



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

108

RA-CW-491-2024 in
CWP-26785-2023
Date of decision: 25.11.2024

RAM DIYA ATTRI

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Petitioner in person.

Mr. Sudhir Nar, Senior Panel Counsel
for respondents No.1 -Union of India.

Mr. Amrinder Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2-All India Football Federation.

Mr. Amit Jhanji, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Abhinav Sood, Advocate and
Mr. Nitesh Jhahria, Advocate
for the respondents No. 3 to 8 and 11 to 13.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present review application has been filed under Order 47 Rule 1 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure seeking review/modification of the order dated 19.11.2024 passed by this Court.

The only ground for seeking a review is that the age determination has been directed to determine age by dental/bone density instead of the latest technique and that no directions have been issued by this Court for conducting TW-3 test.

The said argument is factually incorrect since contention of

**RA-CW-491-2024 in CWP-26785-2023****-2-**

the respondent-State was noticed that TW-3 method test facility is not currently available at any institution in Chandigarh. It was thus that other forms of test have been ordered to be conducted, subject to final testing as per the TW 3 method. The stage about conducting TW3 Test has not yet reached. The present application is thus pre-emptive and based on apprehensions as if the determination would not happen. Besides, the respondent authorities are alive to the situation and there is no reason for this Court to assume that a time when such a need arises, the facility would not be put in place. Moreover, the tournament was scheduled to commence from 20.11.2024. It would have been wholly unwarranted to prescribe a mandatory TW3 test before commencement of the tournament. The same would have led to delaying the tournament. All teams having already come, the after-effects would be cascading. Besides, an apprehension cannot be the basis for reviewing an order. Hence, all the aspects had been considered in the order. There is no ground for directing review/modification of the order dated 19.11.2024 passed by this Court.

The instant review application is accordingly dismissed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 25, 2024*Vishal sharma*

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No