



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-33236-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:12.11.2025

Tanvi Verma and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Union Territory Chandigarh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Fariad Singh Virk, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Divanshu Jain, Addl. Standing Counsel with
Mr. Gaurav Vir Singh Behl, Jr. Standing Counsel
for UT Chandighr.

Mr. Naveen Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Mr. Marinal Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Talwar, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing Letter No. CRSA/118 dated 01.11.2025 (Annexure P-3) issued by respondent No.4 – Chandigarh Roller Skating Association.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are roller skaters and respondent No.2 is the Roller Skating Federation of India at the apex level. Respondent No.3 is the Chandigarh Roller Skating Association and apart from the above, there is one more association by the name of Chandigarh Roller Skating



Association—respondent No.4. He submitted that an *inter se* dispute has arisen between the two associations namely respondents No.3 and 4, in Chandigarh. He further submitted that be that as it may, so far as the petitioners are concerned, they are only concerned with their participation according to their own merits, and the petitioners had participated in the roller skating competition which was organized by respondent No.3—Skating Association, by paying the requisite fee and they were selected and recommended for national events. Thereafter, respondent No.4 also wanted to select the candidates and the petitioners deposited the fee before respondent No.4-Skating Association as well and they participated in the same. He further submitted that for the second round they again participated in the competition organized by respondent No.3, but respondent No.4 did not permit them to participate because of Annexure P-3, which was issued by respondent No.4, stating that since they had participated in the competition organized by respondent No.3-Skating Association, they should tender an unconditional apology and a fine of Rs.500/- was imposed. He further submitted that respondent No.4 has no authority to pass the aforesaid order.

3. Learned counsel also submitted that in this manner, the petitioners who had participated earlier in the competition organized by respondent No.3, except for one of the petitioners, the remaining petitioners were not permitted to participate in the trial conducted by respondent No.4 and there is an *inter se* dispute between both the Chandigarh Roller Skating Associations.



4. At this stage, Mr. Amandeep Singh Talwar, Advocate, has appeared and submitted that the aforesaid Annexure P-3 has since been withdrawn and that respondent No.4 had never prohibited the petitioners from participating, and rather petitioner No.1 had actually participated. He submitted that respondent No.4 is duly recognized organization whereas respondent No.3 is not duly recognized organization by respondent No.2.

5. At this stage, Mr. Naveen Kumar, Advocate, has caused appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and submitted that they have recognized only respondent No.3 and not respondent No.4.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners pointed out that even otherwise, respondent No.4 has filed a separate petition seeking issuance of a direction to respondent No.2 not to interfere in the Association affairs, which is also under challenge and the matter is fixed for 03.12.2025.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that since the impugned letter (Annexure P-3) has been withdrawn, as stated by learned counsel for respondent No.4 and the petitioners have already been selected for the national events by respondent No.3- Association, he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition.

8. Dismissed as withdrawn.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

12.11.2025

shweta

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No