



\$~66

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

+ **W.P.(C) 17756/2022**

DELHI GYMNASTICS ASSOCIATION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Naushad Ahmed Khan and
Mr. Syed Rehan, Advocates.

versus

GYMNASTICS FEDERATION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Parth Goswami and Mr. Akshay
Kumar, Advocates for R-1.
Ms. Arunima Dwivedi, CGDC with
Mr. Aakash Pathak, GP for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

24.10.2024

CM APPL. 62878/2024 (for exemption)

1. Exemption is granted, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The Applicant shall file legible and clearer copies of exempted documents, compliant with practice rules, before the next date of hearing.
3. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

CM APPL. 62877/2024 (for early disposal of appeal filed on behalf of the applicant before the Indian Olympic Association)

4. This writ petition has been disposed of on 6th August, 2024, in the following terms:

“8. The remedy of appeal is available and it cannot be said to be waived just because the learned Counsel for the Petitioner refused to avail the same at the time of hearing of the writ petition.

9. In view of the fact that this Court had noted that there is an



appellate remedy available to the Petitioner, which was not accepted by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner, this Court is inclined to accede to the request made by the Petitioner in the present application.

10. It is made clear that all the rights and contentions of both the parties, being the Petitioner and the Respondent, are left open and the Respondents are at liberty to dispose of the appeal in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible in terms of the Constitution of GFI.”

5. The Petitioner has filed the present application, seeking a direction to Indian Olympic Association (‘IOA’) to dispose of their appeal in a time-bound manner. It is noted that IOA was not a party to the present petition when the final order was passed, nonetheless, a copy of the present application has been served on IOA, and they are represented by a counsel today.

6. Be that as it may, in the opinion of the Court, no further directions are necessary, as the aforesaid final order makes it abundantly clear that the appeal has to be disposed of expeditiously.

7. However, since counsel for Respondent No. 1 objected to the maintainability of the alleged appeal, it must be clarified that the Court has not made any comments regarding the maintainability of any appeal filed by the Petitioner. All rights and contentions of the parties to that extent are left open.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

OCTOBER 24, 2024

nk