



\$~36

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

+ W.P.(C) 3513/2026 & CM APPL. 16977/2026, CM APPL. 16978/2026, CM APPL. 21055/2026, CM APPL. 21058/2026, CM APPL. 21061/2026, CM APPL. 31519/2026

ALL INDIA CARROM FEDERATION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Deesh Narayan, petitioner
in person

versus

UNION OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Udit Dedhiya, SPC with
Ms. Apurva Sachdev, Ms. Preyansha
Gupta, Advocates with Ms.
Akanksha, GP.
Mr. Aseem Mehrotra and Ms.
Deeksha Mehtra, Advocates for
applicants in CM APPL. 21055/2026,
CM APPL. 21058/2026, CM APPL.
21061/2026

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

%

11.05.2026

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:



a) Quash/set aside the impugned Letter No. 21-01/2023-SP-I/GOV-2 dated 06.02.2026, issued by the Under Secretary, Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, Government of India.

b) Issue a writ of mandamus directing respondent-UOI to:
Accept the election report dated 30.08.2023 submitted by the Returning Officer (Retired High Court Judge) in respect of election of petitioner-AICF held on 27.08.2023 at New Delhi.

c) Renew the annual recognition of the petitioner-All India Carrom Federation as a National Sports Federation.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is against the impugned communication dated 6th February 2026 issued by the respondent, whereby the election results of the petitioner federation were not accepted and renewal of recognition was denied.

3. Notice in the present petition was issued *vide* order dated 18th March 2026, on which date the respondent was directed to file counter-affidavit.

4. Counter-affidavit has been filed on behalf of the respondent/Union of India. In the counter-affidavit, it is stated as under:

4.1. The election process undertaken by the petitioner federation was not in conformity with the National Sports Development Code of India, 2011 (hereinafter 'Sports Code') and the Model Election Guidelines applicable to National Sports Federations (NSF).

4.2. The Ministry had previously raised concerns with regard to violations of Clause 3.10 of Annexure-II of the Sports Code and therefore, the petitioner was well aware of the deficiencies pointed out by the Ministry.



5. Mr. Vivek Dheesh Narayan, the Authorised Representative of the petitioner, who appears in-person, submits that the impugned order has been passed without giving any show cause notice to the petitioner. Hence, the same is in violation of the Sports Code. He further submits that the alleged deviations referred to in the impugned letter are factually incorrect and contrary to the material already placed before the respondent. An email dated 4th February 2026 had specifically been addressed to the respondent seeking an opportunity of hearing before any adverse action is taken. However, despite the said request, the respondent proceeded to issue the impugned order.

6. Mr. Udit Dedhiya, counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent, has drawn the attention of the Court to guidelines for recognition of the National Sports Federation's procedure for suspension/withdrawal of recognition and consequences thereof (pages 68 and 69 of the writ petition). He further submits that the speaking order was passed in terms of the directions passed by the Division Bench on 30th January, 2026, in LPA 697/2025.

7. I have heard the counsel for the parties.

8. As noted above, the main ground of challenge of the petitioner is that the impugned order has been passed in violation of the principles of natural justice inasmuch as no opportunity has been given to the petitioner to meet the grounds taken for de-recognition in the impugned order. Though certain concerns had earlier been expressed by the respondent with regard to compliance with the Sports Code, no specific show cause notice proposing de-recognition or rejection of the election dated 27th August 2023 was issued to the petitioner prior to passing the impugned letter.

9. A reference may be made to the 'Guidelines For Recognition of



National Sports Federations' provided as Annexure-II to the Sports Code, the relevant portion of which is set out below:

“PROCEDURE FOR SUSPENSION/WITHDRAWAL OF RECOGNITION AND CONSEQUENCES THEREOF

I. ...

II. WITHDRAWAL OF RECOGNITION:

Recognition may be withdrawn in case of any of the following:

- (i) the same has been obtained by misrepresentation of material information or by fraudulent means;*
- (ii) violation of the terms and conditions of recognition or of Government Guidelines or of the provisions of their own constitution; b 7*
- (iii) in the judgment of the Government of India, the Federation is not functioning in the best interest of development of sports for which the Federation was granted recognition;*
- (iv) an inquiry confirms serious irregularities regarding the functioning of the Federation;*
- (v) the concerned International or Asian Federation permanently derecognises or disaffiliates a National Federation. Similarly, derecognition may take place in the event that the JOA permanently derecognises or disaffiliates National Federation. **Before withdrawal of recognition, the concerned NSF will however, be given reasonable opportunity to present their defence.***

III. ...”

10. In terms of the aforesaid, withdrawal of recognition can only be done after giving ‘reasonable opportunity through the concerned NSF to present their defence’.

11. Mr. Dedhiya has drawn the attention of the Court to a letter dated 7th December, 2020 sent by the respondent to the petitioner. For ease of reference, the said letter is reproduced below:-



Vide this Department's letter number F.No.21-2/2018-SP-III dated 07/03/2019 elections of office bearers and members of the management committee of the AICF were taken on record and AICF recognition was renewed w.e.f. 16/01/2020 subject to the outcome of the court case filed by Haryana Carrom Association & Ors against the AICF, pending in the Hon'ble Delhi High Court (copy enclosed).

2. The matter regarding renewal of recognition to All India Carrom Federation (AICF) has been examined. After perusal of the electoral college of the said election of AICF it has been observed that AICF is having two units in the State of Maharashtra viz. Maharashtra Carrom Association and Vidarbha Carrom Association and voting rights were given to members of these units and also members from the units of Maharashtra Carrom Association and Vidarbha Carrom Association have been elected during the elections, which is against One State One Unit principle of National Sports Development Code of India, 2011. Therefore, the elections of the candidates elected from Maharashtra Carrom Association and Vidarbha Carrom Association units cannot be accepted. AICF is advised to ask candidates elected as office bearer or for any other position from Maharashtra Carrom Association and Vidarbha Carrom Association units to demit office immediately under intimation to the Ministry. Action for renewal of recognition will be taken thereafter.

This issues with the approval of competent authority.

12. Having perused the aforesaid communication dated 7th December 2020, in the opinion of this Court, the said communication cannot be considered to be a show cause notice or an opportunity to the petitioner to present its case.

13. Even though the impugned letter may have been passed in compliance with the directions passed by the Division Bench, it would not mean that the procedural requirements of giving an opportunity to the petitioner to present his case, as provided in the aforesaid Guidelines, are not complied with.

14. Having heard the counsel for the parties, it is deemed appropriate that the impugned letter dated 6th February, 2026, be treated as a show cause notice to the petitioner.

15. Reply to the aforesaid communication has been filed by the petitioner *vide* communication dated 9th February, 2026 (Annexure A-26 to the writ petition).

16. In view of the above, it is directed that a fresh order with regard to the



recognition of the petitioner association shall be passed by the respondent/UOI within eight (8) weeks from today.

17. Petition, along with pending applications, stands disposed of.
18. All rights and contentions of the parties are kept open.

AMIT BANSAL, J

MAY 11, 2026
ds