

\$~45

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 1523/2018 & CM No. 6224/2018**

PRASAR THROUGH ITS AUTHORISED
REPRESENTATIVE

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Ashutosh Lohia, Advocate, with
Mr Archana Saxena, Mr Rohan
Dewan, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Abhinav Mukherji, Mr Pratishtha
Vij, Advocates for R2/BCCI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

17.12.2018

1. The petitioner is a society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1960. The petitioner claims to be engaged in social and charitable activities for the past two decades. The petitioner states that during the course of doing charitable activities, it had decided to host a domestic cricket tournament with the intent of promoting and supporting children belonging to the economically weaker section of society.

2. It is stated that several children (approximately 700 – 800 in number) participated in the trials conducted for holding the said tournament – ‘Sudama Premier League’. The inauguration ceremony for the said tournament was scheduled to be held on 14.02.2018 at Karnail Singh Stadium at Pahar Ganj, New Delhi. The inauguration was to be followed by an exhibition match between media persons as well as the coaches and other

members of the organising committee. The first rounds of matches were scheduled to be held on 17.02.2018 at Roshnara Cricket Club Ground and Karnail Singh Stadium.

3. The petitioner claims that few hours before the tournament was to be held, it received messages from several match officials including umpires, scorers and players withdrawing their support and assistance promised by them earlier.

4. The petitioner states that it had also obtained permission from Delhi and District Cricket Association (DDCA) which had also promised to provide technical support as per norms.

5. The petitioner states that support and facilities promised to the petitioner were withdrawn at the instance of the Board of Cricket Control of India (BCCI).

6. Accordingly, the petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the said communication dated 14.02.2018 (hereafter 'the impugned communication') issued by BCCI to all its affiliated units, *inter alia*, stating that BCCI had not given any permission to a league by the name "Sudama Premier League". It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that the impugned communication is without any authority as BCCI has no right to interfere with the holding of the tournament in question. It is submitted that the said tournament was a private tournament organised for the benefit of children from EWS category and did not require any approval or permission from the BCCI. It is also submitted that since, the BCCI controls (through its affiliated clubs and associations) most of the stadiums, it has

unjustifiably deprived the petitioner of the assistance promised by various officials (umpires, scorers etc.).

7. Before proceeding further, it would be relevant to mention the prayers made by way of the present petition. The same are set out below:-

- “i) issue a Writ, order and/or direction in the nature of Certiorari or such other Writ of like nature directing canceling/quashing of the letter dated 14.02.2018 issued by the Respondent No.4;
- ii) issue a Writ, order and/or direction in the nature of Mandamus or such other Writ of like nature prohibiting the respondents to act in an illegal, unjustified and unauthorised manner;
- iii) issue a Writ, order and/or direction in the nature of Quo Warranto or such other Writ of like nature directing the Respondents to show cause as to under what authority the letter dated 14.02.2018 was issued against the Petitioner;
- iv) issue a Writ, order and/or direction as this Court deems fit against the respondents;”

8. The impugned communication merely states that BCCI had not given any permission to a league by the name of “Sudama Premier League”. Admittedly, the said statement is not incorrect. In view of the above, this Court is unable to accede to the petitioner’s prayer for quashing the impugned communication. Further, an affidavit has been filed on behalf of the BCCI wherein it has been affirmed that BCCI had merely clarified that the tournament “Sudama Premier League” was not being conducted by the BCCI. It is stated that the impugned communication was issued by way of abundant caution to avoid any misrepresentation by any person. The BCCI

has, unequivocally, clarified that it has not in any manner prohibited the petitioner from organising a private league match but had simply clarified that the BCCI had nothing to do with the same.

9. In view of the above clarification, no further orders are required to be passed in this petition. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed. The pending application is also disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

DECEMBER 17, 2018
RK