

IN THE COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA : HYDERABAD

MAIN CASE NO.: W.P.NO.6598 OF 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
1.	08.06.2026	<p><u>RY,J</u></p> <p><u>I.A.Nos.1 and 2 of 2026</u></p> <p>In view of elections already been conducted to the post of Secretary, Hyderabad Cricket Association pursuant to impugned letter dated 19.02.2026 and notice dated 28.02.2026, this Court is not passing any specific orders in these petitions.</p> <p><u>W.P.No.6598 of 2026</u></p> <p>Heard Mr. Mohammed Omer Farooq, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Government Pleader for Sports for respondent No.1 and Mr. V. Rajender Rao, learned Standing Counsel for HCA appearing for respondent Nos.2 to 6.</p> <p>The writ petition is filed aggrieved by the letter dated 19.02.2026 issued by respondent No.2 - President of Hyderabad Cricket Association intimating the petitioner that he shall cease to hold the office of Secretary of Hyderabad Cricket Association with effect from 05.03.2026. In that context, there was contest between the petitioner on one hand and respondent Nos.2 and 5 on the other hand with respect to maintainability of the writ petition. According to the writ petitioner, the petition is maintainable as there was violation of</p>	

principles of natural justice as he was not given an opportunity of being heard before issuing the impugned letter dated 19.02.2026 with respect to his eligibility to continue to hold the post of office of Secretary. Whereas, according to the respondent No.2 and respondent No.5, the writ petition is not maintainable as alternative efficacious remedies are available before the Ombudsman and before a Civil Court under Section 23 of Societies Registration Act.

A perusal of the record shows that there is an issue about whether or not the petitioner completed 9 years as Office bearer of the Hyderabad Cricket Association. For the purpose of completing said 9 years' time period, respondent No.5 on the basis of a fact finding report given by respondent No.4 concluded that the petitioner completed 9 years which includes the term of the petitioner from 10.08.2010 to 31.03.2017 as Executive Committee Member & Treasurer and from 22.10.2023 to 09.02.2026 as Secretary of Hyderabad Cricket Association. There is a dispute about whether or not the term of the petitioner as Executive Member should be included in the 9-year term period. According to respondent No.2 and respondent No.5, said time period has to be included and therefore, the petitioner completed 9 years. Whereas, the petitioner is relying upon the Memorandum of Association and Rules and Regulations-2018, which govern the functioning of Hyderabad Cricket

Association, to challenge the stand taken by respondent No.2 and respondent No.5. More particularly, the petitioner is relying upon the Rule 6 and Rule 14 and their interpretation by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in I.A.No.94179 of 2019 in Civil Appeal No.4235 of 2014. There is a need for clarification on this aspect.

Coming to the aspect of availability of an efficacious alternative remedy, as per the recommendations made by Lodha Committee and the single member committee report, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has accepted the recommendations and the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court have binding force as per Article 141 of Constitution of India. The Lodha Committee recommended for resolution of dispute in the cricket associations through the institution of Ombudsman, which is to be manned by a person who is a retired judge of the Supreme Court or a retired Chief Justice of a State. When the Hyderabad Cricket Association accepted the recommendations as per the undertaking given by it before the Supreme Court, it would not stand to reason to direct a member of HCA to approach a Civil Court for remedy.

With respect to presenting the issue before the Ombudsman, the pleadings themselves make it clear that the Ombudsman was out of station when the issue arose. By the time, the Ombudsman

arrived, the tenure of the petitioner is declared to have concluded on completion of 9 years and notice for elections has been issued. Therefore, there was no occasion for the petitioner to present his case before the Ombudsman and therefore, the writ petition is maintainable.

For hearing the case of petitioner on merits, list this matter after two weeks on 22 -06-2026.

RY,J

gvl

--	--	--	--