



\$~12

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

+ **W. P. (C) 19825/2025**

NILESH VISHNU JAGTAP

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Bharat
Bagla, Mr. Saurav Singh, Ms.
Kunika Bansal & Mr. Preet,
Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Jayant Kumar, Sr. Adv.
(through VC) for R-1/UOI.
Mr. Swaroop George, Adv. for
Maharashtra Volleyball
Federation.

CORAM:

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR**

ORDER
29.12.2025

%

CM APPL. 82766/2025 (For Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The Application stands disposed of.

W. P. (C) 19825/2025 & CM APPL. 82767/2025 (Stay)

3. By way of the present Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the Petitioner primarily challenges the notice dated 04.12.2025 issued by Respondent No. 2 - Volleyball Federation of India, whereby an Annual General Meeting [“AGM”] of Respondent No. 2 is sought to be convened on 05.01.2026. It is stated that the said AGM is a consequence of directions dated 09.05.2025



passed by this Court in a batch of Writ Petitions being No. WP (C) 1938/2024 and others.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner contends that they have not been invited to the AGM and, resultantly the conduct of such an AGM, without their presence, is unwarranted and illegal.

5. Learned counsel for Respondent No. 2/Volleyball Federation of India would contend that there is an internecine dispute as regards who represents the Maharashtra Volleyball Federation, and to address the said dispute, an email has been addressed to the concerned representatives for both the factions of Maharashtra Volleyball Association.

6. Since the copy of the said notice, which is stated to have been issued by the Respondent No. 2, is not on record, the learned counsel for Respondent No. 2 has undertaken to provide a copy of the same to the learned counsel appearing on behalf of both the factions by the end of the day.

7. Learned counsel for Respondent No. 2 further states that by virtue of the said notice, they have sought replies of both the factions and upon receipt of the responses, and after appropriate deliberations, Respondent No. 2 shall take a decision as to which of the factions would be permitted to participate in the AGM. He further contends that, as per the notice, the last date for submission of responses is tomorrow, i.e. 30.12.2025, and consequently, Respondent No. 2 would be able to tender its decision in respect of which of the two rival factions would be permitted to participate in the AGM by 31.12.2025.

8. Learned counsel for the Petitioner fairly states that in view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the Respondent No. 2, he would not press the present Petition, provided that, in the event of



any adverse decision, he is not precluded from seeking appropriate remedy(ies).

9. In view of the aforesaid submissions by learned counsel for the parties, the present petition, alongwith pending application, is disposed of.

10. Needless to say, if either of the factions is aggrieved by the decision taken by Respondent No. 2, they are at liberty to take such appropriate measures as may be permissible under law.

**HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR
(VACATION JUDGE)**

DECEMBER 29, 2025/sk/va