



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 2ND DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 16128 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

M/S MINERVA ACADEMY FOOTBALL CLUB
SPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA,
GNANA BHARATHI,
BENGALURU - 560 056
REPRESENTED BY ITS HEAD OF OPERATION
MR. AKSHAY SAWANT
HEADQUARTERED AT:
NH-21, VPO DAUN,
SECTOR - 120, DISTT MOHALI
PUNJAB - 140 301
REGISTERED UNDER COMPANIES ACT 2013

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VIKRAM HUILGO, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. SUDEVRAJ HEGDE M.N., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. DEPUTY DIRECTOR
SPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
NETAJI SUBAS SOUTHERN CENTRE,
MYSORE ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 056
2. REGIONAL DIRECTOR
SPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
NETAJI SUBAS SOUTHERN CENTRE,

Digitally Signed
by SHWETA
RAGHAVENDRA
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



MYSORE ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 056

3. UNION OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS,
6TH, 7TH AND 8TH FLOOR, GPOA-3 NETAJI NAGAR,
AFRICA AVENUE,
NEW DELHI - 110 023

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ARAVIND KAMATH, ASGI FOR

SRI. MUKUNT PRASAD, CGC)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE LETTER
DATED 16.04.2026 (ANNX-A) ISSUED BY THE R1. DIRECT THE
RESPONDENTS TO EXTEND THE TIME PERIOD OF THE
CONTRACT ENTERED INTO ON 29.05.2023 FOR A PERIOD OF
TWO MORE YEARS, I.E. UNTIL 29.05.23.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY
HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. Sri. Mukund Prasad, learned CGC accepts notice for
respondent Nos.1 to 3.
2. Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following
reliefs:



- a. *Issue a writ of certiorari to set aside the letter dated 16.04.2026 (Annexure A) issued by the Respondent No. 1.*
- b. *To direct the Respondents to extend the time period of the contract entered into on 29.05.2023 for a period of two more years i.e., until 29.05.2028*
- c. *To pass such other order/s and grant such other reliefs as this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant in the circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice and equity.*

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner, under a work order having been appointed for management as Management Operator to operate and maintain FIFA Standard Artificial Football Turf at the Sports Authority of India, Netaji Subas Southern Centre, Bangalore, for a period of 3 (three) years. The same was extendable by a further period of 2 (two) years. The period of three years was going to expire on 29.05.2026. A representation had been submitted by the petitioner for extension by a period of two years. This representation not having been considered has led to the filing of the above petition.

4. Sri. Vikram Huilgol, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner would submit that the football facility was being maintained and operated by the petitioner for the last



three years and now, the said facility being closed, the interest of the students would be adversely affected, and no harm would be caused to the respondents if the period is extended by two years. The petitioner would maintain the said football turf in a proper manner for the said period of two years.

5. Sri. Aravind Kamath, learned ASGI for the respondents would submit that the period of contract was three years, extendable by two years and there is no vested right of the petitioner to claim the extension. The term of the contract of three years having expired on 29.05.2026. The question of the petitioner seeking for extension and it being favourably considered by the respondents is at the sole discretion of the respondents. The respondents have decided that there is certain upgradation works which are to be carried out on the football turf, which will be so carried out, and the operation of the football turf will be carried out by the respondents or any other contractor.
6. His submission is that a mere clause indicating extension would not confer a right of extension on the petitioner.



7. Heard Sri Vikram Huilgol, learned Senior counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Aravind Kamath, learned ASGI for the respondents.
8. There is substance in the submission made by the learned ASGI inasmuch as the term reads "The time period of Contract is 3 (Three) years and further extendable by 2 (Two) Years which shall be reckoned from the date of signing of contract."
9. The above would categorically indicate that the time period of the contract is three years and the extension is for two years. The contract of three years having expired or come to an end by efflux of time on 29.05.2026 is at the most a discretion with the respondents to extend by a period of two years when a request has been made. The said request has been denied by the respondents as per the submission of the learned ASGI.
10. If that be so, the above petition seeking for a mandamus to be issued to consider the representation for extension of the contract is not maintainable. There is no vested



NC: 2026:KHC:25816
WP No. 16128 of 2026

right to the petitioner for the issuance of such a
mandamus. As such, the petition stands ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

GJM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 19