



2025:DHC:10144



\$~52

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

*Date of decision: 14.11.2025*

+ **FAO 312/2025 & CM APPLs. 71473-74/2025**

HOCKEY INDIA

.....Appellant

Through: Ms. Shyel Trehan, Senior Advocate  
with Mr. Nishi Kant Singh, Mr.  
Rohan Poddar and Ms. Vidhi Jain,  
Advocates.

versus

HOCKEY BIHAR & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. D.N. Goburdhun, Senior  
Advocate with Mr. Hemant Raj  
Phalpher, Advocate for respondent  
no. 1.  
Mr. Akhil Suri and Mr. Jitu Khure,  
Advocates for respondent no. 2.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE CHANDRASEKHARAN SUDHA**

**JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

**CHANDRASEKHARAN SUDHA, J.**

**CM APPL 71474/2025 (Exemption)**

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

**FAO 312/2025 & CM APPL. 71473/2025 (Stay)**



1.The present appeal has been filed under Order XLIII, Rule 1, read with Sections 104 and 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (the CPC) against the order dated 29.10.2025 in CS DJ No. 87/2025, whereby the trial court has allowed the application filed by respondent no. 1/plaintiff under Order XXXIX, Rule 1 and 2 of the CPC and thereby, staying the decision of the appellant/defendant no. 1 regarding disaffiliation of the respondent no. 1/plaintiff and fresh affiliation of the respondent no. 2/defendant no. 2.

2. Brief facts relevant to the adjudication of the present appeal are as follows:- The appellant/defendant no. 1 is the nationally recognized federation responsible for governing and promoting hockey in India. Respondent no. 1/plaintiff is the State association for the sport of hockey in Bihar, which was earlier affiliated with the appellant/defendant no.1 as its State Member Unit. After the disaffiliation of respondent no. 1/plaintiff, respondent no.2/defendant no. 2 was appointed as the newly affiliated State member of the appellant/defendant no. 1 for the State of Bihar.



2025:DHC:10144



2.1. The President of respondent no. 1/plaintiff emailed the appellant/defendant no. 1 on 04.12.2024, levelling grave allegations of internal malfunction and lack of co-operation, among its office bearers. The appellant/defendant no. 1 issued a show cause notice dated 12.12.2024 to respondent no. 1/plaintiff, to which no reply was sent by respondent no. 1/plaintiff. They never received any show cause notice either by email or post. In light of the seriousness of the allegations, the executive board of the appellant/defendant no. 1, in its meeting dated 28.12.2024, made the decision to disaffiliate respondent no.1/plaintiff as a State member unit. Thereafter, respondent no. 2/defendant no. 2 sent an application for affiliation to the appellant, which was accepted, and affiliation was granted to respondent no. 2/defendant no. 2.

2.2. Respondent no.1/plaintiff filed the suit for declaration and injunction against the appellant/defendant no. 1. Along with the suit, an application under Order XXXIX, Rule 1 and 2 of the CPC was also filed, seeking interim injunction against appellant/defendant no.



2025:DHC:10144



1 from interfering with the affiliation of respondent no. 1/plaintiff and staying the decision of the executive board of the appellant/defendant no. 1 dated 28.12.2024.

2.3. *Vide* the Order dated 29.10.2025, the trial court allowed the application and thereby stayed the operation of the decision of the appellant/defendant no. 1 for disaffiliation of respondent no. 1/plaintiff and subsequent affiliation of respondent no. 2/defendant no. 2, and further restrained appellant/defendant no. 1 from interfering with the affiliation status of respondent no. 2/defendant no. 2 during the pendency of the suit. Aggrieved, the appellant has come up in appeal.

3. Issue notice. Mr. Hemant Raj Phalpher, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent no. 1, and Mr. Akhil Suri, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent no. 2/defendant no. 2.



4. It is submitted by the learned senior counsel appearing for the appellant/defendant no. 1 that the main grievance pertains to the direction given in the impugned order, whereby the appellant/defendant no. 1 has been further restrained from interfering with the disaffiliation of respondent no. 1/plaintiff during the pendency of the suit. She submits that if this order continues, even in the event of future violation(s) by respondent no. 1/plaintiff, the appellant/defendant would not be in a position to take any action against them, which could affect the future of the athletes, as no activities have, according to her, been conducted. However, the said submission is opposed by the learned counsel for respondent no. 1/plaintiff, stating that it is incorrect to say that no activities have been conducted by respondent no. 1/plaintiff.

5. The question whether the act of the disaffiliation is correct or not needs to be decided by the trial court after considering the oral and documentary evidence led in. At this point, the same cannot be adjudicated by this Court. On consideration of the facts



and submissions made on behalf of the parties, I find no infirmity in the impugned order passed by the trial court.

6. However, in the interest of both parties and the athletes, it is made clear that in event of any violation(s) being committed by respondent no. 1/plaintiff in the future, the appellant/defendant no. 1 is at liberty to approach the trial court and get necessary orders for taking whatever action necessary, as contemplated by the Rules/Regulations, etc. applicable to the parties. In such an event, the trial court, after hearing both sides, will pass necessary orders in accordance with law.

7. In view of the above directions, the appeal is disposed of. Application(s), if any pending, shall stand closed.

**CHANDRASEKHARAN SUDHA  
(JUDGE)**

**NOVEMBER 14, 2025  
kd**