ITEM NO.102 COURT NO.2 SECTION X
(M)

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO(s). 89 OF 2011

JAIPURIA INST.OF MGT.& ORS. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

ALL INDIA COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL EDU.&ORS Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for directions and office report))

WITH

W.P(C)No.90/2011
(With Appl.(s) for stay and with office report)

W.P(C)No.92/2011
(With Appl.(s) for stay and with office report)

T.P.(C) No.510/2011
(With Appl.(s) for stay and with office report)

T.P.(C) No.511/2011
(With Appl.(s) for stay and with office report)

T.P.(C) No.514/2011
(With Appl.(s) for stay and with office report)

SLP(C)No.15584/2011
(With Office Report)

W.P(C)No.325/2011
(With Appl.(s) for ex-Parte stay and with office report)

W.P(C)No.258/2012
(With Appl.(s) for interim Relief and bring on record subsequent event and with Prayer for Interim Relief and Office Report)

W.P(C)No.451/2012
(With Appl.(s) for interim Relief and permission to file lengthy list of dates and with office report)

Date: 16/01/2014 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.M. LODHA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MADAN B. LOKUR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KURIAN JOSEPH

For Petitioner(s)
Mr. Vinay Garg,Adv.

Mr. Nikhil Goel, Adv.

Mr. Renjith. B, Adv.

Mr. Navin Prakash, Adv.

Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Adv.
Mr. Vikramaditya, Adv. for
Mrs Lalita Kaushik, Adv.

Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, Adv.

Mr. Romy Chacko, Adv.

For Respondent(s)
Mr. Rakesh Dwivedi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Navin Prakash,Adv.
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Mamta Tiwari, Adv.

Mr. R. Gopalakrishnan ,Adv

Mr. Gopal Singh, Adv.

Mr. Romy Chacko, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Interlocutory Application No. 2 of 2014
in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 92 of 2011

By this application, the applicants/petitioners have prayed for the following reliefs :

(i) Direct the Respondent AICTE to continue to operate as the regulatory authority of the PGDM institutions for the Academic Year 2014-2015 and to take all necessary steps

towards facilitating approvals as necessary;

(ii) Direct the Union of India to consider the establishment of a separate regulatory body for the PGDM institutions in the interregnum;

(iii) Pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Mr. Rakesh Dwivedi, learned senior counsel for the All Indian Council for Technical Education (for short, 'AICTE') submits that AICTE continues to operate as a regulatory authority of the PGDM institutions.

In this view of the matter, we do not feel that it is necessary to issue any direction that AICTE continues to operate as regulatory authority of the PGDM institutions for the Academic Year 2014-2015 as prayed for by the applicants/petitioners.

No other prayer deserves any consideration.

Interlocutory Application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Rajesh Dham)
Court Master

(Renu Diwan)
Court Master