



\$~79

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

+ W.P.(C) 2600/2025 and CM APPL.12384/2025 (Stay)

BOXING FEDERATION OF INDIA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia (Sr. Adv), Mr. Shashank Garg (Sr. Adv), Mr. Parth Goswami, Mr. Akshay Kumar, Mr. Ayush Yadav, Advs.

versus

INDIAN OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Mr. Sanjiv Kr. Saxena, Mr. Mukesh Kr. Tiwari, Ms. Poonam Shukla, Ms. Reba Jena Mishra, Ms. Harshita Sharma, Advs. Mr. Shashank Shekhar (Sr. Adv) along with Mr. vikash singh, Mr. Ujjwal Chaudhary, Advs. Mr. Devvrat Yadav (GP)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

03.03.2025

CM APPL.12385/2025 (Exemption)

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

W.P.(C) 2600/2025 & CM APPL.12384/2025 (Stay)

3. The present petition assails an order dated 24.02.2025 (hereinafter '*the impugned order*') issued by the President of the Indian Olympic Association (respondent no.1) whereby an ad hoc committee has been sought to be appointed by the respondent no.1 to manage the affairs of the petitioner (Boxing Federation of India).
4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submit that the impugned



order was passed unilaterally, without any prior notice, in utter violation of the principles of natural justice.

5. Further, it is submitted that the constitution of the IOA does not confer any power/ authority on the President of the IOA to unilaterally constitute an ad hoc committee to take over the affairs of a National Sports Federation.

6. It is pointed out that the said aspect has been dealt with and adjudicated upon by this Court in the case of ***Bihar Olympic Association v. President Indian Olympic Association & Anr.*** being W.P.(C) 308/2025. In that case, it has been, *inter alia*, held as under:-

“

xi. Quite apart from the aspect of procedural fairness and adherence to the principles of natural justice, a perusal of the Constitution of the IOA reveals that the President, IOA does not have any power to unilaterally take over the affairs of any SOA. An SOA is a “member” of the IOA under Article 1.2 read with Article 3.9 of the Constitution of the IOA (as amended upto 2nd November 2022).

xii. The IOA Constitution contemplates to “suspend, terminate or expel a member” for violation of the IOA Constitution or the Olympic Charter. However, the power to do so is specifically conferred on the General Assembly of the IOA under Article 6.1.5 of the Constitution. Constituting an Ad-hoc body “to look after the affairs” of the concerned State Association is akin to suspending the Executive Committee of the concerned SOA.

xiii. As such, any proposal to take over, to suspend and/or appoint an ad-hoc body “to look after the affairs” of the concerned SOA should have been taken by the General Assembly of the IOA.

xiv. Learned counsel for the petitioner also rightly points out that in terms of Article 15.1.4, the President, IOA has, inter alia, the following powers:-

“15. Duties of Office-Bearers

15.1 PRESIDENT

15.1.4 To deal with all disciplinary matter arising in the IOA or in relation to the National Sports Federations/Associations/State Olympic



Associations, as per rules on the subject provided that any decision in relation to those matters shall be made by the Executive Council and/or the General Meeting”

xv. *In terms of the above, the President, IOA undoubtedly has powers to deal with all disciplinary matters in relation to an SOA “as per rules on the subject”. However, learned counsel for the respondent has not been able to point out any rules that are in existence to deal with disciplinary matters in relation to the SOA. In any event, the latter part of Article 15.1.4 explicitly clarifies that any decision in relation to any disciplinary matter shall be made by the Executive Council and/or the General Meeting. No such decision has been taken in the present case.*

xvi. *Learned counsel for the respondents relies upon Article 15.1.5 to contend that it is open for the President of the IOA to constitute various commission/committees and that it is always open to obtain a post facto ratification from the Executive Council and/or the General Body. Article 15.1.5 reads as under :-*

“15.1.5 The President of IOA may propose the formation of various IOA Commission / Committees and the Members of those Committees and Commission, subject to ratification by the Executive Council and/or the General Meeting.”

xvii. *The above provision, no doubt, indicates that the President of the IOA has the power to form various commission/committees. However, an ad-hoc committee “to look after the affairs” of an SOA, which is a constituent member of the IOA, cannot be said to be a “committee” of the IOA. The committees of the IOA are those which are set out in Article 17 of the Constitution of the IOA. The Committees contemplated therein are those which are necessary for running the affairs of the IOA. Article 15.1.5, therefore, encompasses within its scope, the power to constitute a committee for the purpose of running the affairs of the IOA. It cannot be construed to include the power to constitute committee/s for running the affairs of another independent body viz. the SOA, which is a constituent member of the IOA.*

xviii. *Moreover, the residuary powers to deal with matters which have not been specifically provided under the IOA constitution lie with the General Council of the IOA in terms of Article 25.3 of the IOA Constitution.*

xix. *In view of the aforesaid, the respondent no.1/President, IOA cannot be considered to have the power to constitute an Ad Hoc Committee to “look after the affairs” of an SOA.*

xx. *Also, the affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent no.1 does not disclose*



as to whether any steps were taken to obtain any ratification of the Executive Council and/or the General Meeting in respect of the action taken by the President.

22. For the above reasons, I find that the impugned action on the part of the President, IOA in constituting an Ad-hoc Committee “to look after the affairs” of the Bihar Olympic Association does not satisfy the requirements of law. The impugned order dated 01.01.2025 is consequently set aside. “

(emphasis supplied)

7. Issue notice.
8. Learned counsel, as aforesaid, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
9. Let reply, if any, be filed within a period of two weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of one week thereafter.
10. List on 27.03.2025.
11. In the meantime, in view of the aforesaid submissions of the learned senior counsel for the petitioner, and particularly in view of the judgment of this Court in ***Bihar Olympic Association v. President Indian Olympic Association & Anr.*** (supra), it is directed that the operation of the impugned order dated 24.02.2025 shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.
12. Learned counsel for respondent no.1 submits that *inter-se* discussions between the parties are ongoing for the purpose of seeking an amicable resolution of the matter. It would be apposite for the parties to continue to engage with each other for the purpose of arriving at an amicable resolution of the controversy.

SACHIN DATTA, J

MARCH 3, 2025/uk