



\$~5 & 6

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

+ W.P.(C) 14408/2025, CM APPL. 59107/2025 & CM APPL. 60995/2025

CHURCHILL BROTHERS SPORTS CLUB PVT LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gautam Narayan, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Asmita Singh, Ms. Vrinda Bhandari and Ms. Pragya Barsaiyan, Advocates.

versus

ALL INDIA FOOTBALL FEDERATION & ANR.....Respondents

Through: Mr Prateek Chadha with Mr. Sreekar Aechuri, Advocates for R1.

Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Senior Advocate with Mr. R. Sudhinder, Ms. Ekta Bhasin, Mr. Ashish Mukhi, Ms. Aastha Trivedi, Mr. Anand Amit & Ms. Radhika Yadav, Advocates for R2.

+ W.P.(C) 17144/2025, CM APPL.70482/2025 & CM APPL. 71367/2025

AVIMUKTA SPORTS PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Senior Advocate with Mr. R. Sudhinder, Ms. Ekta Bhasin, Mr. Ashish Mukhi, Ms. Aastha Trivedi, Mr. Anand Amit & Ms. Radhika Yadav, Advocates.

versus

ALL INDIA FOOTBALL FEDERATION AND ORS

.....Respondents



Through: Mr Prateek Chadha with Mr. Sreekar Aechuri, Advocates for R1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

08.01.2026

1. There are two writ petitions. Churchill Brothers Sports Club Pvt. Ltd. has filed W.P.(C) 14408/2025, whereas, Avimukta Sports Private Limited (Inter Kashi FC) is the petitioner in W.P.(C) 17144/2025. Churchill Brothers Sports Club Pvt. Ltd. claims to be a professional football club in the I-League and competes directly with Inter Kashi FC (Avimukta Sports Private Limited). Respondent no.1 herein is the All India Football Federation (AIFF). The AIFF is a National Sports Federation and the apex body for governance of football in India.
2. The primary grievance raised by Churchill Brothers Sports Club Pvt. Ltd. (the petitioner) is against Avimukta Sports Private Limited (respondent no. 2), alleging that the latter violated the terms of the RFP dated 05.05.2023, under which it was allowed to establish a football club in the Tier II city in Varanasi. They, however, have played all its home matches in the years 2023 – 2024 and 2024 – 2025 from Kalyani near Kolkata which is a Tier I city and plans to play in Guwahati, another Tier I city in the year 2025 – 2026. It is the case of the petitioner that while doing so, respondent no. 2 has violated contractual norms, and therefore, renders itself liable for necessary consequences by respondent no. 1.
3. It has also been pointed out that there seems to be some conflict of interests between the current President respondent no. 2 and respondent no. 1.



4. Mr. Gautam Narayan, learned senior counsel then points out from Annexure 'P7', being letter dated 16.04.2025, that written complaints were made to AIFF by six applicants including the petitioner.

5. During the course of hearing, Mr. Dayan Krishnan, learned senior counsel who appears for respondent no. 2, however, submits that the complaint made by the petitioner is meritless and lacks substance.

6. It is submitted by Mr Prateek Chadha, learned counsel who appears for respondent no.1/AIFF that there has been earlier litigation between the petitioner and the respondent no. 2 which had gone up to an international forum and under these circumstances, both the petitions deserve to be dismissed.

7. A perusal of the facts would then indicate that there seems to be a complaint made by the petitioner to respondent no. 1, which is yet to be taken to its logical end. If there is any grievance of respondent no. 2 against the petitioner or *vice versa*, the same will have to be raised before respondent no. 1. Respondent no. 1 being a national sports body is under an obligation to take those issues to their logical conclusion.

8. Under the aforesaid circumstances, it would be in the fitness of things that both the writ petitions be disposed of with directions to respondent no. 1 to address the grievances. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits, or otherwise, of the grievances raised by the petitioner and respondent no. 2, the petitions stand disposed of with the following directions:

(i) Let the petitioner and respondent no. 2 to submit their comprehensive representations within a period of seven days from today, enclosing all documents including the earlier complaints which they had made.



(ii) On receipt of the comprehensive representations, respondent no.1 is directed to deal with the same after affording opportunity of hearing to both of them.

(iii) Let respondent no.1 to pass a speaking order dealing with their grievances within a period of four weeks from the date of conclusion of the hearing.

(iv) It will be up to the respondent no.1 as to how the complaints will have to be decided.

9. Thereafter, the aggrieved party shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.

10. All pending applications shall also stand disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

JANUARY 8, 2026

tr/amg