

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH PRINCIPAL SEAT AT
JABALPUR.**

215

WRIT PETITION NO. 18455 OF 2013.

PETITIONER: Shoshit Pedit Kalyan Vikas Parishad, Jail Road Rewa.
Through: it's Secretary, namely- Lavkush Prasad
Chourasiya, son of late Shri Ramrakhan Chourasiya, aged
about 57 years, R/o Village & Post-Jhinna, Tehsil-
Amarpatan, District-Satna. (M.P.)

Versus

- RESPONDENTS:**1. National Council for Teacher Education, Hans
Bhawan, Wing-II, 1, Bahadur Shah Jafar Marg, New
Delhi. Through: it's Under Secretary,
2. Western Regional Committee of National Council for
Teacher Education, Manas Bhawan, Shyamla Hills,
Bhopal-462002. Through: it's Regional Director.

**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF
INDIA**

1. **Particulars of the cause/order against which the petition is made:**

- (1) Date of the order: (a) 26-06-2012. Presented on 9/10/13
(b) 01-04-2013. By M. Chansasiya

(2) Passed in:

Presented by Assistant

(a) WRC/WRC APP 874/163/MP/2012-91700/92738.


(b) F No. 89-54/2013 Appeal/4th Meeting-2013 A 65204.

(3) Passed by: (a) The respondent No.2.

(b) The respondent No.1.

(4) **Subject matter in brief:**

That, this is the second round litigation on the same issue. That, the
first round litigation was decided on 28-01-2013 by this Hon'ble
Court with direction to the respondents. The petitioner in
compliance of Hon'ble Court order dated 28-01-2013 filed appeal







Copy

(214)

Vs.

DATE OF THE ORDER	ORDER
	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>W.P.No.18455/2013</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Shoshit Pidit Kalyan Vikas Parishad</i> <i>Vs.</i> <i>N.C.T.E. & anr.</i></p> <p><u>10/03/2014:</u></p> <p>Shri Manoj Chansoriya, learned counsel for the petitioner.</p> <p>Shri K.K.Singh, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Considering the fact that the orders impugned rejecting applications have been passed by the respondents in the light of clause 8.2 of the National Council for Teacher Education Admission Notification and Regulations issued vide Annexure-P/12, no indulgence into the matter is called for. However, for the subsequent academic year if the petitioner submits a fresh application seeking recognition for the courses, the respondents counsel are expected to consider the application in accordance with law, the regulation framed and decide it without being influenced by the rejection of the earlier applications.</p> <p>In view of the aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">C.C. as per rules.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> (Rajendra Menon) Judge</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> (Anil Sharma) Judge</p>