

**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. 71/2025

**Surabhi College of Pharmacy,
Bhopal
Tuser344340**

..... Appellant

V E R S U S

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

..... Respondent

Appeal No. 72/2025

**Surabhi College of Pharmacy,
Bhopal
Tuser24340**

..... 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. 71/2025 & 72/2025.
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. 2044 and 1983, both dated 28.08.2025, whereby the fee for the

appellant institute was fixed Rs. 15,000/- per student per semester for Diploma Pharmacy (2 Year) and Rs. 20,000/- per student per semester B.Pharm. course being run by it, for academic sessions 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28.

3. It is submitted on behalf of the appellant that the AFRC has regulated fee at lower side without hearing the appellant. It is also submitted that looking to the expenditure of both the courses, the appellant is unable to run the courses properly. Therefore, it is prayed that the impugned orders are liable to be rejected and the appeals deserve to be allowed. However, it is prayed that the fee has been regulated for three academic sessions and the present academic session is going on, therefore, alternatively, submitted that as fee regulated by AFRC for academic session 2025-26 may be affirmed and order pertaining to regulating fee for academic sessions 2026-27 and 2027-28 may be set aside.
4. On the other hand, 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. The AFRC has not given notice to the appellant to produce any documents, hearing opportunity has also not been given to him. Therefore, in view of this Authority, alternative submission of the appellant appears to be proper and appeals deserve to be allowed partly. Accordingly, both the appeals are partly allowed. The impugned orders passed by AFRC are affirmed for academic session 2025-26 and are set aside for academic sessions 2026-27 and 2027-28.
7. The respondent is directed to regulate the fee for the appellant institution afresh for further academic sessions, when occasion arises, after considering

all the necessary documents and giving opportunity of hearing to the appellant.

8. With aforesaid directions and modifications in the impugned orders passed by AFRC, the appeal stands disposed of.

(Justice Prakash Chandra Gupta)
Appellate Authority