



\$~SB-8

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

% *Date of Decision : 15.06.2026*

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1054/2026 & CM APPL. 38844/2026**

R.S.C. COLLEGE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Akhilesh K. Srivastava, Mr.  
Rishabh Kumar & Ms. Ritu Kumari,  
Advocates (through VC).

versus

MS. SUKHGEET KAUR, MEMBER SECARETARY AND  
ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor & Mr. Nandeesh  
Nanda, Advocates for Respondent  
Nos.1 & 2.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA**

**TEJAS KARIA, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present Petition has been filed under Section 11 And 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India for wilful and deliberate disobedience of the order dated 29.01.2026 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 1207/2026 titled '*R.S.C. College vs National Council For Teacher Education & Anr*'.

2. It is the case of the Petitioner that the Petitioner was granted recognition by the Western Regional Committee, National Council for Teacher Education ("NCTE") *vide* order dated 27.05.2005 to run the B.Ed. course with an annual intake of 100 seats. The Petitioner, thereafter, sought



shifting of the premises from which the said course was being conducted and submitted an application on 13.09.2007 and thereafter on 23.10.2013 to the Regional Director, NCTE, seeking permission for shifting of premises (“**Application**”). It is further the case of the Petitioner that despite the said Application and subsequent representations, no decision was taken on the Application, which constrained the Petitioner to approach this Court by way of W.P.(C) 1207/2026. This Court *vide* order dated 29.01.2026 passed in W.P.(C) 1207/2026 directed the NCTE to consider the Application expeditiously and, in any case, within six weeks from the date of the said order.

3. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that, despite expiry of the six weeks’ time granted *vide* order dated 29.01.2026 in W.P.(C) 1207/2026, the Application filed by the Petitioner was not decided. Accordingly, the Petitioner filed CONT. CAS(C) 469/2026 alleging wilful disobedience / non-compliance with the directions contained in the order dated 29.01.2026 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 1207/2026. This Court *vide* order dated 20.03.2026 passed in CONT. CAS(C) 469/2026, *inter alia*, observed that:

*“6. It is submitted that the list of documents that are required from the petitioner shall be submitted to the petitioner within a period of three days from today. Upon submission of these documents, the decision making process shall be expedited and completed latest within a period of four weeks therefrom.*

*7. It is made clear that in case the requisite decision is not taken within the aforesaid period, the same shall be construed as wilful and egregious breach on the part of the respondent no.2 of the directions passed by this Court entailing action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.”*



4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that, notwithstanding the order dated 20.03.2026 passed in CONT. CAS(C) 469/2026, the Respondents had failed to decide the Application, which had remained pending for several years.

5. Learned counsel for the Respondents submitted that the Petitioner had incorrectly impleaded Respondent No. 1, namely, the Member Secretary, NCTE, in the array of parties, whereas matters relating to shifting of premises was considered by Respondent No. 2. It was further submitted on behalf of the Respondents that, insofar as the Application is concerned, a decision had already been taken on 02.06.2026 in a meeting held on the said date, whereby the Application was rejected, and that the said decision had been communicated to the Petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the Respondents further submitted that the Petitioner had, in fact, shifted its premises in 2006 and that, by way of the Application, it was seeking retrospective approval. It was also submitted that, pursuant to the order dated 20.03.2026 passed by this Court in CONT. CAS(C) 469/2026, show cause notices were issued to the Petitioner and, thereafter, upon consideration of the response and documents furnished by the Petitioner, a decision on the Application was taken on 02.06.2026. It was, accordingly, contended that there had been no wilful disobedience of the orders passed by this Court.

7. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the prescribed procedure for consideration of an application seeking shifting of premises requires the NCTE, upon receipt of such application, first to carry out an inspection of the premises and, in the event any deficiency is found, to issue



a show cause notice. It was submitted that, in the present case, the decision dated 02.06.2026 had been taken without any inspection of the premises having been conducted.

8. Be that as it may, since the Respondents have now taken a decision on the Application on 02.06.2026, the validity of the said decision cannot be examined in the present contempt proceedings.

9. At this stage, when the learned Counsel for the Petitioner was asked whether the Petitioner wished to pursue the present Petition in view of the decision dated 02.06.2026 having been taken on the Application, learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner would avail of the remedy of assailing the said decision in appropriate proceedings and prayed that the present Petition be disposed of.

10. In view of the aforesaid statement, nothing further survives for consideration in the present Petition. The present Petition is, accordingly, disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

**TEJAS KARIA, J**  
**(VACATION JUDGE)**

**JUNE 15, 2026**

*hK*