



\$~55 & 56

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

+ W.P.(C) 10681/2024 & CM APPL. 43921/2024

SPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA THROUGH

SH. SANDIP PRADHAN & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Sr.
Adv. with Mr. Sandeep Kumar Mahapatra,
CGSC, Mr. Sugam Kumar Jha, Mr. Sreedass
K.P., Mr. Aditya P. Khanna and Mr. Raghav
Tandon, Advs,

versus

NAINA PRAVEEN & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj and Ms.
Sakshi Saugat, Advs.
Mr. Abhimanue Shrestha, Adv.

56

+ W.P.(C) 10807/2024 & CM APPL. 44449/2024

SPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

THROUGH SH. SANDIP PRADHAN,

DIRECTOR GENERAL & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Sr.
Adv. with Mr. Sandeep Kumar Mahapatra,
CGSC, Mr. Sugam Kumar Jha, Mr. Sreedass
K.P., Mr. Aditya P. Khanna and Mr. Raghav
Tandon, Advs,

versus

AMANDEEP SINGH & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj and Ms.
Sakshi Saugat, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER

%

04.05.2026



1. This matter was listed today only because of the statement by learned Counsel for the respondent, recorded in the order dated 16 April 2026, that the case is fully covered by the judgment of the Supreme Court in **SAI v. Kulbir Singh Rana**¹.

2. We have heard Mr. Abhimanue Shrestha, learned Counsel for the respondent, at some length on the applicability of the aforesaid decision. Mr. Shrestha has taken us through the said judgment. In para 4 of the judgment, the Supreme Court has held as under:

“Under the above provision, an employee, who is working on ad hoc basis on any post mentioned in the 1992 Rules shall be deemed to be appointed under the said rules, after being duly approved for the “initial constitution” of SAI. In other words, he/she is not merely a daily wage or a contractual employee, but an employee of SAI. The respondent was continuing on contractual basis as a physiotherapist (Grade II) since 20-2-2021.”

3. The Supreme Court has, therefore, held that persons who were appointed on *ad hoc* basis mentioned in the 1992 Rules would be deemed to have been appointed under the said Rules after being duly approved for initial constitution and cannot be treated as *ad hoc* or contractual employees but employees of the SAI.

4. We, therefore, called upon Mr. Shrestha as to demonstrate that his clients had been appointed to a post mentioned in the 1992 Rules.

5. Mr. Shrestha candidly acknowledges that 1992 Rules are not on record and submits that he would need time to address these issues.

¹ (2025) 10 SCC 819



6. In the circumstances, re-notify on 19 August 2026.

C.HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

MAY 4, 2026/AR