



\$~17

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

+ W.P.(C) 10706/2022 and CM APPL. 64379/2023, CM APPL. 14340/2024, CM APPL. 74500/2024, CM APPL. 56496/2025

INDIAN AMATEUR BOXING FEDERATION
& ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vishnu Sharma, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Appearance not given.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

16.03.2026

1. The petition has been filed for the following reliefs:

*“(a) Issue an appropriate writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing the Respondents to take swift action by referring the matter of de-affiliation of the Petitioner for resolution before the Arbitration Commission.
(b) A Rule NISI be issued in this matter”*

2. During the course of hearing, the attention of this Court has been drawn to Clause 24.1 of the Memorandum of Association of respondent no. 2-Indian Olympic Association [**MoU**], which is extracted below, for reference:

“24.1 Any decision taken by IOA is subject to appeal before the Arbitration Commission of the IOA within 21 days after the receipt of decision.”

3. The Court, therefore, was of the *prima facie* opinion that when the



petitioner did not approach the Arbitration Commission (Commission) within 21 days, therefore, right to raise grievance before the Arbitrator stands forfeited. However, Mr. Kirtiman Singh, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner, takes this Court through the decision passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Municipal Corporation of Delhi v. Natraj Construction Company***,¹ and submits that the limitation period for approaching the Commission cannot be as per the terms of the MoA in derogation of the provisions of the Limitation Act, 1963 [‘Act’]. He submits that the petitioner had approached the Commission within three years from the date of the decision within the limitation period.

4. Learned counsel appearing for respondent no.2, however, opposes the said submissions. According to him, the decision in ***Municipal Corporation of Delhi*** is not applicable on the facts of the present case. He submits further, that the petitioner does not have any *locus* to challenge the decision at this point of time. The court, however, finds that all those aspects can be looked into by respondent no.2 while passing an appropriate order after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

5. If, for any good reason, there is no necessity for the same, or the petitioner is not entitled in law to prefer an appeal before the Commission, the same has to be adjudicated and a reasoned order has to be passed.

6. Having considered the aforesaid circumstances, the instant petition stands disposed of with the direction to the Commission constituted under respondent no.2 as per Clause 24 of the MoA, to decide the aspect as to whether the matter is amenable to be adjudicated by it as per Clause 24.1 of

¹ (2023) 2 High Court Cases (Del) 347



the MoA.

7. Let the said decision be taken by way of a speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.
8. Petition stands disposed of.
9. All rights and contentions are left open.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 16, 2026/P