



\$~63

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

+ **W.P.(C) 12548/2024 & CM APPL. 52198/2024**

SUNDEEP VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nitesh Rana, Ms. Pallavi Garg,
Mr. Kohli, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr.
Devvrat Yadav, GP for UOI.
Mr. Apoorv Shukla, Mr. Puneet
Chahar, Mr. Prabhleen A. Shukla,
Advocates for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

06.09.2024

%

1. The Petitioner is a Member of the Governing Council of Respondent No. 3 – Indian Golf Union¹, the nationally recognized federation in the sport of golf. He has approached this Court impugning order dated 30th August, 2024² passed by Respondent No. 3 whereby the Petitioner has been suspended from the Governing Council pending enquiry against him for serious misconduct on his part while representing India at the Paris Olympics 2024.

2. Mr. Apoorv Shukla, counsel representing Respondent No. 3, argues that the misconduct on the part of the Petitioner was serious and therefore,

¹ “IGU”



the IGU has considered it appropriate to suspend him from the Council, pending said enquiry. He further submits that the enquiry is likely to be completed within a period of six weeks from today.

3. Mr. Shukla submits that through an email communication sent to Respondent No. 3, the National Coach for Golf, Mr. Jaskirat Singh Grewal informed the IGU of the misconduct on the part of the Petitioner at the Paris Olympics 2024. He emphasis that the Petitioner somehow got into the Olympic Village unlawfully and also attended the opening ceremony with the Indian contingent without any lawful basis, after taking another athlete's bus/boat pass. Further, despite the Petitioner not having an invitation for the special opening ceremony, he procured the uniform from the father of one of the golf players and attended the ceremony. It is thus pointed out that such infraction could have resulted in serious repercussions for the country as the entire Golf contingent could be deported.

4. Counsel for the Petitioner strongly denies all the aforementioned contentions of Respondent No. 3.

5. In light of the above, in the opinion of the Court, since the charges levied against the Petitioner are of such serious nature, and considering that the impugned order is only an interim suspension order, no ground is made out to entertain the present writ petition.

6. However, it is clarified that the Court's observations noted hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present writ petition and shall not influence the Enquiry Committee who are looking into the charges against the Petitioner. All rights and contentions of the parties to that effect are left open.

² "Impugned order"



7. The present writ petition is disposed of along with the pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

SEPTEMBER 6, 2024/ab