

13/11/28  
D92  
B  
BEFORE THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY CONSTITUTED UNDER THE  
MADHYA PRADESH NIJI VISHWA VIDHYALAYA (STHAPANA EVAM  
SANCHALAN) ADHINIYAM, 2007.

Presided over by Justice Prakash Chandra Gupta.

MPPURC Appeal No. 01/2025

13/11/2025

Azim Premji University, Bhopal

-Appellant

V E R S U S

Madhya Pradesh Private University Regulatory Commission,  
Bhopal

-Respondent

**ORDER**  
**(Date: 7th November, 2025)**

1. This appeal is filed under Sec. 36A(1) of Madhya Pradesh Niji Vishwa Vidhyalaya (Sthapana Eevam Sanchalan) Adhiniyam 2007 (hereinafter referred to as "PUA 2007") against the order passed by the Madhya Pradesh Private University Regulatory Commission (hereinafter referred to as "MPPURC") dated 29.11.2024 whereby the MPPURC reviewed the fee for the academic session 2024-25 for various courses run by the appellant university.
2. The appellant, while not pressing any other points mentioned in the memo of appeal has argued that the fee as approved by the MPPURC is on lower side. The appellant had proposed fee Rs. 3,28,125.00 per student per year for B.A. History and B.Sc. Biology, Rs. 1,28,750.00 per student per year for M.A. Education and Master of Public Health, Rs. 3,28,125.00 per student per year for B.A. Economics, B.A. English and B.A. Social Science course, but the MPPURC has approved fee only Rs. 2,35,000/- per student per year for B.A. History, B.Sc.



Biology, B.A. Economics, B.A. English and B.A. Social Science courses and Rs. 1,05,000/- per student per year for M.A. Education and Master of Public Health course.

3. It is further submitted that the appellant claimed expenditure of Rs. 1289.91 lacs for salary, allowances and bonuses to teaching employees, Rs. 675.45 lacs for salary, allowances and bonuses to non-teaching employees (Admin), Rs. 2829.44 lacs for expenditure on administrative services and Rs. 648.50 lacs for depreciation on fixed assets (Institutions mobilizing resources for replacement of assets), while the MPPURC has allowed only Rs. 386.13 lacs, Rs. 202.64 lacs, Rs. 231.82 lacs and Rs. 64.85 lacs only respectively, which is on very lower side. It is also submitted that the MPPURC has not considered properly the audited balance sheet filed by the appellant for the concerning financial year.
4. It is also submitted that in the academic year 2023-24 under graduate student per year cost was Rs. 11.6 lacs and it is prayed that the cost per student per year was estimated to be Rs. 9.29 lacs for the academic year 2024-25.
5. On the other hand, it is submitted on behalf of the respondent that the appellant had not supplied TDS returns, salary payments and other documents to show that it had actually paid the salary amount to the teaching and non-teaching employees, despite giving notice. Therefore, it cannot be presumed that the appellant had actually paid the aforesaid alleged amount to teaching and non-teaching staff. It is also submitted that only 10% of total depreciation has been allowed because depreciation of entire premises meant to be used for larger strength of students and it cannot be charged to existing strength of students. It is also submitted that the MPPURC has properly considered all the material supplied by the appellant and has properly approved the fee. It

is also submitted that fee structure of the appellant university is much higher than the other universities situated in Madhya Pradesh and no error has been committed by the MPPURC. Therefore, appeal is liable to be rejected.

6. Having heard both the parties. Perused the record. It appears that the appellant had not supplied the relevant and essential documents such as TDS returns and pay slip of teaching and non-teaching employees to the MPPURC despite of service of notice. It has also not filed aforesaid documents before this Authority. While the aforesaid documents were material documents to consider the expenditure of the appellant university. Apart from that, considering the fee structure approved by the MPPURC, it appears to be proper and reasonable. Therefore, no interference is required in the impugned order.
7. In this view of the matter, the impugned order is affirmed and the appeal is liable to be dismissed.
8. The appeal is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-  
**(Justice Prakash Chandra Gupta)**  
**Appellate Authority**