

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

**WEDNESDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE RENUKA YARA

WRIT PETITION NO: 15349 OF 2026

Between:

Deccan Arsenal Cricket Club, (Regd. No.540 of 2014) Affiliated to Hyderabad Cricket Association, Rep. by it's Vice President (In-charge President, Deccan Arsenal Cricket Club, Sahebzada Azmath Ali Khan, both O/o at 22-7-382/1, Purani Haveli, Hyderabad.

AND

...PETITIONER

1. The State of Telangana,, Rep. by it's Principal Secretary - Youth Services AND Sports, Tank Bund, Hyderabad
2. The Hyderabad Cricket Association, Rep. by its Secretary.
3. The Apex Council -, Hyderabad Cricket Association, Rep. by it's Secretary.
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Hyderabad Cricket Association.

Respondents No.2 to 4 Office at Rajiv Gandhi International Cricket Stadium, Uppal, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue writ, order or direction, more particularly in the nature of WRIT OF MANDAMUS BY COMMAND declaring the acts actions of the Respondents in refusing to register the petitioner club its players in B - Division 2 days leagues for the season 2026-27 onwards conducted by respondent No. 2 as provided to other member clubs thereby abhorrently cascading depriving the right of petitioner being constituent general body member to participate in the all matches conducted by

respondent No. 2 as manifestly arbitrary, discriminatory, illegal, capricious, bad in law in violation of principles of natural justice AND binding order of Ombudsman in Case No. 9 of 2026 dated 10-04-2026 as mandated in Judgement of Supreme Court reported in 2016 (8) SCC 535 besides being in violation to Article 14, 19 (1) (C), 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to act conduct function in accordance with byelaws HCA, reports and Judgements rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Honorable Court

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to restrain the Respondents from dispossessing relegating the petitioner club its players from B- Division 2 days matches for the season 2026-27 onwards conducted by respondent No.2 as provided to other member clubs without applying principles of natural justice, application of mind, without opportunity of being heard and passing orders

**Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI MIR MASOOD KHAN, COUNSEL
REPRESENTING SRI MIR OMER KHAN**

Counsel for the Respondent No.1 : GP FOR YOUTH SERVICES & SPORTS

**Counsel for the Respondent Nos. 2 to 4: SRI A. VENKAIAH, SENIOR COUNSEL
REPRESENTING SRI VADEENDRA JOSHI, SC FOR HCA**

The Court made the following: ORDER

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT
HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE RENUKA YARA

WRIT PETITION No.15349 of 2026

THE 06TH DAY OF MAY, 2026.

Between:

Deccan Arsenal Cricket Club.

...Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana and 3 others.

...Respondents

ORDER:

Heard Sri Mir Masood Khan, learned counsel representing Sri Mir Omer Khan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri A. Venkatesh, learned Senior Counsel representing Sri Vadeendra Joshi, learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4. Perused the entire record.

2. The writ petition is filed with the following prayer:

“...to issue writ, order or direction, more particularly in the nature of WRIT OF MANDAMUS BY COMMAND declaring the actions of Respondents in refusing to register the petitioner club and its players in B- Division 2 days leagues for the season 2026-27 onwards conducted by respondent No. 2 as provided to other member clubs thereby abhorrently cascading depriving the right of petitioner being constituent general body member to participate in all matches conducted by respondent no. 2 as manifestly arbitrary, discriminatory, illegal, capricious, bad in law in violation of principles of natural

justice & binding order of Ombudsman in Case No. 9 of 2026 dated 10-04-2026 as mandated in Judgment of Supreme Court reported in 2016 (8) SCC 535, besides being in violation to Article 14, 19(1)(C), 21 of Constitution of India, and consequently direct the respondents to act conduct function in accordance with byelaws of HCA, reports and Judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Hon'ble Court and pass such other order or orders as deemed fit and proper..."

3. The petitioner-cricket club is affiliated to respondent No.2- Association i.e. Hyderabad Cricket Association ('HCA'). The petitioner club is a registered society under Societies Registration Act. Likewise, respondent No.2-HCA is a registered association under A.P. (Telangana Areas) Public Societies Registration Act 1350 Fasli. The case of petitioner club is that it is a general body member of respondent No.2-Association and therefore, entitled to participate in all the matches conducted by respondent No.2. Thus, the petitioner participated in B-Division 2 day league Championship for the season 2025-26 arrayed in Group D. The schedule of B-Division Leagues commenced on 07.07.2025 and continued upto 05.09.2025. The last match was played by the petitioner club on 03.11.2025 with Future Star Cricket Club. Thereafter, on 14.02.2026, respondent Nos.2 to 4 posted a WhatsApp group schedule matches describing the same as relegation matches without prior intimation. On 20.02.2026, the elimination match of petitioner club was scheduled without prior notice. On 19.02.2026, the petitioner received a communication from

the opponent cricket team, Continental Cricket Club, which has lost the first relegation match scheduled on 17 and 18.02.2026 against New Blues. Respondent Nos.2 to 4 were requested to reschedule the match fixed on 20.02.2026 due to examinations and non-availability of players who were out of station. Said communication was made through email dated 19.02.2026. Having received said email, respondent Nos.2 to 4 did not communicate to the petitioners about postponement. Even before the announcement of relegation matches and their schedule, due to non-availability of players, the petitioner club filed W.P.No.35135 of 2025 for registering new players to participate in B-Division 2 day league matches, knockout, playoff and any other match or matches or tournaments conducted by HCA by replacing them with any existing players, registered participants played for petitioner club. The said order has not been implemented. If the petitioner's retention match is not conducted, by rescheduling the same in compliance with orders in W.P.No.35135 of 2025 dated 20.02.2026, said act would cause irreparable loss and injury to the players of the petitioner team.

4. The petitioner club insisted that the other team Continental which also did not play the relegation match by seeking postponement has been retained in the same league. Further, to the knowledge of petitioner club,

Zinda Tilismath Cricket Club and Crown Cricket Club have not participated in B-Division 2 day league matches. Therefore, said teams which did not participate ought to have been relegated instead of the teams that have participated. The act of respondent Nos.2 to 4 is deliberate and their refusal to conduct the retention match and their refusal to comply with the orders of this Court in W.P.No.35135 of 2025 dated 20.02.2026 are arbitrary.

5. The petitioner referred to the order passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.No.35135 of 2025, wherein a direction was given to the respondent No.2 to register and replace players in accordance with notification dated 26.06.2025 for participation in the remaining matches of B-Division 2 day league championship 2025-26 including knockouts and playoffs subject to eligibility conditions prescribed in the said notification. The aforementioned was communicated by the petitioner to respondent Nos.2 to 4 on 03.03.2026 and 04.03.2026 for implementation. However, the said order is not implemented till date. On 27.03.2026, the petitioner requested for scheduling of the match for the purpose of implementing order dated 20.02.2026 in W.P.No.35135 of 2025. At that juncture, respondent Nos.2 to 4 issued circular for payment of annual subscription fee for the season 2026-27 on 07.03.2026. On said date, the petitioner paid

the subscription fee *vide* Cheque No.259127 dated 03.02.2026 and receipt dated 24.02.2026 is issued.

6. Reference is made to orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.18413 of 2024 dated 12.09.2024, wherein Sri Justice P. Naveen Rao has been appointed as Single Member Committee for the purpose of conducting league matches for the cricket season 2025-26. Reference is also made to Sri Justice R.M.Lodha Committee's ('Lodha Committee') recommendation incorporated by the Supreme Court, followed by the report of Sri Justice L. Nageswara Rao. It is pleaded that the recommendations of the Lodha Committee have been incorporated and inserted as Rule 40 in HCA by-laws, wherein Ombudsman is the absolute sole authority to decide all matters creating implied bar on Section 9 CPC and Section 23 of Andhra Pradesh Societies Registration Act and Central Act, 1860. As per Rule 40 of byelaws of HCA, a retired Judge of the Hon'ble Supreme Court or Chief Justice of High Court, has to be the Ombudsman, an Ethics Officer shall be retired Judge of High Court under Rule 39 of byelaws of HCA. The powers of the Ombudsman include resolving any disputes of HCA and its members, and the order of the Ombudsman shall be final and binding.

7. According to the petitioner, the Single Member Committee as Supervisory Committee is as contemplated by Lodha Committee and incorporated in the judgment in **Board of Control of Cricket v. Cricket Association of Bihar**¹. The powers and functions of Apex Council elected by the general body was never disturbed, but was placed under the function of supervisor advisory under Single Member Committee. Apex Council was directed to carry out their duties under the supervision of Single Member Committees by order in W.P. No. 21904 for 2025. The single member committee appointed by this Court made an internal communication dated 31.03.2026 to the CEO of HCA and said recommendation is sought to be implemented by the CEO and the Apex Council without application of mind. As per Rule 24 of byelaws of HCA, the CEO has to implement all the rules and regulations made by governing body and Apex Council as to non-cricketing matters. The promotion and delegation chart prepared by respondent Nos.2 to 4 does not contain reasons for said promotion and relegation.

8. Respondent No.2 did not provide the data of teams with respect to score, match sheet, position of teams, criteria, parameters applied, decision resolution by competent authority, but is threatening to delegate petitioner

¹ (2016) 8 SCC 535

club to C-Division without giving an opportunity of being heard in violation of principles of natural justice. According to the petitioner, the Apex Council has to make a decision independently *dehors* the communication dated 31.03.2026 as per its powers and powers bestowed on it by the byelaws.

9. Referring to the communication dated 31.03.2026, the petitioner emphasizes that two teams in A-Division League i.e. BDL and Income Tax were relegated to B-Division, as they have not participated in the League Season 2026. Two teams Zinda Tilismath and Crown Cricket Clubs have not participated in B-Division leagues for the seasons 2025-26. In case the teams which did not participate in the league matches from A-Division were relegated to B-Division, the same principle has to be applied to Zinda Tilismath Cricket Club and Crown Cricket Club, which also did not play the leagues for the cricketing season 2025-2026. Further, Continental Cricket Club which also did not play the relegation retention match is retained in B-Division, but the petitioner is relegated to C-Division without playing retention match and without implementing the order of this Court in W.P.No.35135 of 2025 dated 20.02.2026. The petitioner is not provided with key to register the players in B-Division leagues for the season 2026-27, though subscription fee is received. The selections for Under-19 State

Team, Under-23 State Team, Ranji Trophy, TG20 League and IPL are all considered from B-Division League, thus depriving the petitioner and its players from B-Division without assigning reasons in arbitrary manner. In the circumstances, the petitioner approached Ombudsman in Case No. 9 of 2026 and having heard the matter, the Ombudsman passed order dated 10.04.2026 directing the petitioner to be placed in parity in B-Division 2 days leagues along with other clubs. However, said order of the Ombudsman is not implemented, therefore the writ petition is filed for implementation of the order passed by Ombudsman.

10. Respondent No.2, for the purpose of opposing the writ petition, relied upon copy of memo dated 04.05.2026, copy of report of Sri Justice L. Nageshwara Rao dated 29.10.2023, copy of minutes of the 86th Annual General Body Meeting 18.02.2024, copy of order passed in SLP(C).No. 6779 of 2021 dated 05.12.2023, copy of order in W.P.No.18413 of 2024 dated 12.09.2024, copy of order passed in W.P.No.21904 of 2025 dated 25.07.2025, copy of email, copy of HCA Press Notification dated 22.05.2023, copy of HCA Notification for A-1 Division Championship 2025-2026 dated 14.06.2025, copy of HCA notification for B-Division Championship 2025-2026 dated 26.06.2025, copy of order passed in W.P.No.18058 of 2025 dated 06.04.2026, copy of order passed in

SLP(C).No.6779. of 2021 dated 15.09.2023, copy of judgment in **Hyderabad Cricket Association v. Charminar Cricket Club²**, copy of order in W.P.No.10001 of 2026 dated 27.04.2026, copy of order in W.P.No.21904 of 2025 dated 24.04.2026, copy of order passed in W.P.No.9744 of 2026, dated 31.03.2026, copy of order passed in W.P.No.18058 of 2025 dated 27.06.2025, copy of B-Division Points Table 2025-26 and list of petitioners' players.

Contentions of the petitioner:

11. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the retention match was scheduled to be played on 20 and 21st of February, 2026 and the loser of both rounds shall be relegated. At that point of time, there was a need for implementation of orders of a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.No.35135 of 2025 dated 20.02.2026 wherein the petitioner herein was permitted to register and replace players in accordance with notification dated 26.06.2025 for participating in the remaining matches of B-Division 2 day league championship 2025-26 including knockouts and playoffs. Said order was never implemented as the HCA never gave consent for replacement of players. In that context, the petitioner got notice issued for contempt under Contempt of Court Act, 1971. On 19.02.2026, the

² 2023 SCC OnLine SC 2564

Continental Cricket Club requested postponement of the match scheduled to 20.02.2026. Similarly the petitioner club also requested for re-fixing of the match scheduled for 20.02.2026. However, said re-fixing of match was never done.

12. Further, the learned counsel for petitioner relied upon the Lodha Committee recommendations with respect to role of Ombudsman and the decision of Ombudsman being final and binding on the parties. Further, reference is made to judgment of the Supreme Court in the judgment reported in **Board of Control of Cricket** (supra), wherein it is observed that the report of the committee and the recommendations made in with such modifications and clarifications have been set out in the body of the judgment.

13. Further, in judgment in the case of **M. Govind Reddy v. Hyderabad Cricket Association**³, the Division Bench of this Court observed that the recommendations of Lodha Committee which to the extent accepted by the Supreme Court, constitute law under Article 141 of Constitution are binding on the BCCI and State Cricket Associations including HCA. As per Sri Justice L. Nageshwara Rao Committee's report, there are 22 teams in 3-day league, 63 teams in 2-day league and 106 teams in 1-day league.

³ 2017 SCC OnLine Hyd 703

Said report was placed before the Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 6779 of 2021.

14. Further, as per byelaws amended by the recommendations of Lodha Committee and accepted by the Supreme Court, as per Rule 24 (1), the CEO shall implement rules and regulations by governing body and Apex Council as regards to non-cricketing matters. As per Rule 40 and 41 (3), the order of Ombudsman is final and binding and shall come into force on being pronounced and delivered. Reference is made to the order of Ombudsman in Case No.9 of 2026 dated 10.04.2026 directing respondent Nos.2 to 4 to retain the petitioner club in B-Division 2 day league.

15. Coming to the factual aspect, the case of the petitioner is that BDL Cricket Club was relegated from A to B Division for not participating in the league season for the year 2025-26. Similarly, Income Tax Cricket Club was relegated from A to B Division for not participating in the league season for the cricket season 2025-26. Crown Cricket Club and Zinda Tilismath Cricket Club also did not participate in the season 2025-26, but are sought to be added to B-Division contrary to the relegation of BDL and Income Tax Cricket Clubs. Further, Continental Cricket Club did not participate in the relegation match by addressing a letter to HCA. Said team

is retained in B-Division whereas the petitioner is sought to be relegated to C-Division. For retaining Continental Cricket Club, the run rate is taken into consideration whereas, run rate is not a rule for relegation, only loser of both rounds has to be relegated.

16. To sum up, the learned counsel for petitioner submits that uniform rules or pattern is not followed while relegating teams from A-Division to B-Division and vice versa and B-Division to C-Division and vice versa, apart from the fact that the order passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in W.PNo.35135 of 2025 not being implemented. In view of the aforementioned facts, the matter was addressed by Ombudsman in Case No.6 of 2026 and order dated 10.04.2026 has been passed. The petitioner seeks implementation of said order relying upon the report of Sri Justice L. Nageswara Rao, and judgment passed by this Court in **M. Govind Reddy** (supra).

Contentions of respondent Nos.2 to 4:

17. Learned Senior Counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4 did not venture into the merits of the recommendation made by the Single Member Supervisory Committee *vide* communication dated 31.03.2026. Further, there is no dispute raised about the recommendations made by the Lodha

Committee or the report submitted by Sri Justice L. Nageswar Rao and its acceptance by the Supreme Court with respect to role of Ombudsman and finality of its decision. The learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4 relied upon the communication dated 31.03.2026 addressed by the Supervisory Committee to the CEO of HCA. It is argued that the Supervisory Committee has considered all the aspects and recommended relegation of the petitioner club to C-Division. The retention of Continental Club in B-Division is on the basis of run rate. The learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4 did not give any reason for inclusion of Crown Cricket Club and Zinda Tilismath Cricket Club in B-Division, irrespective of the fact that they have not played the league matches for the cricket season 2025-26. Further, it is submitted that selection of the teams for B-Division has been completed and the same has been intimated to the concerned parties. As per the list posted on the website of HCA, which is produced at page number 481 of the material papers of the writ petition, already 63 teams have been selected for B-Division and a schedule for conducting matches has already been released and at this juncture, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

18. Further, learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4 relied upon the judgment of this Court in W.P.No.10001 of 2026, wherein this Court held that the Ombudsman does not have power to promote or relegate teams

from A-Division to B-Division or vice versa and said decision about promotion and delegation has to be taken up by the Supervisory Committee which shall exercise the powers of Single Member Committee. Therefore, it is argued that the same analogy is applicable to the facts of the present case and therefore, the order passed by the Ombudsman cannot be implemented and the communication of the single member Supervisory Committee to the CEO dated 31.03.2026 alone would be the basis for promotion and relegation of teams from A to B – Divisions and vice versa and B to C - Divisions and vice versa.

19. It is a point to be noted that the learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4 did not address the issue of power of Ombudsman to deal with disputes between HCA and its members as per Rule 40 (3), or the Single Member Committee report of Sri Justice L. Nageswara Rao becoming law under Article 141 of Constitution of India on account of said report being accepted by the Supreme Court. There is no challenge with respect to the aforementioned legal points raised by the learned counsel for petitioner, but supported the recommendations of the single member Supervisory Committee *vide* communication dated 31.03.2026.

Findings of the Court:

20. Having considered the submissions of both the respected counsel and the voluminous record produced before this Court, there is no dispute with respect to the backdrop of the disputes leading to appointment of Lodha Committee and the recommendations made by said committee for the purpose of handling the affairs related to conduct of cricket matches at various levels. Further, there is no issue about the recommendations made by Sri Justice L. Nageswara Rao Committee in his report which has been accepted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and said recommendations becoming law as per Article 141 of Constitution of India. There is also no dispute about the affairs of HCA to be governed by the byelaws which are amended in tune with the recommendations made by the Single Member Committee of Sri Justice L. Nageswara Rao. It is in this context that the present dispute between Hyderabad Cricket Association and the petitioner cricket club has to be considered.

21. In terms of the factual situation existing on ground, the case of petitioner is that it has been meted out with unfair treatment i.e. when some of the players were not available, request was made for their replacement and registration, and in that context, have approached a Co-ordinate Bench

of this Court *vide* W.P.No.35135 of 2025 and said writ petition was allowed by the order dated 20.02.2026. In said order, the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court permitted the petitioner to register and replace players and also directed respondent Nos.2 to 4 to permit the same and also permit the petitioner club to participate in remaining matches of B-Division, whereas no such opportunity was given by respondent No.2.

22. While canvassing for retaining the petitioner's club in B-Division, the petitioner is reluctant to challenge the retainment of Continental Cricket Club in B-Division, in spite of said team not playing the relegation match, nor does it want to challenge the placement of Crown Cricket Club and Zinda Tilismath Cricket Club, which have not participated at all in the league matches of the cricket season 2025-26. The petitioner submits that while not challenging the opportunity bestowed on any of the cricket clubs, the petitioner wants it to be retained in B-Division, even in case the number of teams increases more than 63 as has been stipulated by Sri Justice L. Nageswar Rao Committee. It is submitted that when Continental can be retained, when Crown Cricket Club and Zinda Tilismath Club can be included in B-Division, though they did not play single match for the previous cricketing season, the petitioner club which did participate in some of the league matches cannot be relegated to C-Divisions solely on

the basis of run rate. More so when run rate is not the basis for promotion and relegation. It was performance in the relegation matches which was supposed to decide the promotion and relegation of teams from B-Division to C-Division and vice versa.

23. In that context, it is emphasized that on account of pendency of various matters before the Civil Courts under Section 23 of Societies Registration Act, which was causing much delay in resolution of disputes, the Justice Lodha Committee and the Sri Justice L. Nageswara Rao Committee have recommended for resolution of said disputes through Ombudsman. Since said recommendation has become law as per Article 141 of Constitution of India. The order of the Ombudsman has to be implemented notwithstanding the fact that this Court in W.P.No.10001 of 2026 has held that the Ombudsman does not have power of promotion or relegation of teams from one division to the other.

24. The case of respondent Nos.2 to 4 is that this Court in W.P.No.10001 of 2026 has held that performance alone can be the criterion for deciding the promotion and relegation of teams from one division to another. In that context, the finding of this Court about Ombudsman not having the power to promote or relegate is emphasized. Therefore, it is contented that the

Ombudsman order dated 10.04.2026 cannot be implemented and that the communication dated 31.03.2026 of the Supervisory Committee alone can be considered and therefore, there is no irregularity in relegation of the petitioner club to the C-Division and therefore, opposed the petitioner's claim for retention in B-Division.

25. The facts borne by record are that the petitioner participated in the league matches of the Cricket Season 2025-26. Similarly, Continental Cricket Club also participated in the cricket matches. For standing at the bottom of the teams in B-Division, HCA issued notification for conducting relegation matches on 20.02.2026 and 21.02.2026. Four teams consisting of the Deccan Arsenal i.e. the petitioner, Continental Cricket Club, Nizam Cricket Club and New Blues Cricket Club were scheduled to play matches. Continental Cricket Club played match with New Blues Cricket Club and lost the match. Continental Club thereafter was scheduled to play cricket match with the petitioner on 20.02.2026. This match could not be played at the request of both the teams. As per email communications, both the teams have requested for rescheduling of the relegation match. No evidence is placed on record to show about the decision made by the concerned authority about rescheduling of the match or refusal of the request. As per contents of communication dated 31.03.2026, it is to be gathered that the

request of both the parties i.e. Continental Cricket Club and the Deccan Arsenal Cricket Club for rescheduling the relegation match has been rejected. Both the teams were expected to appear on the ground for playing the relegation match on 20.02.2026, but the same did not materialize, as none of the teams appeared to play the match. In said situation, the Supervisory Committee on the basis of run rate retained Continental Cricket Club in B-Division and relegated the petitioner to C-Division. When this issue was presented before the Ombudsman, the Ombudsman passed order dated 10.04.2026 directing respondent Nos.2 to 4 to retain the petitioner in B-Division, but the same was not complied with.

26. The important factor to be noted is that there is no explanation forthcoming from respondent Nos.2 to 4 for inclusion of Crown Cricket Club and Zinda Tilismath Cricket Club in B-Division, when they have not played any league match for the cricketing season 2025-26. There is no explanation forthcoming for whether run rate can be the basis for relegation or promotion of teams from one division to the other. Further, no explanation is forthcoming for non-implementation of the order of a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.No.35135 of 2025 dated 20.02.2026. On all these counts, the material placed on record or the arguments on behalf of respondent Nos.2 to 4 are not convincing. Therefore, there are

sufficient grounds for the petitioner to feel aggrieved and for being treated unfairly.

27. Leaving aside the factual aspects canvassed, coming to the rules applicable to the present fact situation, the byelaws are undisputedly the governing Rules for conducting the affairs of Hyderabad Cricket Association and its members. The powers of Ombudsman under said byelaws are also undisputed. The learned counsel for petitioner emphasized on the powers of Ombudsman to resolve the disputes in the complaints presented and the decision of Ombudsman being final and binding on the Hyderabad Cricket Association and its members.

28. This Court completely aligns itself with the contention of the petitioner about the powers of Ombudsman under Rule 40 and the finality of decision made by Ombudsman. A case is sought to be made out by the learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4 on the basis of order passed by this Court in the W.P.No.10001 of 2026 dated 27.04.2026. On that count, there is a need to revisit Rule 40 (3) of byelaws of the Hyderabad Cricket Association. The byelaws of Cricket Association leave no doubt whatsoever about the power of Ombudsman to resolve the disputes between Hyderabad Cricket Association and its members.

29. In the present case, there is a dispute between the decision of Hyderabad Cricket Association, to relegate the petitioner to C-Division while retaining Continental Cricket Club in B-Division on the basis of run rate and include Crown and Zinda Tilismath Cricket Clubs, irrespective of the fact that they did not play any league match for the Cricket season 2025-26, and application of performance as a parameter for relegation of BDL and Income Tax Clubs from A-Division to B-Division. The dispute is between HCA and its members. Therefore, the dispute squarely falls under the purview of Ombudsman, and when said issue is presented before the Ombudsman in Case No. 9 of 2026, and the order passed in that regard by the Ombudsman, as long as it is in conformity with the recommendations made by the Single Member Committee and Sri Justice L. Nageshwar Rao Committee and the principles of natural justice, cannot be challenged.

30. The fact situation of the present case is not comparable to the fact situation of the case presented in W.P.No.10001 of 2026. In said case, the complaint before the Ombudsman was about the eligibility of one player by name Chettineni Srihith on behalf of Rohit Cricket Club and the permission given to Imperial Cricket Club to play a league match in a tournament.

When a complaint of such nature was presented before the Ombudsman, the order passed was promotion of 4 teams from B-Division to A-Division,

exceeding the limit of 22 members in A-Division. The Ombudsman does not have *suo moto* power of promotion or relegation of teams from one division to another division. However, the Ombudsman does have power to deal with the disputes in case there is any irregularity or illegality in relegation of teams from one division to another division. In the instant case, Ombudsman is not recommending promotion of one team from one division to another, rather is dealing with a dispute of unfair or arbitrary retention and relegation of the petitioner team to C-Division. Therefore, the fact situation in the present writ petition and the fact situation in W.P.No.10001 of 2026 are not comparable and the finding given in said writ petition is not applicable to the facts of the present writ petition.

31. As per the recommendation made by Sri Justice L. Nageswara Rao in his report, which forms the basis for the amendment of byelaws of Hyderabad Cricket Association and as per said byelaws, the disputes between Hyderabad Cricket Association and its members fall squarely within the purview of Ombudsman and therefore, said entity has power to make a decision in the regard. The Ombudsman has made a decision to retain the petitioner in B-Division without affecting the rights of other teams.

32. In that context, respondent No.2 emphasizes that already there are 63 teams and there is no place for inclusion of any other team and that the schedule is already published for conducting matches. In case the HCA-respondent no. 2 is unwilling to increase the number of teams in B-Division from 63 then, a fair decision has to be made with respect to the petitioner vis-à-vis the teams which are similarly placed i.e. Continental Cricket Club which team did not play the relegation match and Crown Cricket Club and Zinda Tilismath Cricket Club which did not play even a single match for the cricket season 2025-26. Respondent No.2 association has to either follow the order passed by the Ombudsman or make a fair decision with respect to petitioner vis-à-vis those teams which are similarly placed are even worse.

33. In the result, the writ petition is disposed of directing respondent No.2-HCA to implement the order of the Ombudsman dated 10.04.2026 or alternatively, respondent No.2-HCA shall place the case of the petitioner herein for reconsideration before the Supervisory Committee for being continued in B-Division together with the case of the other teams which were included in B-Division for the 2 day league championship for the year 2026-27, but were not part of the B-Division for the 2 day league championship for the year 2025-26, by giving an opportunity to be heard to

all the teams concerned. The said exercise shall be completed within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous applications, if any, pending shall stand closed.

SD/-M. OSMAN ALI BAIG
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary - Youth Services & Sports, Tank Bund, The State of Telangana, Hyderabad
2. The Secretary, Hyderabad Cricket Association,
3. The Secretary, Apex Council -, Hyderabad Cricket Association,
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Hyderabad Cricket Association. Respondents No.2 to 4 Office at Rajiv Gandhi International Cricket Stadium, Uppal, Hyderabad.
5. One CC to SRI MIR OMER KHAN, Advocate [OPUC]
6. One CC to SRI VADEENDRA JOSHI, SC FOR HCA, Advocate [OPUC]
7. Two CCs to GP FOR YOUTH SERVICES & SPORTS, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad [OUT]
8. Two CD Copies

PVL

HIGH COURT

DATED: 06/05/2026



ORDER

WP.No.15349 of 2026

**DISPOSING THE WRIT PETITION
WITHOUT COSTS**

(11) MT
8/5/26