

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD**

FRIDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF JUNE  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**:PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI**

**I.A. No. 1 OF 2026**

**IN**

**WP NO: 19048, 19192, 19197 AND 19200 OF 2026**

**I.A. NO.1 OF 2026 IN W.P. NO. 19048 OF 2026**

**Between:**

1. St. Martins Children's Educational Society,, Having office at H. No. 145, Geetha Nagar, Ferozguda, Secunderabad. Rep. by its President Mr. Marri Laxman Reddy
2. St. Martins Engineering College, Dhulapally Village, Qutbullapur Mandal, R. R. District. Rep. by its Chairman Mr. Marri Laxman Reddy
3. Mr. Marri Laxman Reddy, S/o Bal Reddy, Aged 81 years, C/o St. Martins Children's Educational Society, Having office at H. No. 145, Geetha Nagar, Ferozguda, Secunderabad.

**...PETITIONERS**

(Petitioners in WP NO: 19048 OF 2026  
on the file of High Court)

**AND**

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Higher Education Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
2. Telangana Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee,, 2nd Floor, JNAandFAU Campus, Opp. Mahavir Hospital, Mahaveer Marg, Masab Tank, Hyderabad. Rep. by its Member Secretary.
3. Telangana State Council for Higher Education, 1 Floor, JNTU Masab Tank Campus, Mahaveer Marg, Opp. Mahavir Hospital, Masab Tank, Hyderabad. Represented by its Secretary
4. Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Hyderabad. Rep. by its Registrar.
5. The Convenor, TG EAPCET, 2026, Sankethika Vidya Bhavan Masab Tank Hyderabad 500 028.

**...RESPONDENTS**

(Respondents in-do-)

**Counsel for the Petitioner** : **SRI TARUN G. REDDY**  
**Counsel for the Respondents no. 1,3and 5** : **GP FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**  
**Counsel for the Respondent no.2** : **SRI G. CHANDRA SHEKAR**  
**REDDY, Standing Counsel for**  
**TAFRC.**  
**Counsel for the Respondent no. 4** : **SRI PRABHAKAR PERI, Standing**  
**Counsel for JNTU.**

Petition under Section 151 of C.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner Institution to collect a fee of Rs. 1,00,000/- per annum for the B.Tech course for the block period of A.Y. 2025-26 to A.Y. 2027-28, including by suspending the effect and operation of the recommendations of Respondent No. 2 dated 29.10.2025 and 31.10.2025 and G.O. Ms. No. 06 dated 04.03.2026 issued by Respondent No. 1, in so far as the Petitioner Institution is concerned and to the extent of permitting the Petitioner Institution to collect a fee of Rs. 1,00,000/- as was prevailing for the previous block period, pending disposal of WP No 19048 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

**I.A. NO.1 OF 2026 IN W.P. NO. 19192 OF 2026**

**Between:**

1. Marri Educational Socieity, Having office at 1-9-49 Sowjanya Colony New Bowenpally Secunderabad Rep by its Executive Member Mr M Dhiren Reddy
2. Marri Laxman Reddy Institute of Technology and Management, Having office at Marri Educational Societys Group of Institutions Dundigal Village Qutbullapur Mandal Rangareddy District Telangana Rep by its Executive Member Mr M Dhiren Reddy
3. Mr. M. Dhiren Reddy, S/o M. Rajshekar Reddy.

**...PETITIONERS**

(Petitioners in WP NO: 19192 OF 2026  
on the file of High Court)

**AND**

1. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary Higher Education Department Secretariat Buildings Hyderabad
2. Telangana Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee, 2nd Floor JNAFAU Campus Opp Mahavir Hospital Mahaveer Marg Masab Tank Hyderabad Rep by its Member Secretary
3. Telangana State Council for Higher Education, 1st Floor JNTU Masab Tank Campus Mahaveer Marg Opp Mahavir Hospital Masab Tank Hyderabad Represented by its Secretary
4. Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Hyderabad, Rep. by its Registrar.
5. The Convenor TG EAPCET 2026, Sankethika Vidya Bhavan Masab Tank Hyderabad.

**...RESPONDENTS**

(Respondents in-do-)

**Counsel for the Petitioner** : **SRI TARUN G. REDDY**  
**Counsel for the Respondents no. 1,3and 5** : **GP FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**  
**Counsel for the Respondent no.2** : **SRI G. CHANDRA SHEKAR**  
**REDDY, Standing Counsel for**  
**TAFRC.**  
**Counsel for the Respondent no. 4** : **SRI PRABHAKAR PERI, Standing**  
**Counsel for JNTU**

Petition under Section 151 of C.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner Institution to collect a fee of Rs 1,00,000/- per annum for the B. Tech course for the block period of AY 2025-26 to AY 2027-28 including by suspending the effect and operation of the recommendations of Respondent No. 2 dated 29.10.2025 and 31.10.2025 and GO Ms. No. 06 dated 04.03.2026 issued by Respondent No 1 insofar as the Petitioner Institution is concerned and to the extent of permitting the Petitioner Institution to collect a fee of Rs 1,00,000/- as was prevailing for the previous block period pending disposal of WP No 19192 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

**I.A. NO.1 OF 2026 IN W.P. NO. 19197 OF 2026**

**Between:**

1. Maruthi Educational Society, Having office at Dundigal, Hyderabad. Rep. by its Secretary Mr. Chilumula Sathi Reddy.
2. Institute of Aeronautical Engineering, Having office at Dundigal Village, Qutbullapur Mandal, Sy. No. 483, 484, Rangareddy District, Hyderabad. Rep. by its Correspondent Mr. Chilumula Sathi Reddy.
3. Mr. Chilumula Sathi Reddy, S/o Pulla Reddy Chilumula, Aged 79 years, R/o Dundigal Village, Qutbullapur Mandal, Sy. No. 483, 484, Rangareddy District, Hyderabad

**...PETITIONERS**

(Petitioners in WP NO: 19197 OF 2026  
on the file of High Court)

**AND**

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Higher Education Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
2. Telangana Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee, 2nd Floor, JNAandFAU Campus, Opp. Mahavir Hospital, Mahaveer Marg, Masab Tank, Hyderabad. Rep. by its Member Secretary.
3. Telangana State Council for Higher Education, 1st Floor, JNTU Masab Tank Campus, Mahaveer Marg, Opp. Mahavir Hospital, Masab Tank, Hyderabad. Represented by its Secretary.
4. Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Hyderabad. Rep. by its Registrar.

5. The Convenor, TG EAPCET 2026, Sankethika Vidya Bhavan Masab Tank Hyderabad 500 028.

**...RESPONDENTS**  
(Respondents in-do-)

**Counsel for the Petitioner** : **SRI TARUN G. REDDY**  
**Counsel for the Respondents no. 1,3and 5** : **GP FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**  
**Counsel for the Respondent no.2** : **SRI G. CHANDRA SHEKAR**  
**REDDY, Standing Counsel for**  
**TAFRC.**  
**Counsel for the Respondent no. 4** : **SRI PRABHAKAR PERI, Standing**  
**Counsel for JNTU**

Petition under Section 151 of C.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner Institution to collect a fee of Rs. 1,01,000/- per annum for the B.Tech course for the block period of A.Y. 2025-26 to A.Y. 2027-28, including by suspending the effect and operation of the recommendations of Respondent No. 2 dated 29.10.2025 and 31.10.2025 and G.O. Ms. No. 06 dated 04.03.2026 issued by Respondent No. 1, insofar as the Petitioner Institution is concerned and to the extent of permitting the Petitioner Institution to collect a fee of Rs. 1,01,000/- as was prevailing for the previous block period, pending disposal of WP No 19197 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

**I.A. NO.1 OF 2026 IN W.P. NO. 19200 OF 2026**

**Between:**

1. KMR Educational Socceity, Having office at Plot No. 48, Sowjanya Colony, Bowenpally, Secunderabad. Rep. by its Executive Member Mr. M. Dhiren Reddy.
2. MLR Institute of Technology, Having office at Laxma Reddy Avenue. Dundigal Village, Qutbullapur Mandal, Rangareddy District, Telangana. Rep. by its Executive Member Mr. M. Dhiren Reddy.
3. Mr. M. Dhiren Reddy, S/o M. Rajshekar Reddy, Aged 26 years, R/o Plot No. 48, Sowjanya Colony, Bowenpally, Secunderabad

**...PETITIONERS**  
(Petitioners in WP NO: 19200 OF 2026  
on the file of High Court)

**AND**

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Higher Education Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
2. Telangana Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee, 2nd Floor, JNA and FAU Campus, Opp. Mahavir Hospital, Mahaveer Marg, Masab Tank, Hyderabad. Rep. by its Member Secretary.
3. Telangana State Council for Higher Education, 1st Floor, JNTU Masab Tank Campus, Mahaveer Marg, Opp. Mahavir Hospital, Masab Tank, Hyderabad. Represented by its Secretary.

4. Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Hyderabad. Rep. by its Registrar.
5. The Convenor, TG EAPCET 2026, Sankethika Vidya Bhavan Masab Tank Hyderabad - 500 028.

**...RESPONDENTS**  
(Respondents in-do-)

<b>Counsel for the Petitioner</b>	<b>: SRI TARUN G. REDDY</b>
<b>Counsel for the Respondents no. 1,3and 5</b>	<b>: GP FOR HIGHER EDUCATION</b>
<b>Counsel for the Respondent no.2</b>	<b>: SRI G. CHANDRA SHEKAR REDDY, Standing Counsel for TAFRC.</b>
<b>Counsel for the Respondent no. 4</b>	<b>: SRI PRABHAKAR PERI, Standing Counsel for JNTU</b>

Petition under Section 151 of C.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner Institution to collect a fee of Rs. 1,10,000/- per annum for the B.Tech course for the block period of A.Y. 2025-26 to A.Y. 2027-28, including by suspending the effect and operation of the recommendations of Respondent No. 2 dated 29.10.2025 and 31.10.2025 and G.O. Ms. No. 06 dated 04.03.2026 issued by Respondent No. 1, insofar as the Petitioner Institution is concerned and to the extent of permitting the Petitioner Institution to collect a fee of Rs. 1,10,000/- as was prevailing for the previous block period, pending disposal of WP No 19200 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

The court while directing issue of notice to the Respondents herein to show cause as to why this application should not be complied with, made the following.(The receipt of this order will be deemed to be the receipt of notice in the case).

**COMMON ORDER:**

**Heard Mr. Tarun G.Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. Prabhakar Peri, learned Standing Counsel for JNTU and Mr. G.Chandra Shekar Reddy, learned Standing Counsel for TAFRC.**

**Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners-institutions are AICTE-approved and affiliated educational institutions in the State of Telangana imparting Engineering and Technical courses. For the block period 2025-28, TAFRC, the petitioners-institutions proposed a fee of Rs.1,85,000/- in W.P.No.19048 of 2026, Rs.1,45,000/- in W.P.No.19192 of 2026, Rs.1,61,000/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026 and Rs.1,50,000/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026. After considering the proposals and conducting personal hearings on 29.10.2025 and 30.10.2025, initially the TAFRC**

determined/approved higher fee structures of Rs.1,55,000/- in W.P.No.19048 of 2026, Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19192 of 2026, Rs.1,40,000/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026 and Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026. However, without issuing any further notice or affording an opportunity of personal hearing, the Government issued G.O.Ms.No.6, dated 04.03.2026 notifying substantially reduced fees of Rs.90,800/- in W.P.No.19048 of 2026, Rs.88,500/- in W.P.No.19192 of 2026, Rs.97,500/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026 and Rs.90,200/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026.

Learned counsel further submits that contrary to the recommendations, dated 29.10.2025 and 31.10.2025, fees was reduced by TAFRC, which is arbitrary, illegal and contrary to the statutory scheme. He further submits that the recommendations were made without assigning reasons, without any finding of profiteering or capitation fee and without granting the petitioners any notice or opportunity of hearing, thereby violating the principles of natural justice. He further submits that once the proposals of the petitioners-institutions have been scrutinized in accordance with Rule 4 of the Telangana Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee Rules, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Rules') and after TAFRC satisfied itself that the fees so determined did not involve any element of profiteering or capitation, TAFRC ought to have recommended the said fees to respondent No.1 for the purpose of notification, in terms of Rule 4(v) of the Rules.

Learned counsel further submits that the TAFRC, without assigning any reasons whatsoever, reduced the furtherance factor that had consistently been applied to the petitioners-institutions during the earlier block periods. Several expenditure heads, which are mandatory for maintaining the educational standards prescribed by AICTE, have been disallowed. He further submits that TAFRC is empowered only to identify and eliminate components of a proposed fee structure that reflect profiteering or collection of a capitation fee. It is not authorized to disregard or disallow genuine expenditure that is reasonably incurred and necessary for the administration, maintenance, growth and advancement of the institutions.

Learned counsel further submits that the statement of disallowances contains new heads of expenditure which had never previously been treated as disallowable by TAFRC during earlier block periods. TAFRC also enhanced the disallowances in comparison with the proceedings conducted in February and March, 2025, without issuing any proper notice or assigning valid reasons. He further submits that the student strength considered in the evaluation worksheets includes lateral entry admissions for

the block period in a manner contrary to the actual sanctioned intake and actual lateral entry admissions of the institutions, which has a direct and substantial bearing on the fee fixation exercise, as it artificially reduces the per student expenditure by spreading the legitimate expenditure of the institutions over a larger number of students than those actually admitted.

Learned counsel further submits that the errors are apparent on the face of the record. He further submits that every private unaided educational institution must have the freedom to fix its own fee structure after taking into account the need to generate funds for running the institution and providing facilities necessary for the benefit of the students. In fact, the institutions are also empowered to collect surplus which can be used for the betterment and growth of the institutions.

In support of his contentions, learned counsel relied on the judgment of the erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh in *Consortium of Engineering Colleges Managements Association (CECMA), Hyderabad and others v. Government of Andhra Pradesh and others* [2011 SCC OnLine AP 924] and drawn attention of this Court to paragraph No.147, wherein, it was held as follows:

*“147. In the light of the principles evolving from TMA Pai Foundation’s case (supra), to PA Inamdar’s case (supra) and to sustain the provisions of Section 7 and Rule 4, we consider it appropriate to read down these provisions; (i) as enabling the AFRC to consider institution-specific fee proposals, course-wise on the bases of the parameters indicated in clauses (a) to (e) and (g) of sub-rule (iv) of Rule 4; (ii) to analyze fee proposals to verify whether they incorporate or camouflage any profiteering or capitation fee; and (iii) to approve, modify or alter the fee structure proposed by each institution, only for the purpose of excising pro tanto any element of profiteering or capitation fee. If fee proposals of an institution, duly substantiated by relevant date, audited accounts and balance-sheets, do not incorporate elements of profiteering or capitation fee (on analyses of the proposals within the contours of the guidelines in Rule 4), the AFRC must accept the same. The AFRC cannot transgress the law declared in TMA Pai Foundation’s case (supra), Islamic Academy of Education’s case (supra) and PA Inamdar’s case (supra), (that every institution enjoys the operational autonomy to devise its own fee structure) by resorting to a misconceived*

*mission, of formulating a common fee structure for private unaided educational institutions.”*

Learned counsel further submits that the action of the TAFRC is contrary and violative to the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforesaid judgments. He further submits that if the fee structure fixed by the TAFRC under G.O.Ms.No.6, dated 04.03.2026 i.e., Rs.90,800/- in W.P.No.19048 of 2026, Rs.88,500/- in W.P.No.19192 of 2026, Rs.97,500/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026 and Rs.90,200/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026 is continued throughout the block period from A.Y. 2025-26 to A.Y. 2027-28, the petitioners would incur a deficit and by the end of the said block period, the petitioners would be in a negative financial position. He further submits that the counselling process has already commenced today.

Learned counsel further submits that in a batch of similar matters challenging the reduction of fees, pursuant to the recommendations of TAFRC and the consequential issuance of G.O.Ms.No.6, dated 04.03.2026, this Court had remanded the matters to TAFRC for fresh consideration, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the institutions concerned. However, TAFRC, issued letters, dated 16.06.2026, in a summary manner informing the concerned institutions that the fee structure notified under G.O.Ms.No.6, dated 04.03.2026 holds good within one day of hearing, without duly considering the objections raised by the petitioners. He further submits that even if the present matters are remanded to TAFRC for fresh consideration, no effective relief would ensue as the fee structure is likely to remain unchanged.

Hence, learned counsel prayed this Court to permit the petitioners-institutions to collect the fee fixed for the previous block period i.e., A.Y. 2022-23 to 2024-25 i.e., Rs.1,00,000/- in W.P.Nos.19048 and 19192 of 2026, Rs.1,10,000/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026 and Rs.1,01,000/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026, pending disposal of the present writ petitions and further requested this Court to direct the Convener, TGEAPCET, to display in the official website that the fees may be increased to Rs.1,55,000/- in W.P.No.19048 of 2026, Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19192 of 2026, Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026 and Rs.1,40,000/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026, which was tentatively arrived at by the TAFRC at the time of personal hearings conducted on 29.10.2025 and 30.10.2025, subject to the result of the present writ petitions and communicate the same to prospective students seeking admission into the petitioners-institutions, clearly indicating that the fees may be increased to Rs.1,55,000/- in W.P.No.19048 of 2026, Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19192 of

2026, Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026 and Rs.1,40,000/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026, which was tentatively arrived at by the TAFRC at the time of personal hearings conducted on 29.10.2025 and 30.10.2025, subject to the result of the present writ petitions.

On the other hand, learned Standing Counsel for TAFRC opposed for the grant of any interim relief to the petitioners-institutions.

Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, in view of the law laid down by the erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh in the aforesaid judgment and considering the fact that the counselling process has already commenced and even if the matters are remanded to TAFRC for fresh consideration, no effective relief would ensue as the fee structure is likely to remain unchanged, as an interim measure, this Court is inclined to issue following directions:

(i) The petitioners-institutions are permitted to collect the fee fixed for the previous block period A.Y. 2022-23 to 2024-25 i.e., Rs.1,00,000/- in W.P.Nos.19048 and 19192 of 2026, Rs.1,10,000/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026 and Rs.1,01,000/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026, for the A.Y. 2026-27, pending disposal of the present writ petitions.

(ii) The Convener, TGEAPCET, is directed to display in the official website that the fees may be increased to Rs.1,55,000/- in W.P.No.19048 of 2026, Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19192 of 2026, Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026 and Rs.1,40,000/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026, for the A.Y. 2026-27, which was tentatively arrived at by the TAFRC at the time of personal hearings conducted on 29.10.2025 and 30.10.2025, subject to the result of the present writ petitions.

(iii) The Convener, TGEAPCET, shall communicate the present interim order to the prospective students seeking admission for the A.Y. 2026-27 into the petitioners-institutions, clearly indicating that the fees payable by the students may be increased to Rs.1,55,000/- in W.P.No.19048 of 2026, Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19192 of 2026, Rs.1,35,000/- in W.P.No.19200 of 2026 and Rs.1,40,000/- in W.P.No.19197 of 2026, which was tentatively arrived at by the TAFRC at the time of personal hearings conducted on 29.10.2025 and 30.10.2025, subject to the result of the present writ petitions.

Sd/- T.SRINIVASA REDDY  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

  
SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary, Higher Education Department, Secretariat Buildings, State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Member Secretary, Telangana Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee,, 2nd Floor, JNAandFAU Campus, Opp. Mahavir Hospital, Mahaveer Marg, Masab Tank, Hyderabad.
3. The Secretary, Telangana State Council for Higher Education, 1 Floor, JNTU Masab Tank Campus, Mahaveer Marg, Opp. Mahavir Hospital, Masab Tank, Hyderabad.
4. The Registrar, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Hyderabad.
5. The Convenor, TG EAPCET, 2026, Sankethika Vidya Bhavan Masab Tank Hyderabad 500 028.

**(Addressees 1 to 5 BY SPAD)**

6. One CC to SRI TARUN G. REDDY Advocate [OPUC]
7. Two CCs to GP FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
8. One spare copy

**HIGH COURT**

**JS, J**

**DATED: 19-06-2026**



**ORDER**

**I.A. No. 1 OF 2026  
IN  
WP NO: 19048, 19192, 19197 AND 19200 OF 2026**

**DIRECTION**