligibility of candidates for admissions to courses or manner of admission of students or other areas falling within the sphere of the State Government and/or the examining body. Even the order of recognition dated 17-7-2000 issued by NCTE specifically contemplates the need for the institution to comply with and fulfil the requirement of the affiliating body and the State Government, in addition to the conditions of NCTE.***

24. ***The examining body can therefore impose its own requirements in regard to eligibility of students for admission to a course in addition to those prescribed by NCTE. The State Government and the examining body may also regulate the manner of admissions. As a consequence, if there is any irregularity in admissions or violation of the eligibility criteria prescribed by the examining body or any irregularity with reference to any of the matters regulated and governed by the examining body, the examining body may cancel the affiliation irrespective of the fact that the institution continues to enjoy the recognition of NCTE. Sub-section (6) of Section 14 cannot be interpreted in a manner so as to make the process of affiliation, an automatic rubber-stamping consequent upon recognition, without any kind of discretion in the examining body to examine whether the institution deserves affiliation or not, independent of the recognition. An institution requires the recognition of NCTE as well as affiliation with the examining body, before it can offer a course or training in teacher education or admit students to such course or training. Be that as it may."***

(emphasis supplied)

9. In ***Ahmedabad St. Xavier's College Society and Another Vs. State of Gujarat and Another : (1974) 1 SCC 717***, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed the importance of Educational Institutions. The Hon'ble Apex Court,

held that “the Educational institutions are temples of learning. The virtues of human intelligence are mastered and harmonized by education”.

10. In ***Andhra Kesari Educational Society Vs. Director of School Education and Others : (1989) 1 SCC 392***, the Hon’ble Apex Court, had the occasion to highlight the importance of a teacher and the provisions of teaching as such. The Hon’ble Apex Court stated that: “Though teaching is the last choice in the job market, the role of teachers is central to all processes of formal education. The teacher alone could bring out the skills and intellectual capabilities of students. He is the “engine” of the educational system”.

11. In ***State of Maharastra Vs. Vikas Sahebrao Roundale and Others : (1992) 4 SCC 435***, the Hon’ble Apex Court held that: “The teacher plays pivotal role in moulding the career, character and moral fibres and aptitude for educational excellence in impressive young children.”

12. In ***St. Jonh’s Teachers Training Institute (for women), Madurai and Others Vs. State of Tamil Nadu and Others : (1993) 3 SCC 595***, the Hon’ble Apex Court had dealt with the paramountcy of having Teacher Education Programme, and held that “the Teacher Education Programme has to be redesigned to bring in a system of education which can prepare the student-teacher to shoulder the responsibility of imparting education with a living dynamism”.

13. In ***Adarsh Shiksha Mahavidyalaya and others Vs. Subhash Rahangdale and others; (2012) 2 SCC 425***, the Hon'ble Apex Court had given seminal directions in Para 87 of the Judgment with regard to the conduct of inspections and grant of recognition by the NCTE.

14. In ***National Council for Teacher Education and Another Vs. Vaishnav Institute of Technology and Management : (2012) 5 SCC 139***, the Hon'ble Apex Court had the occasion to deal with the ill-effects of withdrawal of recognition. The Hon'ble Apex Court, in Para-28 has held as under:

“28. Derecognition or withdrawal of recognition of a recognised institution is a drastic measure. ***It results in dislocating the students, teachers and the staff. That is why, the Council has been empowered under Section 13 to have a constant vigil on the functioning of a recognised institution.*** On the recommendation of the Council after inspection, if a recognised institution does not rectify the deficiencies and continues to function in contravention of the provisions of the 1993 Act or the Rules or the Regulations, the Regional Committee under Section 17 has full power to proceed for withdrawal of recognition in accordance with the procedure prescribed therein.

15. The Hon'ble Apex Court, having recognised the fact that all the affiliated Colleges/affiliated Institutions should have common schedule for obtaining recognition from the NCTE and obtaining affiliation from the concerned University, had the occasion to fix the time schedule in the case of ***Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya Vs. State of U.P : (2013) 2 SCC 617***. Relevant paras of the Judgment are usefully extracted hereunder:

“87. Compelled by these circumstances and to ensure that there exists no ambiguity, uncertainty and confusion, we direct and prescribe the following Schedule upon a cumulative reading of the Regulations and judgments of this Court in relation to recognition and affiliation:

87.1.Schedule for Recognition and Affiliation

87.1.1.	Submission of applications for recognition in terms of Regulation 5(4)	1st September to 1st October of the year immediately preceding the relevant academic year
87.1.2.	Communication of deficiencies, shortcomings or any other discrepancy in the application submitted by the applicant to the applicant in terms of Regulation 7(1)	Within 45 days from the date of receipt of the applications
87.1.3.	Removal of such deficiencies by the applicant	Within 60 days from the date of receipt of communication
87.1.4.	Forwarding of copy of the application to the State Government/UT Administration for its recommendations/comments in terms of Regulation 7(2)	Within 90 days from the date of receipt of the application
87.1.5.	Recommendations/comments of the State Government/UT Administration to be submitted to the Regional Committee under Regulation 7(3)	Within 30 days from the date of issue of letter to it
87.1.6.	If recommendations/comments are not received within 30 days, the Regional Committee shall send to the State Government/UT Administration a reminder letter for submission of the	Within seven days from the date of expiry of the period of

	recommendations/comments	30 days
87.1.7.	State Government/UT Administration shall furnish the recommendations/comments	Within 15 days from the date of receipt of such reminder letter
87.1.8.	Intimation regarding inspection by the Regional Committee to the applicant under Regulation 7(4)	Within 10 days from final scrutiny of the application
87.1.9.	Report by the Inspection Committee under Regulation 7(5)	20 days thereafter
87.1.10.	Letter of intent to the institution with respect to grant or refusal of recognition in terms of Regulation 7(9)	10th of February of the succeeding year/relevant year
87.1.11.	Time to comply with certain specified conditions, in terms of Regulations 7(10) and 7(11)	20 days from the date of issuance of letter of intent
87.1.12.	Issuance of formal order of recognition	By 3rd March of each year
87.1.13.	Last date for submitting proposal for affiliation	By 10th March of each year
87.1.14.	Forwarding of proposal by the University to the State Government/UT Administration after inspection by expert team	By 10th March of each year
87.1.15.	Comments to be submitted by the State Government/UT Administration, if any	By 10th March of each year
87.1.16.	Final date for issuance/grant of affiliation for the relevant	By 10th March of

	academic year	each year
--	---------------	--------------

87.2. All notices/orders/requirements/letters in terms of the above schedule or under the provisions of the Act or terms and conditions of already granted recognition/affiliation shall be sent by the authority concerned by speed post/e-mail on the address given in the application for correspondence, etc. and shall be posted on the website of the Authority/Committee/Council/Government concerned.

87.3. The recognition and affiliation granted as per the above Schedule shall be applicable for the current academic year. For example, recognition granted up to 3-3-2013 and affiliation granted up to 10-5-2013 shall be effective for the academic year 2013-2014 i.e. the courses starting from 1-4-2013. For the academic year 2013-2014, no recognition shall be issued after 3-3-2013 and no affiliation shall be granted after 10-5-2013. Any affiliation or recognition granted after the above cut-off dates shall only be valid for the academic year 2014-2015.

87.4. We make it clear that no Authority/person/Council/Committee shall be entitled to vary the Schedule for any reason whatsoever. Any non-compliance shall amount to violating the orders of the Court.

88. In all the appeals and petitions before us, the basic issue is whether the university and the State Government were justified in rejecting the application or not granting application for affiliation on the ground that there was a cut-off date and/or the conditions of recommendation/affiliation had not been satisfied. In some cases, serious disputes have been raised with regard to the fulfilment of the conditions of recognition and/or affiliation. As far as the reason in relation to cut-off date is concerned, we cannot find any fault with the view taken by the authorities concerned. 10th of May has been provided as the cut-off date, after which no affiliation for the current academic year would be granted. This, being the law stated by this Court, is binding on all concerned, including any authority. The authorities have rightly acted in declining to entertain and/or refusing affiliation to the institutions being beyond the cut-off date. Adherence to the Schedule was the obligation of the authorities and the institutions cannot raise any grievance in that regard. The said time schedule must become operative in all respects and nobody should be permitted to carve out exceptions to this mandatory direction."

16. Despite the strong mandate rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court, it appears that the concerned Universities have not been following this schedule. It also appears that the NCTE has given a complete go-by to the schedule which is handed down by the Hon'ble Apex Court. Needless to state that as per Para-87 (extracted supra), any deviation from the time schedule would tantamount to the violating the Orders of the Hon'ble Apex Court. In

Paras 81 and 88 of the said Judgment, the Hon'ble Apex Court had also stated that the adherence to the schedule was the obligation of the authorities and the Institutions cannot raise any grievance in that regard. The Hon'ble Apex Court has also stated that the said time schedule must become operative in all respects and nobody should be permitted to carve out exceptions to this mandatory direction. Despite this mandatory injunction, it is unfortunate that the NCTE as well as the respective Universities have not been adhering to the Schedule.

17. The Andhra Pradesh State Council of Higher Education conducts the common entrance test and oversees the various phases of common counseling which is an integral part of common admissions undertaken for the purpose of admissions into various Courses. The Andhra Pradesh State Council of Higher Education would be required to oversee to ensure that all the Universities would follow the schedule handed down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya's* case. Insofar as the cases of the individual Institutions are concerned, since there are lapses on the part of the respective Universities in constituting and sending the Inspection Committees and also in view of the fact that the Verification Committees, instead of verifying whether the earlier deficiencies have been complied or not, have been pointing out the new defects and also making it mandatory to cure the new defects as a condition precedent for granting of affiliation, such conditions are unsustainable.

18. In the case of **Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya v. State of U.P.,; (2013) 2 SCC 617**, the Hon'ble Apex Court had dealt with situations relating to the establishment of new colleges which impart B.Ed and M.Ed courses. In the current batch of cases, majority of the institutions have already been earlier granted recognition by the NCTE and affiliation by the concerned University and they were being run. Several issues have arisen only in respect of the Academic year 2022-2023 is concerned. This Court has noticed that the Executive Councils of various Universities and also the Registrars of various Universities have issued proceeding placing the B.Ed colleges under 'Zero Admission' category for the Academic Year 2022-2023. As an illustration, this Court is relying on the facts relating to the W.P.No.2105 of 2023, wherein, the Executive Counsel of Adikavi Nannayya University (Respondent No.5 in W.P.No.2105 of 2023) has issued proceedings on 24.01.2023 listing out as many as 31 B.Ed Colleges and by stating that instead of *de-affiliation*, the Executive Council of Respondent No.5 University has placed these colleges (31 in number) under the 'Zero Admission' category. The Writ Petitioner's college (in W.P.No.2105 of 2023) is at Serial No.17 of the Proceedings issued by the Executive Council of Respondent No.5 University dated 24.01.2023 (Ex.P.1). A perusal of the entire Proceedings of the Executive Counsel dated 24.01.2023 would clearly indicate that the Inspection Committees have raised several objections on subjects that essentially fall for consideration only by the NCTE. It is noticed that the impugned Proceeding (in W.P.No.2105 of 2023) (Ex.P.1) is directly in

conflict with the dictum of the Hon'ble Apex court judgment in **Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya v. State of U.P: (2013) 2 SCC 617**. The NCTE, Andhra Pradesh State Council of Higher Education (APSCHE), all the Respondent Universities and the Colleges/Institutions imparting B.Ed and M.Ed courses are directed to minutely read and understand the import from Paragraphs 56 to 91 of the said Judgment in order to make the further hearing of these cases more meaningful.

19. Prima facie it appears to the Court that the Respondent No.5 University in this case has in fact transgressed into the domain that is reserved for NCTE under the Act, 1993 and the Rules and Regulations of the NCTE. Despite the fact that the Hon'ble Apex Court has drawn clear distinction as regards the Powers and functions with an intent to avoid overlapping of functions and in order to avoid the exercise of powers in the same area by two different bodies, it has been given a complete go by by the respective Universities in the State of Andhra Pradesh. Apart from blatant violation and non-adherence to the dictum of Hon'ble Apex Court in **Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya's** case, this Court has noticed that each of the University is acting as an island by itself in a misguided manner while the supervision by APSCHE is completely absent.

20. In the circumstances where, the conduct of annual Counseling after the completion of Education Common Entrance Test – 2022, there is a necessity for having a supervisory Authority on all the Universities limited to the smooth conduct of 'EdCET' as well as the consequential counseling. In

the state of Andhra Pradesh a supervisory body called the Andhra Pradesh State Council of Higher Education (APSCHE) has been established under the Andhra Pradesh State Council of Higher Education Act, 1988, under which said APSCHE empowered to perform certain ancillary and incidental functions for conduct of Common Entrance Test and the consequential counseling for admission into the courses, and would embrace within itself the power to supervise all the Universities under its jurisdiction to ensure that all the Universities would follow with one single schedule for effecting the admissions. The process of affiliations and process of conduct of Common Entrance Test and the consequential admission cannot be viewed as activities which have no connection with each other. Rather the process of grant of recognition by NCTE, grant of affiliation by an University and the conduct of the common Entrance Test and the consequent admission process are interrelated and interdependent. Therefore, a comprehensive schedule has to be formulated and fixed by the APSCHE to ensure that the entire process commencing from grant of affiliation up to the completion of admission process shall go on smoothly.

21. Conduct of the admission process is again dependent on the fact whether a particular college has been granted affiliation and thereby allowed to participate in the admission process. If the various Universities adopt a policy of notifying the defects without fixing a deadline in an endless manner, the colleges can never be able to participate in the admission process. Therefore, pointing out the defects cannot be an exercise that goes on in an

endless manner. The first inspection Committee that visits a college and identify certain defects and directs the respective college to cure such deficiencies can be looked into by the subsequent committee. If the defects are not cured, the subsequent committee can only report to the University about the possible action that can be initiated against the college for non-compliance of the defects/short comings which were notified earlier. During the verification, if the Verification Committee has pointed out new defects which were not pointed out by the earlier committee, the University cannot then impose a condition on the colleges that the admission will be allowed for the respective college only after curing of the fresh defects. If pointing out of defects go on endlessly, the private colleges can never be able to participate in the admission process.

22. Therefore, this Court is of the opinion that the subsequent Verification Committees can only ensure compliance of the earlier defects. This does not mean that the subsequent Verification Committees do not have the power to point out new defects, which may have missed the attention of the earlier Inspection Committee. The subsequent Verification Committee can certainly point out the defects but the University cannot impose a condition that the private Colleges will be allowed to participate in the admission process only if the new defects are cured.

23. This Court is constrained to make the above mentioned observations after having noticed in the impugned Proceeding (in W.P.No.2105 of 2023) that the deficiencies that were identified afresh were

also directed to be cured which is made as a condition precedent for permitting admissions. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Maa Vaishno Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya's** case had dealt with the powers of NCTE, the powers of the State Government and the University as the case may be concerning the grant of Recognition and grant of Affiliation at the time of commencement of an institution. The Hon'ble Apex Court had clearly stated that the actions and activities of the State Government or the University shall not touch upon the areas which are reserved for the NCTE. In this view of the matter, this Court is inclined to issue certain directions in respect of the inspections because the period within which the Inspections are to be concluded has a direct bearing on the admission process.

24. This Court is, therefore, inclined to tentatively issue the following general directions insofar as the Inspection Committees are concerned:

- (i) The Universities shall appoint an Inspection Committee within two weeks from the date of which the concerned college had communicated to the University that it has remitted the necessary fee for inspection.
- (ii) If the University does not appoint the Inspection Committee within two weeks from the date of receipt of information about the remittance of inspection fee, the University shall refund the inspection fee, but shall appoint the inspection committee within a week thereafter and bear the expenses for inspection. In other words, if the University causes delay in appointing the Inspection Committee, the remitted Inspection Fee of the College shall be refunded to the respective

college and the University shall bear such expenses for the visit of the Inspection team.

- (iii) The Inspection Committees, after inspecting the respective colleges, shall submit a report within one week to the University forthwith by marking a copy simultaneously to the respective college for curing of defects, if any. The concerned University shall also fix a reasonable time to the colleges for curing of defects and inform to the colleges.
- (iv) After granting reasonable time to the college to cure defects, the respective college shall inform the University about the compliance or curing of defects as pointed out by the Inspection Committee within the time granted for curing the defects.
- (v) Within one week from the date of the communication of receipt from the college, the University shall appoint an Inspection Committee, preferably with the same members who had inspected earlier. Only if the same constitution is unavailable, for the reasons so recorded in writing, the University may appoint 'new members' within one week in place of the earlier members of the Committee who are now unavailable.
- (vi) The Inspection Committee, appointed as aforesaid, shall verify whether the deficiencies pointed out earlier are cured or not by the respective colleges and prepare the Reports within one week thereafter.
- (vii) The said Committee is at liberty to point out new defects but non-compliance of such defects within the

scheduled time shall not be the reason for disallowing the admission process for the particular college.

- (viii) If the new defects are pointed out by the Inspection Committee, the respective Colleges shall be granted time to cure such defects before the commencement of next academic session. In other words, the curing of defects pointed out for the second time cannot be put as a condition for allowing admission process for the current academic year. This entire process shall be completed and be informed to the respective University at least six weeks prior to the commencement of EdCET for the current year.

25. The NCTE, Andhra Pradesh State Council of Higher Education (APSCHE), and all the Respondent Universities are directed to consider the above mentioned tentative directions for further consideration and modification as the case may be.

26. List this batch of matters on 03.07.2025. On the said date, all the above mentioned Universities, Institutions/Colleges shall clearly come out with written suggestions or modifications to the draft directions which are set out in Para No.24 of this common Order.

GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD, J

Dt: 09.05.2025
JKS/MNR