

**IN THE COURT OF ANJU BAJAJ CHANDNA,
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
NEW DELHI DISTRICT: PATIALA HOUSE COURTS: DELHI**

CS No. 519/2025

COL JAIVEER SINGH (RETD.),
SECRETARY-GENERAL
EQUESTRIAN FEDERATION OF INDIA
S/o MAJOR KULWANT SINGH (RETD.).
ADDRESS: 215, New Pratap Chowk,
Arjan Vihar, Delhi Cantt, Delhi-10
Email: chiragmadan14@gmail.com

....PLAINTIFF

VERSUS

1. EQUESTRIAN FEDERATION OF INDIA,
THROUGH ITS ACTING PRESIDENT
MR. HARISH KHOKKAR
OFFICIAL ADDRESS AT:
T1, STATION ROAD,
CARIAPPA MARG, DELHI CANTT-110010
Email harish@sunriseindia.biz

..... DEFENDANT NO.1

2. COL. JAGAT SINGH (RETD)
VICE-PRESIDENT (TECH.)
EQUESTRIAN FEDERATION OF INDIA
OFFICIAL ADDRESS AT.
T1, STATION ROAD,
CARIAPPA MARG, DELHI CANTT-110010
Email: jagatco879@yahoo.co.in

.....DEFENDANT NO.2

3. **M.M REHMAN**
JOINT SECRETARY (TECH.)
EQUESTRIAN FEDERATION OF INDIA
OFFICIAL ADDRESS AT:
T1, STATION ROAD,
CARIAPPA MARG, DELHI CANTT-110010
Email: mmrahman74@rediffmail.com

.....DEFENDANT NO.3

4. **COL S.S. AHLAWAT**
TREASURER
EQUESTRIAN FEDERATION OF INDIA
OFFICIAL ADDRESS AT:
T1, STATION ROAD,
CARIAPPA MARG, DELHI CANTT-110010
Email: alleywithme@yahoo.com

.....DEFENDANT NO.4

5. **DR. SY QURAISHI**
COURT APPOINTED OBSERVER
OF EQUESTRIAN FEDERATION OF INDIA
OFFICIAL ADDRESS AT:
D-17, Basement, Lajpat Nagar - 3, New Delhi - 110024
Email: syquraishi@gmail.com

..... DEFENDANT NO.5

Appearance:

Sh. Pawanjit Singh Bindra, Ld. Senior Advocate along with
Advocates Sh. Siddharth Nath, Sh. Asjad Hussain and Sh.
Anunay Chowdhary, Ld. Counsels for the plaintiff.

Sh. Vinayak Bhandari and Sh. Manan Shishodia, Ld.
Counsels for defendant No.1.

Sh. Samar Bansal and Sh.Ishan Roy Chowdhury, Ld.
Counsel for defendant No.5

ORDER
22.12.2025

1. This order would dispose of application filed on behalf of plaintiff under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 CPC and application under Order 39 Rule 4 CPC filed on behalf of defendant.

2. The present suit has been filed by the plaintiff seeking relief of declaration and injunction on the pleas that plaintiff is a retired Army Officer and was duly elected as Secretary General of Equestrian Federation of India (defendant no.1) in the year 2019. The Federation was constituted in 1967 and is National Sports Federation registered with Registrar of Societies. The Federation is governed by statutes of Equestrian Federation of India. Defendant no.2 is the Vice President, Defendant no.3 is Joint Secretary and Defendant no.4 is the Treasurer of the Federation.

3. In LPA No. 449/2024, High Court of Delhi, vide order dated 29.05.2024 in LPA No. 449/2024 ordered till the disposal of the writ petition (c) 10342/2019 and writ petition (c) 5989/2022, the Executive Committee constituted pursuant to EFI elections held in 2019 be reinstated. Prior to this, in W. P. 10342/2019, High Court vide its order dated 15.11.2019 appointed IAS Mr. S. Y. Quraishi as an

Observer to oversee the functioning of Federation with the power to call upon the Governing Body and to seek prior approval of the court with respect to any decision taken by the Governing Body but not approved by the Observer.

4. The matter relates to the suspension of plaintiff who has been the Secretary General of Equestrian Federation of India (defendant No.1). A show-cause notice was issued to the plaintiff dated 20.03.2025 for his suspension on the alleged misconduct and violation of statutory guidelines and EFI statutes and thereafter on 11.04.2025, the plaintiff was illegally suspended for 89 days. Upon receipt of notice, the plaintiff immediately communicated to defendant no.4 about violation of High Court orders and defendant no.5 by way of emails dated 12.04.2025 and 15.04.2025 communicated that permission of High Court must be taken for such suspension. The defendant no.2 and 4 approached High Court of Delhi seeking removal of the plaintiff by filing CM, APPL 27578/2025 dated 30.04.2025 in LPA No. 449/2024 but the same was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to take recourse to other legal remedies. The order of High Court is dated 07.05.2025.

5. The plaintiff was asked to appear before the Dispute Resolution Disciplinary & Ethics Committee (DRDEC) for hearing with respect to his suspension. On 21.08.2025, the Executive

Committee (EC) was held and report was furnished by DRDEC against the plaintiff and his suspension was extended vide minutes of meeting so recorded. Defendant no.3 was appointed as Interim Secretary General. According to the plaintiff, his removal is contrary to the statutes of defendant no.1 as plaintiff being the Member of Executive Committee could only be removed by two/third majority of the General Assembly. Challenging the legality of the minutes of meeting dated 21.08.2025, it is asserted that same is against the spirit of the orders passed by High Court of Delhi.

6. Further, defendant no.2 and 3 have changed the email for official communication thereby bringing a State of absolute chaos and confusion. The new Website along with email address have been created and attempt was made to operate the account in the name of defendant no.1 at Canara Bank, Dhaula Kuan which could only be operated by Secretary General and Treasurer. Defendant no.3 also opened a new bank account in the name of defendant no.1 with HDFC Bank, Gopinath Bazar, Delhi Cantt thereby misusing the funds. By treating the plaintiff as suspended, defendant no.2 also wrote to the plaintiff on 22.09.2025 directing him to refrain from using the name and logo of EFI in any correspondence / communication and desist himself as a Member of Executive Committee or in any capacity associated with EFI.

7. The plaintiff replied the said communication vide his email dated 23.09.2025 asserting that the alleged suspension is illegal and non est. By way of application under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 CPC, the following reliefs have been sought by the plaintiff:-

a. Pass an Ad Interim, ex-parte injunction in favour of the plaintiff on the operation of the minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting of Defendant No.1 dated 21st August 2025 and all consequential actions arising from the meeting including the suspension of the Plaintiff,

b. Pass an ad-interim, ex parte injunction restraining Defendant No.3 from representing himself as the Acting Secretary General of Defendant No.1:

c. Pass necessary directions that only the official email address of the Secretary General i.e., efiindianf@yahoo.co.in should be used to represent the Secretary General of Defendant No.1 for all official communication till the disposal of the present suit:

d. Pass necessary directions to Canara Bank, Dhaula Kuan, New Delhi allowing the Secretary General and Treasurer as signatories for operation of Account in the name of

Defendant No.1 having Account bearing No. 90302010013740 and the debit freeze on Account bearing No. 90302010013740 be removed till disposal of the present suit.

e. Pass necessary directions to HDFC Bank, Gopinath Bazar, Delhi Cantt, New Delhi allowing the Secretary General and Treasurer as signatories for operation of Account in the name of Defendant No.1 having Account bearing No. 50100834333598 and the debit freeze on Account bearing No. 50100834333598 be removed till disposal of the present suit.

8. Summons of the suit and notice of the application under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 CPC was issued and served to the defendants and they put up appearance on 28.10.2025. After hearing both the sides, ad-interim injunction was granted in the following manner:-

“On giving due consideration to the above facts and circumstances of the case, nature of controversy and the material available on record, there is prima facie case in favour of the plaintiff as he has been suspended without following the rules and procedures and even the Observer appointed by High Court, Mr. S.Y. Quraishi (defendant

No.5) has not approved the decision of the Executive Committee. The General Assembly has not been convened for the purposes of giving legal effect to the suspension of the plaintiff.

Accordingly, till further orders, no further action would be taken by the defendants to give effect to the suspension of the plaintiff. The defendant No.3 is not to take any decision in the capacity of Acting Secretary General. The bank accounts mentioned above at Canara Bank and HDFC Bank are not to be used by the defendants without permission of the Observer.”

9. To controvert the claims of the plaintiff, defendant filed written statement and more specifically an application under Order 39 Rule 4 CPC seeking that order dated 28.10.2025 be vacated on the pleas that defendant no.1 is National Sports Federation for Equestrian Sports in India. It is submitted that plaintiff was elected as Secretary General, during the elections for Executive Committee on 15.11.2019. In 2021 – 2022, the plaintiff unilaterally terminated several members of Executive Committee without following due process. High Court vide order dated 29.05.2024 passed in LPA No. 449/2024, reinstated the entire Executive Committee including the plaintiff. It is further asserted that serious allegations of financial misconduct, fraud and

gross violation of statutes of EFI were levelled against the plaintiff by various stakeholders of EFI which are as follows:-

- i. Incurring financial expenses beyond the limits set by the General Assembly and without the approval of the Executive Committee.
- ii. Redeeming Fixed Deposits of the Answering Defendant unilaterally, without approval of the Executive Committee.
- iii. Unilaterally changing the calendar of events of the Answering Defendant and awarding events to personally favoured entities, without approval.
- iv. Opening up of a separate/parallel Bank Account of the Answering Defendant without the approval or knowledge of the Executive Committee.
- v. Manipulating/falsifying Minutes of Meetings of the Annual General Assembly meetings.
- vi. Unilaterally suspending members of the Executive Committee without following due process, in order to grab control over the Federation.

vii. Restricting access of any of the members of the Executive Committee to the office of the Answering Defendant.

10. The allegations were reported to the Observer but Ld. Observer failed to act on the allegations. The Executive Committee, in view of serious allegations of fraud and embezzlement, during its meeting on 07.03.2025, issued a show-cause notice dated 20.03.2025 to the plaintiff seeking his explanation. Plaintiff despite having been granted extension, failed to reply show-cause notice. The Executive Committee accordingly issued Suspension Resolution dated 11.04.2025 temporarily suspending the plaintiff from the post of Secretary General for a period of 89 days or until conclusion of investigation (whichever is earlier). Ld. Observer was duly informed about the decision of the Committee on 12.04.2025. It is admitted that Observer communicated through emails dated 12.04.2025 and 15.04.2025. It is also admitted that CM Appl No. 27578/2025 was filed in High Court of Delhi seeking permission to suspend the plaintiff but the same was withdrawn as Executive Committee opted to initiate enquiry against the plaintiff by constituting the DRDEC as per EFI statutes. DRDEC granted various opportunities to the plaintiff to appear but plaintiff failed to appear and answer the charges. The DRDEC concluded its

enquiry based on documents and evidence and found the plaintiff guilty of allegations and accordingly recommended the termination of his membership. The Enquiry Report of DRDEC was placed before Executive Committee in its meeting held on 21.08.2025 and it is resolved to extend the suspension of the plaintiff till further action can be taken in pursuance of recommendation of DRDEC. The defendants seek vacation of interim injunction on the ground that plaintiff concealed vital documents and facts in the present suit. Defendants have relied upon order dated 21.05.2024 passed in W. P. (C) 10342/2025 wherein plaintiff has been found guilty of falsifying / forging the Minutes of EGM dated 17.09.2023. It is stated that application for change in signatories of the bank account is pending before High Court. It is alleged that plaintiff has been guilty of financial misconduct and violations of EFI statutes. Various allegations showing misconduct of the plaintiff have been detailed. It is specifically contended that plaintiff has failed to facilitate forensic audit of accounts which was resolved to be conducted by the Executive Committee in its meeting on 17.08.2024 and plaintiff has even restrained Members of Executive Committee from accessing the financial records. According to the defendants, plaintiff was suspended only after following a proper procedure. Relying upon the statutes by which EFI is governing, it is asserted that in view of allegations of gross misconduct and moral turpitude, member can be dealt with and

terminated as per recommendation of DRDEC. It is also stated that interim order operating in favour of the plaintiff amounts to decreeing the suit.

11. Reply to the application under Order 39 Rule 4 CPC is filed on behalf of plaintiff, stating that the plaintiff has been suspended without following the rules and procedures mandated by EFI statutes and without approval of the court appointed observer / defendant no.5 and without convening the General Assembly. Defendant no.2 and 3 unilaterally convened the impugned meeting without notice to the plaintiff and without notice to defendant no.5 and in complete violation of Article 7 (4.3) of EFI statutes which mandates that suspension or removal of an Executive Committee member lies exclusively with the General Body and only upon a two third majority.

12. Reply to the application under Order 39 Rule 4 CPC is also filed on behalf of defendant no.5 wherein it is stated that by virtue of order dated 15.11.2019, defendant no.5 was appointed by High Court of Delhi as an Observer to oversee the functioning of Federation. Defendant no.5 was empowered to direct Executive Committee of defendant no.1 to seek prior approval of High Court whenever it was considered necessary by him. Defendant no.5 was informed that the plaintiff was suspended by resolution dated 11.04.2025. Given that the

entire Executive Committee including the plaintiff was reinstated by the revival order of the High Court, the defendant no.5 advised the Executive Committee to obtain necessary approvals from High Court before implementing the resolution. Defendant no.5 was not present for any of the subsequent meetings as the erstwhile procedure adopted by the defendant no.1 to seek the availability of defendant no.5 prior to holding an Executive Committee meeting is no longer being followed. In relation to the request for a forensic audit to be conducted having been informed to defendant no.5, defendant no.5 had responded to the Executive Committee through email dated 01.09.2024 and separately informed to High Court that such a request had been made by certain members of defendant no.1.

13. Arguing on behalf of plaintiff, Ld. Sr. Advocate Sh. Pawanjit Singh Bindra submitted that plaintiff was temporarily suspended vide letter dated 11.04.2025. No resolution or minutes of meeting have been shown in respect of issuance of such letter and as such Executive Committee Resolution to suspend the plaintiff does not even exist. The suspension of plaintiff as extended vide minutes of meeting dated 21.08.2025, would have no consequence as the initial suspension itself was baseless. The suspension of the plaintiff is challenged on two counts firstly that the observer appointed by High Court Mr. S. Y. Quraishi (defendant no.5) required to give his approval to the

suspension of the plaintiff and in case approval is not granted, Federation needed to go to the High Court. The defendants even approached the High Court by filing the application but withdrew the same as evident by High Court order dated 07.05.2025. The Observer Mr. S. Y. Quraishi who has been appointed to oversee the functioning of the Federation, raised objection to such decision vide communications dated 12.04.2025 and 15.04.2025. Ld. Counsel further relied upon the statutes of EFI whereby Member of Executive Committee could only be suspended or removed or terminated by two third majority of votes in General Assembly. On the allegations of financial irregularities, it is submitted that the accounts of the year 2023-2024 were audited by the auditors and duly approved in Annual General Body Meeting dated 18.08.2024. Ld. Counsel further submitted that DRDEC was constituted in June 2025 and at the time of suspension vide letter dated 11.04.2025 no such committee was in place. Sh. M. M. Rehman (defendant no.3) has been appointed as Acting Secretary General but even no approval of this was sought from the Observer.

14. Argued on behalf of defendants, Ld. Counsels Sh. Vinayak Bhandari and Sh. Manan Shishodia submitted that plaintiff suspended Tarsem Singh (Retired) who was the Member of the Executive Committee and in the same way, suspension of the plaintiff has been

done. A show-cause notice was given to the plaintiff detailing the allegations but no response was received. The plaintiff failed to get the forensic audit of the accounts conducted despite approval of observer as evident from the email dated 01.09.2024. So far as the statutes of Federation are concerned, it is argued by Ld. Counsel that same have to be read and interpreted harmoniously and not selectively. In case of gross misconduct involving moral turpitude, the DRDEC may recommend the suspension. DRDEC was constituted on 28.06.2025 and Executive Committee while accepting the report, recommended the suspension of the plaintiff vide minutes of meeting dated 21.08.2025. Plaintiff even failed to appear and answer the allegations before DRDEC. The plaintiff has only been removed from the post of Secretary General and not as the Member of the Federation. It has also been argued that Observer Mr. S. Y. Quraishi appointed by High Court is only to oversee the functioning of Federation and not to involve himself in day to day functioning.

15. On behalf of defendant no.5 (observer), Ld. Counsel Sh.Samar Bansal has argued that Observer appointed by the order of High Court dated 15.11.2019 is to oversee the functioning of the Federation. The role so assigned is not a passive role but a significant role. The Observer was informed about the suspension and therefore, response was given by the Observer objecting to such suspension

without his approval or without the approval of High Court. The questions were posed through emails dated 12.04.2025 and 15.04.2025. The extension of suspension of the plaintiff was granted in August 2025 but observer was not made the part of decision making process. It has also been contended on behalf of Observer that he is not able to discharge his functions properly and no information or intimation is properly given to the Observer about the procedure and actions. It has also been submitted that matter of the plaintiff is covered under Clause 4.3 of the statutes of EFI.

16. On giving consideration to the nature of facts and circumstances and the rival contentions, I am of the opinion that prima facie case and balance of convenience lies in favour of the plaintiff. It is not in dispute that plaintiff has been appointed as Secretary General of Equestrian Federation of India and he has been the Member of the Executive Committee. The statutes governing Equestrian Federation of India provide for removal / suspension/ termination in the following manner:-

Chapter II

Article 7 – Rights of Members

3. Removal/Suspension/Termination of Membership: A member shall cease to be a member of the EFI if: -

3.1 He has been adjudicated as insolvent by a court.

3.2 He, being a Government servant, has been dismissed from Service.

3.3 A member who has been found guilty by a competent court for an offence involving moral turpitude, gross misconduct or has been sentenced to imprisonment or has been Framed by a Court of Law that has a sentence of 6 months or more.

3.4 He has not paid the bills on due date as stipulated in these Statutes despite two reminders.

3.5 The Dispute Resolution, Disciplinary and Ethics Committee of the EFI recommends any instances that merit termination which may involve gross misconduct and/or moral turpitude. The final decision of termination shall vest with the EC for Individual/Life members and General Assembly for Institution/Club/State/UT members.

4. Removal/Suspension of Membership:

4.1 An Individual/Life member may be removed from the Federation if he/she has been found guilty of any conduct

which, in the opinion of the Executive Committee based on their reasoned decision, is against the objectives of the EFI or contrary to its interest. In such a case, the decision of the Executive Committee which must be passed by a two third majority is final and binding. In case of a State/UT Equestrian Association and Institution/Club members, the same has to be put up to General Body/Extra Ordinary General Body and its decision will be final and binding which shall be required to be passed by a simple majority of members present.

4.2 The Executive Committee, may suspend an individual/life member for an offence for a specific period. The decision for suspension should be passed by a simple majority. At the end of the suspension period, the member may be automatically reinstated with all his/her rights. Such cases will need to be ratified by the Executive Committee.

4.3 The General Assembly, by a two third majority of votes. can suspend/remove/terminate from the Federation any member of Executive Committee, Selection Committee, Athletes Commission and other Sub Committee for gross misconduct or for activities contrary to interests and objectives of the EFI.

17. On analysing the above provisions, it is clear that Member could be removed, suspended or terminated as per clause 3 whereas member of Executive Committee could be removed or suspended as per clause 4.3. The plaintiff was suspended vide letter dated 11.04.2025 wherein it is mentioned that Executive Committee of EFI has resolved to suspend him from the office of Secretary General with immediate effect for a period 89 days or until the conclusion of the investigation whichever is earlier, as an interim measure pending enquiry. However, no resolution / minutes of meeting have been placed on record to show as to on what basis and reasons, Executive Committee resolved to suspend the plaintiff. The approval of the Observer was not obtained for such resolution. The observer raised his objections vide emails dated 12.04.2025 and 15.04.2025 suggesting that Executive Committee must seek the order from Delhi High Court before taking any precipitate and dubious action. It is also evident from the order dated 07.05.2025 (in LPA No. 449/2024) that application seeking such approval was filed but same was withdrawn. So far as disciplinary committee (DRDEC) is concerned, the report was not placed before the Observer for approval nor General Assembly was called seeking approval of such report. It is not clear that as to what prevented the Executive Committee to place the report of DRDEC before General Assembly and before Observer for their confirmation. The suspension of Secretary General of Federation is a matter of due importance and

falls within the domain of observer as he has been specifically appointed to oversee the functioning of the Federation. The role assigned to Observer cannot be undermined to say that he is appointed only to oversee the functioning and not to involve himself in the important decisions. The members of Executive Committee without following due procedure and without getting approval from the observer could not have suspended the plaintiff nor the plaintiff could be removed from the position of Secretary General by assigning the power and responsibility to defendant no.3. Even for appointment of defendant no.3 as Acting Secretary General, no approval of General Assembly or Observer was taken. The actions of defendants cannot be approved by this court as they are in violation of the specific provisions of statutes governing EFI (defendant no.1).

18. In my considered opinion, plaintiff could not have been suspended by merely issuing a letter and without following due procedure and without seeking approval of the General Assembly and the Observer. As such, all three parameters i.e. prima facie case, balance of convenience and irreparable loss are in favour of the plaintiff. The application of the plaintiff under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 CPC is allowed and following reliefs as prayed under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 are granted:-

- a. Injunction is granted in favour of the plaintiff on the operation of the minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting of Defendant No.1 dated 21st August 2025 and all consequential actions arising from the meeting including the suspension of the Plaintiff till the disposal of the suit.
- b. Injunction is granted restraining Defendant No.3 from representing himself as the Acting Secretary General of Defendant No.1 till the disposal of the suit.
- c. The official email address of the Secretary General i.e., efiindianf@yahoo.co.in should be used to represent the Secretary General of Defendant No.1 for all official communications till the disposal of the present suit.
- d. The Canara Bank, Dhaula Kuan, New Delhi is directed to allow Secretary General and Treasurer as signatories for operation of account No. 90302010013740 and the debit freeze on Account bearing No. 90302010013740 be removed till disposal of the present suit.

e. The HDFC Bank, Gopinath Bazar, Delhi Cantt, New Delhi is directed to allow Secretary General and Treasurer as signatories for operation of account bearing No. 50100834333598 and the debit freeze on Account bearing No. 50100834333598 be removed till disposal of the present suit.

19. For the above reasons, application under Order 39 Rule 4 is dismissed.

20. The above observations would not bear any finality on the merits of the case.

(Anju Bajaj Chandna)
Principal District & Sessions Judge
New Delhi District, Patiala House Court
New Delhi/22.12.2025