

**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. 33/2025

**Shri Vaishnav Institute of Management and Science,
Indore
Tuser2001896**

..... Appellant

V E R S U S

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

..... Respondent

Appeal No. 34/2025

**Shri Vaishnav Institute of Management and Science,
Indore
Tuser2011896**

..... Appellant

V E R S U S

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

..... Respondent

**ORDER
(Date: 20th January, 2026)**

1. This common order shall govern disposal of Appeal Nos. 33/2025 & 34/2025.
2. These appeals are filed under Sec. 10 of Madhya Pradesh Niji Vyavasayik Shikshan Sanstha (Pravesh Ka Viniyaman Avam Shulk ka Nirdharan), Adhiniyam, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as “Act of 2007”) against the order passed by the Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee (AFRC for short) bearing no. 1279 and 1280, both dated 28.06.2025, whereby the fee for the

appellant institute was fixed Rs. 15,000/- per student per semester for both B.B.A. and B.C.A. course being run by it, for academic session 2025-26.

3. It is submitted on behalf of the appellant that he had proposed fee at Rs. 30,000/- per student per semester for B.C.A. Course and at Rs. 40,000/- per student per semester for B.B.A. course and he uploaded balance sheet for the F.Y. 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25 on portal of the respondent. It is further submitted that no hearing opportunity has been given by the respondent to the appellant while regulating fee. It is also submitted that no document was sought from the appellant by the respondent. Fee has been regulated at lower side without hearing the appellant. It is also submitted that the impugned order is not speaking order. It has not been shown in the impugned order that what expenditure of the course has been allowed or not allowed during regulating fee. Looking to the expenditure of the course, the appellant is unable to run the courses properly. Therefore, it is prayed that the impugned order is liable to be rejected and the appeal is liable to be allowed.
4. On the other hand, however, the respondent supported the impugned order but fairly submitted that no hearing opportunity was given to the appellant while regulating fee.
5. I have heard both the parties. Perused the record.
6. On perusal of the record, it appears that on 25.08.2025, the respondent was directed by this Authority that he supply copy of calculation sheet to the appellant within a period of three days. On 16.09.2025, he was again directed to comply the order dated 25.08.2025 positively within three days, but till 11.11.2025, the respondent had not provided the aforesaid copy to the appellant. Therefore, it is apparent that the respondent is not ready to comply the order passed by this Authority, which is a clear cut disobedience of the order of this Authority. It also appears that no hearing opportunity is given

to the appellant while passing the impugned order. Therefore, impugned order is against the principle of natural justice. In the considered view of this Authority, the appeals are partly allowed and the impugned orders passed by AFRC are liable to be set aside and hereby set aside. The matters are remanded back to AFRC with a direction to pass speaking order within 15 days from today, after considering the financial data uploaded by the appellant and giving hearing opportunity to him.

Accordingly, this appeal stands disposed of.

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