



\$~56

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ LPA 565/2025, CM APPL. 55759/2025, CM APPL. 55760/2025 &
CM APPL. 56471/2025

INDIAN OLYMPIC ASSOCIATIONAppellant
Through: Mr. Saurabh Kirpal, Senior Advocate
with Ms. Kumudavalli Seetharaman,
Mr. Krishan Singhal and Mr. Rajat
Choudhary, Advocates.

versus

INDIAN GOLF UNION & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Heman Phalpher, Mr. Sukrit
Seth and Ms. Ananya Sharma,
Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Premtosh K. Mishra, CGSC with
Mr. Sarthak Anand and Mr. Prarabdh
Tiwari, Advocates for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER
% **09.09.2025**

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
2. This intra Court appeal takes exception to an order dated 12.08.2025 passed by learned Single Judge on CM APPL. 49027/2025 moved in W.P. (C) 12004/2025. By the order under challenge, learned Single Judge has by way of interim measure, directed that the respondent/petitioner will be entitled to nominate two representatives who shall participate in the Special General Body



Meeting of the Indian Olympic Association which was to be held on 13.08.2025. The learned Single Judge has further restrained the Indian Olympic Association from allowing any other entity or any third-party claiming themselves to be the National Sports Federation (NSF) for the sport of Golf to participate in the upcoming Special General Body Meeting. Admittedly, the Special General Body Meeting of Indian Olympic Association was held on 13.08.2025 and the directions issued by learned Single Judge while passing the order under challenge herein have been followed and, therefore, the order passed by learned Single Judge has lived its life. In these circumstances normally, the instant intra-Court appeal would have been held to have been rendered infructuous, however learned counsel for the appellant states that applying the reason given in the impugned order, further directions may be sought by the respondent/petitioner ensuring their participation in other meetings of the Indian Olympic Association and, therefore, the appeal maybe entertained.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant has also drawn our attention to certain observations made in para 11 of the impugned order where, according to learned counsel for the appellant, certain aspersions have been cast on the appellant/Indian Olympic Association.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the order under challenge before us in this appeal, we find it appropriate not to entertain this appeal for the simple reason that the order under challenge has already been given effect to and the writ petition is still pending before the learned Single Judge. We have also been informed that several other petitions connected to this matter where the election of the Indian Golf Union is under challenge.



5. It is also to be noticed that the order dated 12.08.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge was passed on an interim application and the issues raised in the writ petition are yet to be finally decided and, therefore, we are of the opinion that any finding recorded/observation made in the said order dated 12.08.2025 are tentative in nature, that is to say, the said observations/findings are only for the purposes of adjudicating the prayer made in the interim application and, therefore, findings cannot be said to be final.

6. In these circumstances, we permit the learned counsel for the parties to move an appropriate application on the administrative side to club all the related matters. We further request the learned Single Judge to expedite the proceedings of the W.P.(C) 12004/2025 and other connected matters and conclude the same at an early date.

7. We may clarify again that any observations made or findings recorded in the order dated 12.08.2025 shall be treated to be only tentative in nature which shall abide by the final outcome of the writ petition.

8. As far as the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant in respect of the observations made in para 11 of the order dated 12.08.2025 is concerned, we may only observe that it will be open to the appellant to move an appropriate application before the learned Single Judge seeking expunction of those observations.

9. We are permitting the appellant to move such an application only considering the fact that the said observations appear to have been made without the affidavit in reply on behalf of the appellant being available before the learned Single Judge in the proceedings of the writ petition, though, as submitted by the learned senior counsel for the respondent, Mr. Dayan Krishnan, the appellant was substantially heard.



10. The appeal stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

SEPTEMBER 9, 2025/yrj