



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

Judgment Reserved on: 24.04.2026

%

Judgment Delivered on: 04.06.2026

+ **LPA 305/2026, CM APPL. 27219/2026, CM APPL. 27221/2026 & CM APPL. 27222/2026**

UTTAR PRADESH KHO KHO ASSOCIATIONAppellant

versus

KHO KHO FEDERATION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case

For the Appellant : Mr. Sanjeev Mahajan, Ms. Vanshita Gupta and Mr. Siddhartha, Advocates.

For the Respondents : Mr. Raj Shekar Rao, Senior Advocate with Mr. Sachin Chopra, Mr. Anuj Tyagi, Ms. Maitry Kakade, Ms. Astha Gupta and Ms. Shreelekha Vyas, Advocates for R1.
Mr. Devvrat Yadav, SPC with Mr. Nipun Jain, GP and Mr. Kush Garg, Advocates for UoI.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA**

JUDGMENT

TEJAS KARIA, J

1. This *intra-court* Appeal has been filed against the judgment dated 18.02.2026 (“**Impugned Judgment**”) passed by the learned Single Judge in



W.P.(C) 5375/2023 (“**Writ Petition**”), whereby the Appellant’s prayer for recognition of the elections of its Executive Committee (“**EC**”) held on 27.10.2021, was rejected and the Writ Petition was dismissed.

FACTUAL MATRIX

2. The Appellant is a society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, and is engaged in the promotion and development of the sport of Kho Kho in the State of Uttar Pradesh. Respondent No. 1 is the National Sports Federation governing the sport of Kho Kho in India. It has several affiliated State associations responsible for administering the sport within their respective States. Respondent No. 1 is also recognised by Respondent No. 3 and enjoys various facilities and concessions extended by the Government of India.

3. According to the Appellant, it was one of the founding members of Respondent No. 1 and continued to function as the affiliated association for the State of Uttar Pradesh until January 2020, when it was de-affiliated by Respondent No. 1 by office order dated 30.01.2020. The Appellant alleges that the said action was taken pursuant to a communication dated 19.12.2019 issued by its former President, stating that the Appellant had been dissolved on account of the then General Secretary’s failure to maintain and furnish documents sought by Respondent No. 1.

4. Further, by the aforesaid office order dated 30.01.2020, Respondent No. 1 constituted an Interim Committee (“**IC**”) to manage the affairs of the Appellant organization. It is the Appellant’s case that the said order was founded on the alleged dissolution of the Appellant by its then President, Mr. Sanjay Pratap Singh.



5. On 16.01.2021, the office bearers of District Kho Kho Association, Bijnor and District Kho Kho Association, Moradabad, both affiliated to the Appellant, instituted W.P.(C) 863/2021 challenging the validity of Respondent No. 1's office order dated 30.01.2020, whereby the IC had been appointed to manage the Appellant's affairs. The said writ petition was disposed of by order dated 09.08.2021, recording the agreement of the Parties that fresh elections be held under the supervision of a retired Judge of the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad. Accordingly, this Court appointed Justice D.P. Singh, former Judge of the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, as the Returning Officer to conduct elections to the Executive Committee ("EC") of the Appellant. It was further observed that, since the Parties were not *ad idem* with respect to the electoral college, the Returning Officer would finalise the same after considering the objections of all aggrieved Parties.

6. Pursuant to the aforesaid order passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 863/2021, the Returning Officer conducted the elections to the Appellant's EC and declared the results on 27.10.2021. The said elections were conducted on the basis of the observations recorded by the learned Returning Officer in his order dated 03.10.2021, wherein it was observed as under:

“Wherefore, after considering the Model Election Guidelines and the provision contained in the Societies Registration Act and Rules framed there under, and keeping in view the order dated 01.10.2021, the Model Election Guidelines and surrounding facts and circumstances I proceed to hold the election in the following manner:-

1. It is for the elected body to make change in the memorandum of association in case they advise to do so, only procedural aspect



may be taken into account for the election under the Model Election Guidelines with appropriate modification.

2. Attention has been invited to Writ Petition (Civil) No. 18609 of 2019 order dated 18.09.2021 of the Hon'ble Orissa High Court whereby the Hon'ble Court held that National Federation has no right to interfere with the election of State Association. The operative portion is reproduced as under-

“10. I say that the opp. Party no. 4 has not insisted the National Sports Development Code, 2011 on any State Members. I say that the National Sports Development Code, 2011 are executive Orders passed by the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, Government of India which are applicable only on National Sports Federations and not on State Associations. Copy of the Letter dated 01.05.2010 issued by the Opp. Party No. 1 to the NSF's and IOA regarding age and tenure Guidelines is marked as Annexure-R4/C.

11. That I say that, on various occasions the Op. Party No. 4 required appointment of Ad-hoc Committees; but the same was impugned in different proceedings before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi at New Delhi t and the Hon'ble Delhi High Court deprecated appointment of such Ad-hoc Committee and in case required to make such appointment only with the leave of the Hon'ble Court.

12. I say that the opp. Party No. 4 all along insist the national federation to act fairly and to ensure its State Association free from Government and political interference. However, disputes the being between the petitioner and Opp. Party No. 2, the deponent restrains from passing any comments on the allegations made in the writ petition. And seeks the leave to file detail counter affidavit in case, required/south for by the Hon'ble Court.”

3. The nomination shall be filed for the election for the post of office bearer and member of the Managing Committee in accordance to the Model Election Guidelines, nomination shall be delivered personally to the returning officer in person by the



candidates along the prosper and seconder. Nomination shall be held for two days on the notified dates during working hour that is 11 am to 3 pm. The candidate shall write down their e-mail id in the nomination paper at bottom.

4. List of all nominations received shall be prepared post-wise in Form 3 on the next date i.e., the third day from the commencement of the election and displayed in the office provide by Director Sports, U.P. representing the Sports Council. The outcome of the scrutiny of the election paper shall be communicated through e-mail to all candidate immediately. During scrutiny it shall be open for the candidate to be present in the office.

5. The list of validly nominated candidates shall be prepared in form 4 with due circulation through e-mail to all the candidates who filed nomination.

6. The candidate shall be entitled to withdraw within two working days from the date of publication of Form 4. The notice of withdrawal of the candidate shall be submitted in Form 5 of the Model Election Guidelines. On the very next day after the date of withdrawal, a final list of the contesting candidates shall be prepared in Form 6 and shall be duly communicated to all the candidates. The final list of contesting candidate shall be prepared in Form 6 with the help of Assistant Returning Officer. The election shall be held after two working days from the date of publication of the final list in Form 6 to enable Director of Sports to make necessary arrangement along with police security. At the distance of 10 feet from the ballot box, each candidate or his representative may be present to witness the counting of vote. The result shall be pronounced on public address system (mic) and be communicated to all the candidates through e-mail. The result shall be declared immediately after counting in Form 15 and shall be duly communicated for all concern for follow-up action by the Director of Sports and Kho Kho Federation of India. Director of Sports shall install video cameras in and outside the polling station during course of voting and counting.

7. The Director Sports, U.P. is requested to facilitate the election and provide all necessary assistance as well as infrastructure to enforce the order date 09.08.2021 and 13.08.2021 o the Hon'ble Delhi High Court.



8. *Joint Director Sports, Sri Anil Banudha is engaged and appointed as the Assistant Returning Officer to make necessary arrangement as aforesaid.*

9. *List of electoral college shall be prepared from the list date 30.07.2017 submitted by the Director Sports in Form 1 with appropriate amendment and will be duly communicated to all person concerned.*

10. *The scheme of election shall be published in two newspapers, one in Hindi and one in English by the Director of Sports/ Assistant Returning Officer with prior approval.*

11. *Every candidate during the course of casting vote shall come with Aadhar Card and two copies of Memorandum of Association out of which one copy shall be handed over at the verification table to the person concerned.*

The number of the office bearers and number of post shall be same as provided in the bye-laws and Memorandum of Association being binding under the Societies Registration Act and rules framed therein under.

12. *Copy of order may be communicate to all concerned person including the registrar of the Delhi High Court being passed in order 09.08.2021 in W.P. (C) 863/2021 & CM APPL 2275/2021.*

Order dated 1.10.2021 stand modified accordingly.”

7. Accordingly, the learned Returning Officer proceeded on the premise that the elections were required to be conducted in accordance with the Model Election Guidelines, and not under the National Sports Development Code, 2011 (“**Sports Code**”), on the understanding that the latter was inapplicable to elections of State Associations such as the Appellant. In support of the said view, reliance was placed on an order dated 18.09.2021 purported to have been passed by the High Court of Orissa in W.P.(C) 18609/2019.



8. Consequently, Respondent No. 1 filed CM APPL. 36514/2021 in W.P.(C) 863/2021, *inter alia*, contending that no such order had in fact been passed by the High Court of Orissa, that the learned Returning Officer had recorded serious observations on the basis of a non-existent order contrary to law, and that the elections conducted under his supervision were in violation of the Sports Code as well as the Constitution of Respondent No. 1.

9. *Vide* order dated 12.10.2021, it was recorded that Respondent No. 1 sought leave to withdraw the said application with liberty to raise all objections at the appropriate stage in appropriate proceedings. The application was accordingly dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

10. After the declaration of the election results on 27.10.2021, the Appellant addressed a communication dated 03.11.2021 to Respondent No. 1 seeking recognition of its newly elected Executive Committee (“EC”). The said communication was followed by several further representations seeking re-affiliation of the Appellant with Respondent No. 1. Since no favourable decision ensued, the Appellant instituted a contempt petition, being CCP 931/2021, which was disposed of *vide* order dated 11.02.2022. By the said order, it was observed that Respondent No. 1 had sought certain documents from the petitioners therein for the purpose of considering the Appellant’s re-affiliation, and Respondent No. 1 was directed to take a decision within four weeks of receipt of the said documents.

11. The Appellant asserts that the requisite documents were duly furnished to Respondent No. 1 in terms of the aforesaid order dated 11.02.2022. Thereafter, the Appellant instituted W.P.(C) 15048/2022, which was disposed of *vide* order dated 31.10.2022 directing Respondent No. 1 to



complete the exercise contemplated by the order dated 11.02.2022 with due expedition, preferably within six weeks, after affording an opportunity of hearing to all concerned Parties.

12. On 01.12.2022, Respondent No. 1 issued an office order constituting the Affiliation and Election Review Committee (“**AERC**”) to examine the Appellant’s application for recognition after granting the Appellant an opportunity of hearing.

13. Pursuant thereto, the AERC, by letter dated 01.12.2022, informed the Appellant that it would be afforded an opportunity to furnish the documents sought by Respondent No. 1 through its earlier communications and to explain the reasons for the non-submission thereof. It was further intimated that a hearing had been scheduled on 05.12.2022 for further consideration of the Appellant’s request for re-affiliation, and the Appellant was requested to nominate two representatives to appear before the AERC with the necessary explanation and supporting documents.

14. In response, the Appellant, by communication dated 05.12.2022, reiterated that all available documents had already been furnished to Respondent No. 1 and requested that recognition be accorded to the Executive Committee elected under the supervision of the learned Returning Officer.

15. Thereafter, the AERC submitted its report to Respondent No. 1 recommending rejection of the Appellant’s application for re-affiliation. The AERC observed that any grant of re-affiliation notwithstanding the irregularities noted on record would set an undesirable precedent for other member associations by signalling that the Memorandum of Respondent No. 1 could be disregarded with impunity. The AERC further recommended that



Respondent No. 1 consider taking action in relation to the alleged misappropriation of Government funds, subject to confirmation from the available records.

16. At its meeting held on 28.06.2023, the General Council of Respondent No. 1 considered the aforesaid report of the AERC and, in view of the findings recorded therein, rejected the Appellant's application for re-affiliation.

17. Aggrieved thereby, the Appellant instituted the Writ Petition, which came to be dismissed by the Impugned Judgment passed by the learned Single Judge. The present Appeal has accordingly been preferred assailing the said Impugned Judgment.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT

18. The learned Counsel for the Appellant advanced the following submissions:

18.1. The learned Returning Officer adopted the framework of conducting the elections in accordance with the Model Election Guidelines, and not the Sports Code, based on the legal position as it stood on 27.10.2021. This understanding was also fortified by the counter affidavit dated 18.09.2021 filed by the Indian Olympic Association before the High Court of Orissa in W.P.(C) 18609/2021, wherein it was categorically stated that the Sports Code applies only to National Sports Federations and not to State Associations.

18.2. The learned Single Judge has placed reliance upon the judgment of this Court dated 16.08.2022 in W.P.(C) 195/2010, titled *Rahul Mehra v. Union of India & Ors.*, which came to



be rendered nearly ten months after the conclusion of the elections in question. The retrospective application of the principles enunciated in *Rahul Mehra* (supra) so as to invalidate elections already concluded is impermissible in law.

- 18.3. The learned Returning Officer conducted the elections and declared the results on 27.10.2021. Notwithstanding full knowledge of the said results, Respondent No. 1 did not institute any proceedings challenging either the elections themselves or the orders passed by the learned Returning Officer. Accordingly, the election results have attained finality and are binding upon the Parties.
- 18.4. *Vide* order dated 22.12.2021 passed in CCP 931/2021, it was expressly recorded that the learned Returning Officer's report and the election results would be treated as part of the record, the same having remained unchallenged. Hence, Respondent No. 1 is precluded, whether by principles analogous to estoppel or *res judicata*, from assailing the elections in subsequent proceedings.
- 18.5. The Impugned Judgment places undue reliance upon the AERC report prepared at the instance of Respondent No. 1, while disregarding the concluding observations of the learned Returning Officer, wherein, *inter alia*, it was noted that Respondent No. 1 had attempted to interfere with the electoral process.
- 18.6. The Appellant was disaffiliated unlawfully by Respondent No. 1 based on a fraudulent communication dated 19.12.2019



allegedly issued by Mr. Sanjay Pratap Singh, the erstwhile President of the Appellant. Respondent No. 1 constituted a parallel body under the name 'UP Amateur Kho Kho Association', registered on 25.01.2021, whose membership substantially overlapped with that of the Interim Committee appointed by Respondent No. 1.

- 18.7. The documents sought by Respondent No. 1 are stated to pertain to the financial records of a bank account jointly operated by Mr. Sanjay Singh, who had been appointed as Chairman of the Interim Committee by Respondent No. 1 and who was deliberately withholding the said records in order to obstruct the Appellant's re-affiliation.
- 18.8. In view of the foregoing submissions, it was prayed that the present Appeal be allowed and the Impugned Judgment passed by the learned Single Judge be set aside. In the alternative, it is prayed that fresh elections of the Appellant association be directed to be conducted under the supervision of a Returning Officer appointed by this Court.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS

19. The learned Senior Counsel for Respondent No. 1 advanced the following submissions:

- 19.1. The repeated failure of the Appellant to furnish the material information sought by Respondent No. 1 clearly demonstrates that the affairs of the Appellant association were being conducted in a state of disarray and in breach of the Constitution of Respondent No. 1 as well as the Sports Code.



- 19.2. Since the year 2017, the Appellant was repeatedly called upon by Respondent No. 1 to furnish particulars relating to its last held elections, the composition of its electoral college, its audited accounts, and the names and number of its affiliated District Units; however, the Appellant failed to provide the said information despite repeated requisitions.
- 19.3. Despite the directions issued by this Court *vide* order dated 22.12.2021 passed in CCP 931/2021, the Appellant failed to furnish the complete information and documents sought by Respondent No. 1. The elections in the Appellant association, conducted pursuant to this Court's order dated 09.08.2021 in W.P.(C) 863/2021, were not held in conformity with either the Sports Code or the Constitution of Respondent No. 1. Certain elected office bearers, being Government employees who had previously held elective positions in sports bodies, were ineligible under the Sports Code.
- 19.4. The learned Returning Officer was misled by reliance upon a fabricated order purportedly passed by the High Court of Orissa, which came to be extensively referred to in the order dated 03.10.2021. Such reliance vitiated the electoral process from its inception, inasmuch as the learned Returning Officer proceeded on the erroneous premise that the Sports Code was inapplicable to the Appellant's elections and that only the Model Election Guidelines governed the field.



19.5. In light of the aforesaid submissions, it is prayed that the present Appeal be dismissed and that the Impugned Judgment passed by the learned Single Judge be affirmed.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

20. We have heard learned counsel for the Parties and perused the material placed on record. The principal contention advanced on behalf of the Appellant is that the reliance placed in the Impugned Judgment upon ***Rahul Mehra v. Union of India & Ors.*** (supra) is misconceived, inasmuch as the elections of the Appellant association had concluded and the results thereof were declared on 27.10.2021, whereas the judgment in ***Rahul Mehra*** (supra) came to be rendered subsequently on 16.08.2022, nearly ten months thereafter.

21. Proceeding on the aforesaid premise, it is contended by the Appellant that the legal position obtaining on the date when the elections were conducted stood at variance with the law subsequently declared in ***Rahul Mehra*** (supra), and that, consequently, the said decision could not have been applied retrospectively so as to invalidate an electoral process already concluded.

22. It is, however, material to note that the Impugned Judgment has placed reliance not only upon ***Rahul Mehra*** (supra), but also upon the subsequent judgment of this Court dated 10.02.2023 in W.P.(C) 8915/2019, titled ***K.P. Rao v. Union of India & Ors.***, wherein the principle enunciated in ***Rahul Mehra*** (supra) was reiterated that the Sports Code must be made applicable to every constituent of every National Sports Federation. Only its players will have an opportunity to participate in district, state and national level events and avail of the facilities that are made available by the



Government and even have an opportunity to represent India in international level events.

23. Accordingly, the provisions of the Sports Code are applicable to every constituent of every National Sports Federation, including the State Federations such as the Appellant. It is thus clear that the decisions of this Court in *Rahul Mehra* (supra), as reiterated in *K.P. Rao* (supra), are clarificatory in nature as it only clarifies the existing law. Consequently, no issue of retrospective application of the said decisions arises in the facts of the present case since the Sports Code was always applicable to the Appellant and the said decisions have only clarified the position without laying down that the Sports Code would be applicable from the date of the said judgements.

24. The Impugned Judgment further records that, admittedly, six office bearers elected pursuant to the elections in the Appellant association, including its Chairman, President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Secretary and Member Executive, are Government employees who had held elected posts in sports bodies for more than one term and for a period exceeding five years. They were, therefore, ineligible to contest the impugned elections in view of the letter dated 30.12.2020 issued by the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, Government of India.

25. The Impugned Judgment also notes that the election to the post of Chairman is contrary to the Sports Code, which does not contemplate such an office. It has further been noticed that this Court, on prior occasions, including in *Mahipal Singh and Ors. v. Union of India*, 2018 SCC OnLine Del 10284, has deprecated the induction of persons into the executive bodies of Sports Federations under such innovative nomenclature.



26. In view of the above, the Impugned Judgment rightly observes that the election of the Appellant's Chairman, President, Secretary, Treasurer, Vice-President and Members of its Executive Committee could potentially be in contravention of the Sports Code. However, the learned Returning Officer was precluded from examining the eligibility of the contesting candidates on the touchstone of the Sports Code, having proceeded on the basis of a non-existent order of the High Court of Orissa, which was cited before him and ultimately relied upon, as recorded in his order dated 03.10.2021.

27. The Appellant has further contended that, although the learned Returning Officer declared the election results on 27.10.2021, Respondent No. 1, despite being fully aware thereof, did not institute any proceedings challenging either the elections or the orders passed by the learned Returning Officer and is, therefore, barred from assailing the same in subsequent proceedings. This submission of the Appellant cannot be accepted for the following reasons:

28. *Firstly*, Respondent No. 1's consent to the holding of elections for the Appellant's Executive Committee, as recorded during the proceedings in W.P.(C) 863/2021, cannot be construed as signifying any willingness by Respondent No. 1 for grant of affiliation or recognition to the elected Executive Committee, if the elections were not conducted in accordance with the applicable provisions of law.

29. *Secondly*, the said contention raised by the Appellant is erroneous on the face of the record. Upon discovery of the learned Returning Officer's reliance on a non-existent order of the High Court of Orissa to conclude that the elections were required to be conducted under the Model Election



Guidelines instead of the Sports Code, Respondent No. 1 filed an application being CM APPL. 36514/2021 in W.P.(C) 863/2021, wherein it was averred as under:

“vi. The most blatant disregard of the Ld. Returning Officer towards verification of facts put forth before the Ld. Returning Officer has manifested itself in the latest order dated 03.10.2021, passed by the Learned Returning Officer in the matter of elections of UPKKA. In the said order, the Ld. Returning Officer has quoted from an order purportedly passed by the Hon’ble Orissa High Court in WP 18609 of 2019, which has been stated to have been ‘brought’ to the attention of the Ld. Returning Officer, to state that a National Sports Federation has no ‘right’ to ‘interfere’ with the elections of a State Association. It is pertinent to mention here that the fact as to who brought the said order to the notice of the Ld. Returning Officer has not been specified. The purported order dated 18.09.2021, passed by the Hon’ble Orissa High Court, has also neither been annexed along with the order dated 03.10.2021, passed by the Ld. Returning Officer nor a copy of the same has been supplied to anyone. Having doubts on the perusal of the quoted portion of the purported order of the Hon’ble Orrissa High Court in the order dated 03.10.2021, passed by the Ld. Returning Officer, the applicant tried to find out the purported order on the website of the Hon’ble Orissa High Court but could not find the same. Vide a document-dated 03.10.2021, titled ‘Proceeding’, the Ld. Returning Officer, noted that the State Sports Council had been abolished and appointed the Joint Director of Sports, UP, as the Assistant Returning Officer. It is submitted that in view of the fact that at the request of the Petitioner in the captioned Writ Petition, this Hon’ble Court directed the returning officer to call for a list of members inter-alia, from State Sports Council. Since admittedly the said body is not in existence, no list given by any other body in the place of State Sports Council can be considered by the Ld. Returning Officer as per the order-dated 09.08.2021. Further, the appointment of the Assistant Returning Officer is also not valid as per the order-dated 09.08.2021, passed by this Hon’ble Court. After going through the order and proceeding dated 03.10.2021, the applicant made enquiries in regard to the said Writ Petition from the Indian Olympic Association, which is the parent body of the KKF1 and a party to the said writ petition. To its absolute shock, discovered that no such



order had ever been passed. It is submitted that it is a very serious matter when the Returning Officer has not only quoted copiously from a non existent order, purportedly passed by a High Court but also, on the basis of that non existent order, making serious observations which are neither in consonance with the law laid down by the Courts in this regard, nor the National Sports Code or the Constitution of KKKFI. In such circumstances, the elections conducted by the Ld. Returning Officer are bound to be in violation of the National Sports Code and the Constitution of KKKFI which is essential for recognition of any member association by KKKFI. This is also in violation of the order dated 09.08.2021, passed by this Hon'ble Court in the captioned matter which specifically directed the Returning Officer to consider objections in regard to the finalization of the electoral roll inter-alia from KKKFI and to have an observer from KKKFI to observe the electoral process.”

30. The said application of Respondent No. 1 was disposed of *vide* order dated 12.10.2021 passed by this Court, with liberty to Respondent No. 1 to raise its objections at the relevant stage in appropriate proceedings. Therefore, the Appellant's afore-noted contention is unfounded and contrary to the record.

31. The Appellant has also contended that it was unlawfully disaffiliated by Respondent No. 1 based on a fraudulent communication dated 19.12.2019 allegedly issued by Mr. Sanjay Pratap Singh, the then President of the Appellant association, in collusion with Respondent No. 1. The Appellant has further alleged *mala fides* on the part of Respondent No. 1 by asserting that it constituted a parallel body under the name 'UP Amateur Kho Kho Association', whose membership substantially overlapped with that of the Interim Committee appointed by Respondent No. 1. The Appellant has also assailed the conclusions recorded by the AERC in its report submitted to Respondent No. 1.



32. The aforesaid issues would necessitate an elaborate evidentiary enquiry, which cannot appropriately be undertaken in the exercise of writ jurisdiction. The Appellant is, therefore, granted liberty to avail such appropriate remedies as may be available to it in accordance with law.

33. In view of the foregoing discussion, we find no infirmity in the Impugned Judgment passed by the learned Single Judge in the Writ Petition warranting interference in the present Appeal. The Appeal is, accordingly, dismissed. The pending Applications shall also stand disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

TEJAS KARIA, J

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

JUNE 4, 2026

St/ap