

**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. 96/2025**

**Rani Dullaiya Smriti Ayurved P.G. College Hospital,  
Bhopal  
Muser1812753**

**..... Appellant**

**V E R S U S**

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

**..... Respondent**

**ORDER**

**(Date: 12<sup>th</sup> January, 2026)**

1. This appeal preferred by the appellant under section 10 of Madhya Pradesh Niji Vyavsayik Shikshan Sansthan (Pravesh Ka Viniyaman Evam Shulk Ka Nirdharan) Adhiniyam 2007, (hereinafter referred as Act, 2007) against the impugned order dated 01.10.2025 passed by the Admission and Fees Regulatory Committee (hereinafter referred as AFRC) whereby the fee for the appellant institute was fixed at Rs. 4,51,000/- per student per year for M.D./M.S. Ayu. (Clinical) course being run by it, for academic session 2025-26.
2. It is submitted on behalf of the appellant that he had proposed fee of the course at Rs. 6,25,000/- per student per year and at the relevant time, he uploaded consolidated balance sheet of MD/MS Ayu. (Clinical) and MD/MS Ayu. (Non-clinical) for the F.Y. 2024-25. It is also submitted that the AFRC has been regulated fee at Rs. 4,51,000/- per student per year, which is not adequately reflecting into audited expenditure. Annual inflation, Salary Revision and

increased cost of consumables have not been considered properly. It is submitted that the regulated fee is very less and therefore, the appellant is unable to run course properly. Therefore, it is prayed that the fee may be enhanced accordingly.

3. Per contra, the respondent supported the impugned order by submitting that the AFRC has properly considered all the documents as well as balance sheet uploaded by the appellant on the portal of the respondent. The AFRC also considered all allowable expenditure, as shown in the appellant's balance sheet. It is further submitted that AFRC has also allowed 6% inflation, 15% for growth and development on the basis of expenditure incurred by the institution on the course. It is also submitted by the respondent that apart from that 10% enhancement also granted on ground of accreditation acquired by the institute namely NABH and NABL. Therefore, no error has been committed by the AFRC in regulating the fee of the appellant.
4. It is also submitted that however, the appellant had uploaded a separate expenditure of clinical and non-clinical courses, along with consolidated balance sheet for both the courses, but expenditure as shown separate sheet for both the courses were not in proper proportion. Considering all expenses of both the courses and intake of students for both the course, equal fee has been calculated. The appeal is being sans-merit and is liable to be dismissed.
5. I have heard both the parties. Perused the record.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the matter, in view of this Authority, the AFRC has properly considered all the allowable expenditure of the course and has also granted depreciation, growth and development and accreditations.

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.

Accordingly, the impugned order is hereby affirmed and the appeal is dismissed.

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