

**BEFORE THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY CONSTITUTED UNDER THE
MADHYA PRADESH NIJI VYAVSAYIK SHIKSHAN SANSTHA (PRAVESH KA
VINIYAMAN AVAM SHULK KA NIRDHARAN) ADHINIYAM, 2007, (AS
AMENDED)**

Presided over by Justice Prakash Chandra Gupta.

Appeal No. 55/2025

**R.D. Gardi Medical College,
Ujjain
Muser832759** **Appellant**

V E R S U S

**The Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee,
Bhopal** **Respondent**

**ORDER
(Date: 6th January, 2026)**

1. This appeal preferred by the appellant under section 10 of Madhya Pradesh Niji Vyavsayik Shikshan Sansthan (Pravesh Ka Vinyaman Evam Shulk Ka Nirdharan) Adhiniyam 2007, (hereinafter referred as Act, 2007) against the impugned order dated 14.08.2025 passed by the Admission and Fees Regulatory Committee (hereinafter referred as AFRC) whereby the fee for the appellant institute was fixed at Rs. 15,00,000/- per student per year for M.D./M.S.(Clinical) course being run by it, for academic sessions 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28.
2. It is submitted on behalf of the appellant that he claimed fee for the course at Rs. 18,70,000/- per student per year for academic session 2025-26, Rs. 20,57,000/- per student per year for academic session 2026-27 and Rs. 22,62,700/- per student per year for academic session 2027-28 and average fee of Rs. 20,63,2000/- per student per year. He had uploaded financial data on portal of the respondent. It is further submitted that as per balance sheet for the F.Y. 2023-24 total expenditure of Rs. 4,10,13,721/- under the heads of 'Advertisement, Advocate Fee, Annual

Function, Repairs (Building), Repairs (Electrical), Repairs (Furniture), Repairs (Machine & Equipment), Camping Expenses, CGST, SGST, Consultancy (Prof Chgs.), Janani Sahyog Yojna, Mess Charges (Patient), Mess Charges (PG), Website Expenses' are not taken into consideration by AFRC. It is also submitted that apart from that several expenditures approved for the AFRC has regulated less fee then expenditure of the appellant college. It is further submitted that as per order of state Government of Madhya Pradesh, the appellant paid stipend to the PG students, but has not awarded proper expenditure on stipend. In this situation, the appellant is unable to run its course properly. Therefore, its fee may be enhanced from Rs. 15,00,000/- per student per year to Rs. 16,50,000/- per student per year.

3. On the other hand, it is submitted on behalf of the respondent that the AFRC has properly considered all the documents uploaded by the appellant on its portal. It is further submitted that the respondent has allowed Rs. 1,80,019/- out of Rs. 9,59,437/- under the head of 'Advertisement', Rs. 7,031/- out of Rs. 37,471/- under the head of 'Advocate Fee', Rs. 85,149/- out of Rs. 4,53,813/- under the head of 'Annual Function', Rs. 69,21,832/- out of Rs. 1,52,42,621/- under the head of 'Repairs (Building)', Rs. 3,93,089/- out of Rs. 20,95,014/- under the head of 'Repairs (Electrical)', Rs. 2,35,895/- out of Rs. 12,57,231/- under the head of 'Repairs (Furniture)', Rs. 4,94,240/- out of Rs. 26,34,108/- under the head of 'Machine & Equipment', Rs. 73,656/- out of Rs. 3,92,556/- under the head of 'Camp Expenses', Rs. 25,14,476/- out of Rs. 59,77,220/- under the head of 'Consultancy (Prof Chgs.)', Rs. 25,14,147/- out of Rs. 52,22,162/- under the head of 'Mess Charges (Patient)', Rs. 19,55,379/- out of Rs. 65,38,300/- under the head of 'Mess Charges (PG)'. Expenditure under the head of 'CGST, SGST, Janani Sahyog Yojna and Website Expenses' has been disallowed. It is also submitted that in support of the aforesaid expenditure as alleged by the appellant, no

documents have been uploaded by the appellant and all these expenditures are much excessive. Therefore, entire expenditure cannot be allowed by the AFRC. Apart from that after considering the entire expenditure, 15% amount under head of 'Growth and Development', 6% inflation on the expenditure incurred in academic session 2023-24 and 12.49% inflation for academic session 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28. Along with this, 10% amount of accreditation has been awarded in favor of the appellant. It is also submitted that as per calculation of its Chartered Accountant, fee comes to Rs. 13,93,500/- per student per year, but looking to all the expenditures, the respondent calculated fee at Rs. 15,00,000/- per student per year. It is further submitted that the respondent has regulated fee more than the fee calculated by its Chartered Accountant. Therefore, the respondent has not committed any error in regulating fee of the appellant's institution and the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

4. I have heard both the parties. Perused the record.
5. Considering the documents filed by the appellant, it appears that the respondent has properly considered all the documents filed by the appellant. The respondent also considered all the expenditures shown by the appellant in its financial data and the respondent regulated fee more than the fee calculated by its Chartered Accountant. Therefore, it appears that the AFRC has regulated reasonable fee and has not committed any error while regulating the fee. Hence, the appeal has no force and liable to be dismissed and dismissed accordingly.

Accordingly, the appeal stands disposed of.

**(Justice Prakash Chandra Gupta)
Appellate Authority**