



vinita

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO.231 OF 2025 (F)

WITH

**WRIT PETITION NO.3176 OF 2024 (F), MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION
NO.36 OF 2025**

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO.231 OF 2025 (F)

HEMANT BHIKOO PAI ANGLE

... APPLICANT

Versus

VIPUL PHADKE, PRESIDENT GOA

CRICKET ASSOCIATION

... RESPONDENT

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.3176 OF 2024 (F)

VIPUL PHADKE

... PETITIONER

Versus

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF SOCIETIES,

DISTRICT REGISTRAR (NORTH) AND 8

ORS

... RESPONDENTS

WITH

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO.36 OF 2025

DR. SUSHANT DHULAPKAR

... APPLICANT

Versus

VIPUL PHADKE

... RESPONDENTS

Mr Nikhil Pai, Advocate for the applicant in MCA 231/2025/F.

Mr D. Shirodkar, Addl. Govt. Advocate for the State.

Mr Vishnuprasad Lawande and Mr Parimal Redkar, Advocate for the
applicant in MCA 36/2025.

Mr S. S. Kantak, Senior Advocate with Mr A. Gosavi, Mr Kher
Simoes, Ms Saicha Desai, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr N. Sardessai, Senior Advocate with Mr Kabir Sabnis, Advocate
for respondent nos. 3 to 9.

**CORAM:- M. S. KARNIK &
NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.**

DATED :- 6th March, 2025

P.C.

Heard Mr S. S. Kantak, learned Senior Advocate for the petitioner, Mr Sardessai, learned Senior Advocate appearing for respondent nos. 3 to 9, Mr Lawande and Mr Pai who are appearing for the intervenors.

2. Mr Kantak submits that with passage of time the relief which was then prayed has virtually worked out in view of the order dated 18.12.2024, petition now does not survive. He therefore does not press the challenge any further.

3. Mr Lawande learned counsel for the intervenor submits that based on the report dated 2.11.2024 which was submitted by the inquiry committee, appropriate action against the head coach should be taken.

4. It is submission of Mr Pai, for one of the intervenor that no steps are taken by the Association for appointing ombudsman which is a mandatory requirement under Rule 21 of Goa Cricket Association.

5. Since learned Senior Advocate Mr Kantak has submitted that nothing survives for consideration in this petition and as he does not press the petition any further on instructions, the petition stands disposed of.

6. Intervenors are at liberty to pursue their remedy for the reliefs that they have prayed for in appropriate proceedings. We have not expressed any opinion on the contentions made in the intervention applications. Intervenors are at liberty to raise their grievances to be agitated in an appropriate proceeding. Since the petition itself is

disposed of, it is not possible for us in this petition to entertain the intervention applications. Liberty to the intervenors to file appropriate proceedings is kept open.

7. We appreciate the gesture of Mr YogeshNadkarni, Ms Simran Khadilkar and Mr Nilay Naik in putting great efforts submitting a detailed report to this Court in deference to the order dated 18.12.2024.

8. The petition stands disposed. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, J.

M. S. KARNIK, J.