

(2020) 11 DEL CK 0224

In the Delhi High Court

Case No : Letter Patent Appeal No. 358 Of 2020

Global Educationa L And Social Trust

APPELLANT

Vs

Council Of Architecture Through Its Registrar & Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 26-11-2020

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2020) 11 DEL CK 0224

Hon'ble Judges : Siddharth Mridul, J; Talwant Singh, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Yashpal Rangi, Naveen R. Nath, Naresh Kaushik

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Faculty Post,"Faculty Requirement

as per 1983

Regulations","Faculty available as

per institution","Qualified faculty

available as per 1983

Regulations",Deficit of Faculty

Principal,1,1,1,0

Principal,5,1,1,4

Associate Professor,10,1,1,9

Assistant Professor,19,10,2,17

to the order dated 05.10.2020, which is the subject matter of the challenge in the subject writ petition." ,,,,

6. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant and

perused the impugned Order dated 11.11.2020 and in particular, the",,,,,
circumstance that, the appellant admittedly did not apply for extension of
approval for the subject course for the academic year 2019-20, as well as",,,,,
the circumstance that, it is stated to have been imparting deficient education in
the absence of the requisite faculty, as well as, the situation attendant",,,,,
to the effect that the National Aptitude Test of Architecture (for short â??
NATAâ??), which is the sine qua non for admission of students to the",,,,,
subject course, has already been held and no admission can therefore, be made
by the appellant, at this stage, we are of the considered view that the",,,,,
Appeal is devoid of merit and liable to be rejected.,,,,,

7. Before parting, it is incumbent upon this Court to point out that the scope of
judicial review in relation to expert bodies dealing with the accreditation",,,,,
of institutions imparting education and professional courses, is within a narrow
compass. The Court can interfere with the legality of the opinion",,,,,
rendered by such expert bodies, but cannot substitute its opinion for that of the
expert bodies in relation to essential pre-qualifications requisite under",,,,,
the law, unless and until the decision of an expert body is manifest with
Wednesbury unreasonableness. In other words, the Court does not sit in",,,,,
appeal over the decision of the expert body, on requirements pertaining to
eligibility of educational institutions, for affiliation/recognition, unless they",,,,,
have acted contrary to law or their decision is characterized by perversity.,,,,,

8. We are therefore, of the view that, the impugned interlocutory order dated
11.11.2020, does not suffer from any irregularity or so as to warrant any",,,,,
interference in the present Appeal.,,,,,

9. The Letters Patent Appeal is accordingly dismissed. The pending applications
also stand disposed of.,,,,,