



2025:DHC:10752-DB



\$~

\*

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

%

*Judgment reserved on: 03.11.2025*

*Judgment pronounced on: 03.12.2025*

+

LPA 329/2021, CM APPL. 32033/2021, CM APPL. 28035/2024, CM APPL. 21063/2025, CM APPL. 44206/2025, CM APPL. 44207/2025 and CM APPL. 44281/2025

S.P. SINGH DHILLON

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Talha Abdul Rahman, Ms. Aakanksha Singh and Mr. M. Shaz Khan, Advs.

versus

DELHI CAPITAL BADMINTON ASSOCIATION & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Bharat Gupta, Ms. Swapnil Shukla, and Mr. Amit Gupta, Advs. for R-1.

Mr. Nalin Kohli, Sr. Adv. along with Mr. Anshul Malik and Mr. Ayuushman Arora, Advs.

Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Mr. Mukesh Kumar Tiwari and Ms. Reba Jena Mishra, Advs.

Mr. Jai Anant Dehadrai, Ms. Srutee Priyadarshini, and Ms. Bhavya Jain, Advs. for R-6.

+

W.P.(C) 16967/2024 and CM APPL. 71863/2024

AJEET PANDEY & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Tishampati Sen, Ms. Riddhi Sancheti, Mr. Anurag Anand and Mr. Mukul Kulhari, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents



2025:DHC:10752-DB



Through: Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj CGSC along with Mr. Kushagra Kumar, Adv. for UOI.

Mr. Bharat Gupta, Ms. Swapnil Shukla, and Mr. Amit Gupta, Advs. Mr. Nalin Kohli, Sr. Adv. along with Mr. Anshul Malik and Mr. Ayuushman Arora, Advs.

Mr. Jai Anant Dehadrai, Ms. Srutee Priyadarshini, and Ms. Bhavya Jain, Advs. for R-4 to 13.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR**

### **J U D G M E N T**

#### **ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.**

1. Through the present Letters Patent Appeal filed under Clause 10 of the Letters Patents Act and a Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant/Petitioner not only assails the correctness of the Impugned Judgments dated 12.01.2021, 18.03.2021, 31.05.2021 and 08.09.2021 [hereinafter referred to as “Impugned Judgments”] passed by the learned Single Judge in Writ Petition No. 11247 of 2020, but also prays to direct the Respondent No.2/Badminton Association of India [hereinafter referred to as “BAI”] not to insist the revision of Delhi Capital Badminton Association [hereinafter referred to as “DCBA”] Constitution and thereafter seeks a direction for conducting fresh elections of DCBA.

2. The Learned Single Judge passed a series of Impugned Judgments/orders all aimed at ensuring that elections of DCBA were



conducted in a fair, transparent, and timely manner.

3. Having regard to the fact that the present matters emanate from the identical issues, with the consent of the learned counsel representing the parties, the matters have been heard together and are being disposed of by this common Judgment.

**Brief Factual Matrix:**

4. In order to comprehend the issues involved in the present case, the relevant facts in brief are required to be noticed.

5. The Respondent No.1/DCBA was formed as a State-level Association to regulate and promote the sport of badminton in the National Capital Territory of Delhi. The said Association was registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 on 20.03.2013 bearing Registration No. S/1299/Distt. South/2013. Prior to its registration, the erstwhile Delhi Badminton Association [hereinafter referred to as “DBA”] was managing the affairs of badminton in Delhi. Pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding [hereinafter referred to as “MoU”] dated 23.07.2015, the DBA merged with the DCBA, which fact was recorded in *W.P. (C) 3326/2013*, captioned ***Delhi Badminton Association & Anr. v. Badminton Association of India & Ors.***

6. The DCBA granted affiliation to the respective 11 District Badminton Units. Subsequently, on 22.03.2013, DCBA got affiliation from the BAI. The District Units, however, got registered from May 2013 onwards.

7. Over time, differences arose between the two factions within the DCBA, with one being led by Appellant/Mr. S. P. Singh Dhillon, then



Hony. Secretary and the other by Prof. A. K. Mitra, who later took charge as Secretary. The said disputes primarily concerned the conduct of elections, management of the Association, and recognition of District Units. A dispute has arisen that 10 candidates were elected unopposed.

8. Consequently, a Writ Petition [W.P.(C) No. 11247 of 2020] was filed by the DCBA through its Secretary, Prof. A. K. Mitra, before this Court against the Union of India, the BAI and others, including the Appellant, seeking directions for conducting elections and resolution of disputes concerning management and affiliation.

9. On 12.01.2021, learned Single Judge appointed Justice (Retd.) Brijesh Sethi as the Returning Officer [hereinafter referred to as “RO”] to conduct elections for the Executive Committee of the DCBA. The Court directed that the elections be held for all the posts of management as reflected in the minutes of meeting dated 01.08.2015, and further directed that the electoral roll be drawn up and finalized as on 01.05.2019, as agreed by all parties. Relevant paragraphs of the said order are reproduced hereinbelow:

*“5.....Hence, this Court is of the opinion that the elections ought to be held after the constitution of the DCBA is strictly amended in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the BAI. The BAI has called upon the DCBA to carry out certain amendments. Accordingly, the following directions are passed:*

*a) In accordance with the directions issued by the BAI from time to time, the constitution of the DCBA shall be amended. For the said purpose, a meeting shall be called by the Secretary, BAI under whose supervision the amendment of the constitution of the DCBA shall be carried out. The amended constitution shall then be sent for approval to the BAI.*

*b) Upon the BAI perusing the amended constitution and approving the same, the DCBA can go ahead and conduct the elections for the Executive committee.*

*c) There are a total of 30 posts in the Executive Committee of the*



DCBA. The elections shall be held for all the posts, strictly in accordance with amended constitution of the DCBA.

6. All meetings of the DCBA shall henceforth be held under the supervision of Mr. Ajay K. Singhania, Secretary General, BAI. For the purpose of conducting the elections of the DCBA, Justice (Retd.) Brijesh Sethi (M:9910384669), is appointed as the Returning Officer (hereinafter, "RO"). The elections shall be held strictly under the supervision, control and directions of the RO. The RO shall be paid a lumpsum of Rs.5 lakhs at this stage by the DCBA for the purpose of conducting the election. Upon the conduct of the elections, the new body, as approved by the RO, shall take over and ensure the smooth functioning of the day to day activities of the DCBA.

9. A perusal of the minutes of meeting dated 1<sup>st</sup> August, 2015 also shows that the constitution of the association was amended as per Agenda No.3, which reads as under:

Agenda No.3

To consider the amendment of the relevant Rules of the DCBA in order to create certain further posts so that all the associations which are either joining or merging may get a fair representation in DCBA

It was informed that in terms of observation of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court as made in W.P.(C) No.3326 of 2013 wherein it was observed that it would be in the interest of the sport of Badminton in Delhi that there should be only one Association in Delhi to represent the state in the BAI and hence the two association may explore possibilities of either merger or joining as mass or as it may come out from discussions, the Delhi Capital Badminton Association and the Delhi Badminton Association upon mediation have come to an out-of-court settlement as a consequence whereof in order to give full representation to all the districts as also to the two associations it is necessary to amend existing Clause 6 of the Memorandum of Association of DCBA and Clause 20 of the Rules of DCBA in the following manner:-

EXISTING	AMENDED
6. Management The affairs of the Association shall be managed by the Executive Committee consisting of the office bearers (13) (Thirteen) including 3 (Three) co-opted members. Office Bearers of the Association shall be as under:- President 1	6. Management The affairs of the Association shall be managed by the Executive Committee consisting of 30 (Thirty) elected and 3 (Three) co-opted members. Office Bearers of the Association shall be as



Senior Vice President	1	under:-	
Vice Presidents	5	President	1
Hony. Secretary	1	Senior Vice President	5
Hony. Treasurer	1	Vice Presidents	9
Advisor	1	Hony. Secretary	2
Executive Members	5	Hony. Treasurer	1
Co-opted Members	3	Joint Secretary	3
		Advisor	2
		Executive Members	7
		Co-opted Members	3

EXISTING		AMENDED	
20. Management The affairs of the Association shall be managed by the Executive Committee consisting of the office bearers and not more than 18 (Eighteen) including 3 (Three) coopted members. Office Bearers of the Association shall be as under:-		20. Management The affairs of the Association shall be managed by the Executive Committee consisting of the Office Bearers and not more than 33 (Thirty Three) (including 3 (Three) co-opted members). Office Bearers of the Association shall be as	
President	1	under:-	
Senior Vice President	1	President	1
Vice Presidents	5	Senior Vice President	5
Hony. Secretary	1	Vice Presidents	9
Hony. Treasurer	1	Hony. Secretary	2
Advisor	1	Hony. Treasurer	1
Executive Members	5	Joint Secretary	3
Co-opted Members	3	Advisor	2
		Executive Members	7
		Co-opted Members	3

*The House unanimously adopted, affirmed and approved the aforesaid amendments to amend existing Clause 6 of the Memorandum of Association of DCBA and Clause 20 of the Rules of DCBA.”*

10. In view of the above, this Court directs that the elections ought to be held in terms of the amended 'Management' clause. The RO would, therefore, conduct elections for all the posts of the Management, as reflected in the minutes of meeting dated 1st August, 2015. The RO shall ensure that while accepting the nomination of any candidates the applicable guidelines given by the Ministry of Sports, National Sport Federation and its constituent body are strictly adhered



to. The RO would be assisted by Mr. Ajay K. Singhania, Secretary General, BAI for conducting the elections.

11. All parties agree that the electoral roll would be drawn up and finalised by the RO as on 1st May, 2019. Any member added after 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2019 shall not be entitled to vote in this election, however, they can continue as members. The list of persons entitled to elect shall be drawn up strictly in terms of the rules prescribed by BAI.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

10. Subsequent thereto, Ms. Madhumita Bisht, a badminton player, filed an application being CM APPLs. 6177/2021 (for modification) in W.P. (C) 11247/2020, seeking extension of the cut-off date for preparation and finalization of the electoral roll to ensure complete participation of all stakeholders. This Court, *vide* order dated 19.02.2021, sought comments of the RO w.r.t. issues raised in the application.

11. In pursuance of the said directions, the RO convened meetings of all concerned, including representatives of District Units and thereafter submitted a detailed report dated 15.03.2021 before this Court. On consideration of the said report, this Court *vide* order dated 18.03.2021, passed further directions. The relevant portions of the said order are reproduced hereinbelow:

*“The Returning Officer has now submitted the report. As per the said report, the recommendation of the Returning Officer is that the cut-off date for drawing the electoral roll deserves to be extended, to the date on which the constitution of the DCBA is amended and approved by BAI, which should carry out the said exercise within one month from the date of issuance of directions by this Court. The final recommendation is contained in paragraph 63 of the report, which reads as under:*

*“63. In view of the above discussion, it is recommended that in order to ensure complete participation of all the stakeholders, the cut-off date of 01.05.2019 be extended to the date on which the Constitution of DCBA stands amended and approved by BAI and this exercise should be carried out within one month from the date of issuance of directions by the Hon'ble Court, if it so deems fit. It should, however, be clarified that in an*



eventuality, if the Constitution stands amended prior to one month and also approved by the BAI, the cut-off date would remain the same i.e. one month from the date of issuance of directions by the Hon'ble Court for amendment of Constitution of DCBA so that District Associations can complete the necessary formalities and induct fresh members as per rules within that period of one month.....”

- .....
1. Accordingly, since Justice (Retd.) Brijesh Sethi is already seized of the dispute and the matter relating to the constitution of the DCBA and the elections which are to be conducted thereto, the recommendation of the Returning Officer is accepted by the Court. The fixation of the cut-off date of 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2019 is recalled. The cut-off date for drawing up the electoral roll shall now be fixed by the Returning Officer.
  2. There is a dispute as to whether various member associations of the DCBA should be allowed to participate in the amendment and the election process. There could be deficiencies in the various member associations, however, their existence cannot be disputed. Accordingly, the various member associations would be allowed to participate in the amendment of the constitution. If any steps are required to be taken to overcome any deficiencies in the said member associations, directions shall be issued by the Returning Officer for streamlining the said member associations.
  3. After the DCBA's constitution is amended and the same is approved by the BAI, the cut-off date for drawing up the electoral roll shall be announced by the Returning Officer. The elections shall thereafter be held in terms of the directions issued by the Returning Officer.
  4. It is hoped and expected that the amendment to the Constitution and the removal of defects in the member associations, as also the elections to the DCBA would be completed on or before 31st July, 2021. If extension is needed, parties are permitted to approach the Court.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

12. Pursuant to the said order, the RO once again sought detailed information from all District Units regarding their functioning, to ensure compliance with the Court's orders. A meeting was held on 27.03.2021, wherein only the West District Badminton Association submitted partial information, while the remaining District Units were directed to submit





the required details on affidavit by 15.04.2021.

13. Meanwhile, the BAI convened a meeting on 09.04.2021 for amendment of the Constitution of the DCBA. In the said meeting, the number of Executive Posts for which elections were to be held was reduced, contrary to the directions of this Hon'ble Court to conduct elections for 30 posts. BAI thereafter approached this Court through an application being 15698/2021 in WP (C) 11247/2020, for clarification and directions in respect of the order dated 12.01.2021, seeking confirmation of the amendments carried out by the DCBA in its minutes of meeting dated 09.04.2021. However, this Court, *vide* order dated 31.05.2021, rejected the same and issued the following directions:

*“7. Thereafter, as recorded in the same very order, a question arose as to whether elections should be held for 30 posts or for 15 posts. This Court had considered the matter in detail, and held that the elections would be held for 30 posts along with three co-opted members.*

*8. A dispute has now arisen because, according to the BAI, there are only 11 district organisations which are members and each of them have nominated only two members as their representatives in the DCBA. Mr. Salwan, Id. Sr. Counsel for the BAI submits that since the general body itself consists only of 22 members, there cannot be 30 posts qua which elections are to be held.*

xxxx

xxxx

xxxx

xxxx

xxxx

*10. Disputes have been raised in respect of the amendments as the current office bearers who are outsiders were not given notice to attend the meeting. Only members are stated to have attended the meeting dated 9th April 2021. As recorded in the previous orders there was a merger of two associations to constitute the DCBA and in the previous round, elections were held for 30 positions. However, before holding elections now, the Constitution of DCBA is to be amended in terms of the Rules/Regulations prescribed by BAI. Thus a meeting of DCBA for amending the Constitution was required. Considering the factual position as also the arguments that have been made by the parties, this Court deems it appropriate to direct as under:*



(i) Outsiders would not be permitted to participate in the elections of the DCBA.

(ii) Only the members who are nominated by the various district members associations would be permitted to participate in the said elections.

(iii) The question as to the number of posts qua which the elections should be held, in accordance with the rules of the BAI, would now be decided in a fresh meeting to be held of the DCBA. The same would be presided over by Justice (Retd.) Brijesh Sethi, the Election Officer. The Secretary of the BAI can be present to assist the Election Officer.

(iv) For the said meeting, the current office bearers, who are 33 in number, as also all the members, would be invited. The views expressed in the said meeting shall be considered, and a resolution shall be passed in the said meeting as to the number of posts for which the elections shall be conducted. The said resolution would then result in an amendment of the Constitution of the DCBA.

(v) After the amendment is carried out, the electoral roll shall be drawn up by the Election Officer, and elections shall be conducted, on or before 31st July, 2021 as already directed.

xxxx

xxxx

xxxx

xxxx

xxxx

**11. It is agreed between the parties that the decision taken in the said meeting, which would now be presided over by the Election Officer, Justice (Retd.) Brijesh Sethi, shall be accepted by all the groups of the DCBA and elections shall be permitted to be conducted smoothly without raising further challenges in respect of the number of posts."**

(Emphasis Supplied)

14. Thereafter, in compliance with the directions of this Court, the Returning Officer again called upon all District Units to furnish the requisite information to streamline their functioning.

**Observations made in Report dated 23.07.2021 by the RO:**

15. The RO observed in his report various irregularities, inter alia, as follows:



“4. It may be pointed out that certain information regarding functioning of District Units was already called by the undersigned. However, the said information was not submitted by the concerned District units by the said time. After the above order of Hon'ble Court, the undersigned had once again sought detailed information regarding the functioning of Units so that deficiencies, if any, can be rectified as per the directions of the Hon'ble Court. A meeting was also held, thereafter, on 27th March, 2021 but unfortunately none except one District Unit i.e. West District Badminton Association had submitted the required information, though it too was incomplete. In the said meeting, the undersigned had once again requested all the District Units to supply the information by 15.04.2021 on affidavit so that true and correct facts are placed on record.

5. In the meantime BAI had also held a meeting on 09.04.2021 for amendment of the constitution and in the said meeting, the Executive Posts for which elections are to be held were reduced though the Hon'ble Court had issued directions to hold elections for 30 posts. Thereafter, the BAI had approached the Hon'ble Court for approving its Minutes of meeting dt. 09.04.2021. The Hon'ble Court had, however, rejected the application and passed the following directions vide order dated 31.05.2021:-

11. It is agreed between the parties that the decision taken in the said meeting, which would now be presided over by the Election Officer, Justice (Retd.) Brijesh Sethi, shall be accepted by all the groups of the DCBA and elections shall be permitted to be conducted smoothly without raising further challenges in respect of the number of posts.

7. During the scrutiny of the documents supplied by District Units and Ld. Counsels for the parties, it was revealed that the District units had got affiliation on 15th March, 2013 from DCBA, whereas the DCBA had come into existence on 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 as it was registered on the said date under The Societies Registration Act, 1860. The District Units were, thus, granted affiliation five days even before DCBA came into existence. The perusal of the record further reveals that the DCBA had got affiliation from BAI on 22nd March, 2013 only. It may also be pointed out that District Units were registered under the Societies Registration Act from May, 2013 onwards.

8. Perusal of the record further reveals that none of the District Units had even paid the subscription fee or the annual fee initially, though it was deposited by some of the Districts later on. However, some of them have yet to deposit the up to date annual fee. Most of the Units have also failed to affiliate five clubs as directed by the Constitution of the DCBA. Some of the District Units have also not opened the bank account and some of them are still in the process of opening the same.



9. Thus, in view of large number of substantive irregularities regarding functioning of District Units and further keeping in mind the fact that rectification of the same itself may take some time, it will not be possible to move further towards elections in accordance with the directions of the court and the Hon'ble Court is, therefore, requested to extend the time for holding the Elections for another three months i.e. up to 30th of Oct. 2021. The undersigned hopes that District Units will wake up from their slumber and will act fast and rectify the deficiencies and will also be able to give specific undertaking that shortcomings will be removed within a specified time so that we can march further towards election process.

10. As per the order dated 18.03.2021, the Hon'ble Court had directed that if needed, the parties can seek extension of time for holding elections and the relevant para runs as follows:-

8. It is hoped and expected that the amendment to the Constitution and the removal of defects in the member associations, as also the elections to the DCBA would be completed on or before 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2021. **If extension is needed, parties are permitted to approach the Court.**

(Emphasis Supplied)

12. The details of the proceedings held so far are, thus, submitted for perusal of the Hon'ble Court with a request to grant extension of time up to 30<sup>th</sup> October, 2021 for holding elections of DCBA.”

16. In view of these persistent deficiencies and substantive irregularities in the functioning of the District Units, and considering that rectification would take additional time, the RO submitted a report before this Court seeking extension of time for holding elections by three months, i.e., till 30.10.2021.

17. Subsequently, in further proceedings, this Court *vide* its order dated 08.09.2021, directed that the elections of DCBA be conducted smoothly and not be postponed any further, while ensuring that all irregularities and deficiencies in the District Units be rectified in accordance with the directions issued by the Court. The relevant paragraph are as follows:

“6. Be that as it may, considering the overall nature of this matter, the ultimate aim is to ensure that the DCBA election is conducted smoothly with all the constituents of the DCBA having been given an



*opportunity to participate in the said elections. The DCBA has 11 district units and it is also a body which was constituted post the merger of two associations as is clearly explained in the prior orders of this Court. Accordingly, further to the previous orders, the following directions are issued:*

*i. The ld. Returning Officer would be free to give directions to the district units and DCBA to ensure that the irregularities and deficiencies are removed in respect of the District Units, on an urgent basis. A specific timeline may be given by the ld. Returning Officer for compliance.*

*ii. Considering that the elections to the DCBA have been delayed to a considerable extent, if there are some irregularities and deficiencies, the compliance of which may not be possible to be completely carried out and can be postponed to a later stage, date for the election shall be fixed by the ld. Returning Officer, on or before 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2021. The election shall then be duly conducted by the ld. Returning officer and a report as regards the same shall be filed before this Court, on or by 15th October, 2021.*

*7. The election shall be conducted strictly in terms of the previous directions of this Court issued by order dated 31st May, 2021. The said directions are extracted below:*

*“10. Disputes have been raised in respect of the amendments as the current office bearers who are outsiders were not given notice to attend the meeting. Only members are stated to have attended the meeting dated 9th April 2021. As recorded in the previous orders there was a merger of two associations to constitute the DCBA and in the previous round, elections were held for 30 positions. However, before holding elections now, the Constitution of DCBA is to be amended in terms of the Rules/Regulations prescribed by BAI. Thus a meeting of DCBA for amending the Constitution was required. Considering the factual position as also the arguments that have been made by the parties, this Court deems it appropriate to direct as under:*

*(i) Outsiders would not be permitted to participate in the elections of the DCBA.*

*(ii) Only the members who are nominated by the various district members associations would be permitted to participate in the said elections.*

*(iii) The question as to the number of posts qua which the elections should be held, in accordance with the rules of the BAI, would now be decided in a fresh meeting to be held of the DCBA. The same would be presided over by Justice (Retd.) Brijesh Sethi, the Election Officer. The Secretary of the BAI can be present to assist the Election Officer.*

*(iv) For the said meeting, the current office bearers, who are 33 in*



*number, as also all the members, would be invited. The views expressed in the said meeting shall be considered, and a resolution shall be passed in the said meeting as to the number of posts for which the elections shall be conducted. The said resolution would then result in an amendment of the Constitution of the DCBA.*

*(v) After the amendment is carried out, the electoral roll shall be drawn up by the Election Officer, and elections shall be conducted, on or before 31st July, 2021 as already directed.”*

*8. The Id. Returning Officer is now requested to ensure that the elections are not postponed in any manner, and if there are any irregularities and deficiencies the same can be cured by the district units, as also by the State unit, even after the notification of the election.”*

18. This Court via order dated 26.09.2023, appointed Justice (Retd.) Pankaj Naqvi was appointed as Administrator to examine:

- i. whether the DCBA and its affiliated District Units comply with the National Sports Development Code of India, 2011 [hereinafter referred to as “Sports Code”] and ***Rahul Mehra v. Union of India & Ors.***<sup>1</sup>
- ii. whether the District Units are legally constituted, functional, and democratically governed; and
- iii. to recommend measures to ensure transparent elections and lawful governance of Respondent No.1/DCBA.

**Submissions on behalf of the Appellant:**

19. Learned counsel for the Appellant has made the following submissions:

- i. The Appellant contends that Rule 16 of the Constitution of the Respondent No.1/DCBA explicitly provides that the *voters* in the DCBA elections are representatives of the District Units. Hence, the

---

<sup>1</sup>2022 SCC OnLine Del 2438.



Constitution of Respondent No.1/DCBA vests rights in persons who are not parties to the present *lis*, and it is therefore imperative that neither party is permitted to curtail or affect such rights by mutual consent.

ii. The Respondent No. 1/DCBA has sought to justify the cut-off date of 01.05.2019 on the ground that it corresponds to the notice dated 01.05.2019 convening the last AGM scheduled on 02.06.2019, pursuant to orders of the Learned Trial Court. However, no such rationale was ever placed before or recorded by this Court in its order dated 12.01.2021.

iii. It is submitted that the cut-off date was recorded by consent. However, this Court directed an independent recommendation keeping in view the larger stakeholders' interests, that is, the promotion of sports, the interest of the State of Delhi, and the national interest. It is submitted that the question of "control" over the organization is wholly irrelevant. The preferred interpretation must be one that encourages the inclusion of meritorious sportspersons, experts, and administrators in the management of sports associations.

iv. While the cut-off date was consented to by parties, this Court, keeping in mind the larger public and sporting interest, did not summarily dismiss the application [CM APPL. 6177/2021 in W.P.(C) 11247/2020] of Smt. Madhumita Bisht for modification. In this regard, the orders dated 12.01.2021 and subsequent directions having been passed under Article 226 of the Constitution, this Court



exercises wide equitable and constitutional jurisdiction to advance public interest and fair play in sports administration.

v. It is further submitted that *vide* email dated 17.09.2017, DCBA had sought information from various District Associations, which remained unresponded to until 2019. Consequently, in the Executive Committee meetings dated 05.05.2019 and 19.05.2019, such District Associations were declared defunct. The Respondent No. 1/DCBA and three others thereafter filed Civil Suit No. 1514/2019 on 30.05.2019, seeking a declaration of validity of the said Election Commission meetings. Significantly, the decision of the Election Commission declaring the District Associations defunct has not been challenged by any Association before any forum till date.

vi. In this regard, the underlying purpose of fixing a cut-off date in society elections is to prevent manipulation of the voter base by induction of new members. However, this rationale does not apply to Respondent No.1/DCBA, since its voters are nominees of affiliated District Associations rather than individual members.

vii. It is also contended that on 12.01.2021, no rationale was offered by either party for fixing 01.05.2019 as the cut-off date. The suggestion emanated during arguments only as a matter of convenience. The date, being arbitrary, lacks any logical nexus to the object of ensuring fair representation. As on 01.05.2019, there existed no electoral roll. The first voter list was prepared only on 15.06.2019. Thus, it is contended that para 11 of the order dated





12.01.2021, which fixes 01.05.2019 as the relevant date, creates an impossibility of compliance.

viii. In this regard, it is contended that holding elections on the basis of outdated voter data defeats the intent of this Court's directions. Moreover, it is also contended that Clause 16 of the DCBA Constitution mandates that the RO shall invite *fresh nominations* from the affiliated District Associations. Due to this, adherence to the old cut-off date would directly contravene the said clause.

ix. The District Associations, as on 01.05.2019, stood disaffiliated due to non-performance and non-compliance with constitutional obligations, as recorded in the minutes of 05.05.2019 and 19.05.2019 and further corroborated by BAI's email dated 20.12.2020. Thus, reviving their old nominations would prejudice the integrity of the electoral process and the interest of sports in Delhi.

x. The cut-off date should be determined *vis-à-vis* the *event of re-affiliation* of District Associations with DCBA, rather than being a fixed past date. The electoral process must commence only after the District Associations are duly affiliated, following scrutiny and verification of their compliance with constitutional norms.

xi. It is contended that pursuant to the MOU dated 23.07.2015 executed between the erstwhile DBA and DCBA, both bodies were amalgamated to ensure fair representation of all stakeholders. For this, he relied upon this Court's order dated 12.01.2021, wherein the court has recognized this arrangement, noting the existence of dual Secretaries and other Constitutional safeguard.



xii. Lastly, at present, all 11 District Associations stand disaffiliated. Once their reaffiliation and proper representation are ensured, the RO may invite nominations from them for the purpose of holding fresh elections, thereby fulfilling the constitutional mandate and promoting the larger interest of sports in Delhi.

**Submissions on behalf of the Respondent No. 1:**

20. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the Respondent No.1/DCBA has made the following submissions:

i. The primary contention is that the Appellant, having attained the age of 70 years, became ineligible to continue as an office bearer of the DCBA. Realizing that he would not be able to contest the forthcoming elections post the amendments introduced in accordance with the directions of the learned Single Judge, the Appellant is now seeking to stall the election process with the sole intent of continuing as an office bearer of DCBA during the pendency of the present appeal.

ii. It is further submitted that the Appellant was given repeated opportunities to apply for membership with the respective District Associations but failed to avail of the same. He is, therefore, not a member of any District Unit of Respondent No.1/DCBA and consequently, has no *locus standi* to challenge the impugned orders or seek interference with the election process.

**Submissions on behalf of the Respondent No. 2:**

21. Learned counsel for the Respondent No. 2/BAI has made the following submissions:



i. The primary submission of Respondent No. 2/BAI is that it has only a limited and supervisory role in the issues arising in the present proceedings. It is respectfully contended that the present dispute essentially pertains to inter se disagreements between office bearers of the Respondent No. 1/DCBA, and not to any administrative or regulatory action taken by Respondent No.2/BAI. The Respondent No. 2's concern is confined exclusively to ensuring that the affairs of its affiliated State Association are conducted in strict conformity with the National Sports Development Code of India, 2011 [hereinafter referred to as "Sports Code"], and in furtherance of the governance, development, and promotion of the sport of badminton, as well as the welfare of players and athletes across all levels of participation.

ii. It is contended, prior to the formation of the Respondent No.1/DCBA, the affairs relating to the promotion and management of the sport of badminton in the Union Territory of Delhi were being administered by the Respondent No.1/DCBA until the year 2013. Upon the enactment of the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, 1991, and the subsequent creation of 11 districts within Delhi, it became imperative, in terms of the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports, Government of India and Sports Code, that as per rules, at least 50% of Districts are required to be affiliated to a state unit, which is a mandatory precondition for continued recognition of any State Unit by its parent National Sports Federation.

iii. It is further contended that, in order to meet the aforesaid statutory and administrative requirements, the Respondent



No.1/DCBA was constituted in 2013 as a representative body comprising all the districts of DBA within the National Capital Territory of Delhi. The Respondent No. 2/BAI, after due consideration, confirmed the grant of affiliation to DCBA as the recognized State Unit for Delhi in its General Body Meeting. It is significant to note that the Appellant, who was then serving as a representative of the DBA in the Respondent No. 2/BAI, himself supported and approved the said resolution of affiliation during the said meeting. Under the original Constitution of the DCBA, the Executive Committee consisted of a maximum of 18 members, including 3 co-opted members. Thereafter, pursuant to a MoU executed between DBA and DCBA on 23.07.2015, a General Body Meeting of DCBA was convened on 01.08.2015, wherein the Constitution was purportedly amended. By virtue of this amendment, the strength of the Executive Committee was increased from 18 to 33 members, and two posts of Honorary Secretaries were created in place of one.

iv. However, the said amendments adopted in the General Body Meeting held on 01.08.2015 were never submitted for approval to the Registrar of Societies, as required under the Societies Registration Act, 1860. Consequently, the said amendments never acquired legal sanctity. It is further contended that the Constitution of the DCBA, continues to reflect the composition of the Executive Committee as 18 members only, thus evidencing the non-recognition of the purported amendments in the eyes of law. Following the said meeting of 01.08.2015, elections to the Executive Committee were conducted, wherein the Appellant and Mr. A.K. Mitra were elected



as the two Honorary Secretaries. However, soon thereafter, serious differences and disputes arose between them, resulting in dual and contradictory communications being issued to the affiliated District Associations. These internal conflicts paralyzed the functioning of the DCBA and caused severe administrative disarray, necessitating judicial intervention.

v. It is further submitted that the Constitution of the DCBA, as it then stood, improperly provided for the membership of “outsiders,” including Honorary Members, Life Members, and individual members, in addition to the District Units. This provision was in direct contravention of the Constitution of BAI, which unequivocally mandates that only District Units shall constitute the General Body of a State Association. The BAI, in faithful discharge of its supervisory role under the Sports Code, duly brought this anomaly to the notice of the DCBA vide its email dated 20.12.2020, emphasizing the need to align its Constitution with the national framework to ensure democratic and sport-centric governance. It is also contended that during this meeting, amendments proposed by BAI were deliberated upon and unanimously approved by the member districts, thereby ensuring that only district units would constitute the General Body and that provisions for “outsider” memberships were deleted.

vi. It is, therefore, contended that the Respondent No. 2/BAI has acted throughout in good faith and strictly in accordance with the directions of this Court, keeping paramount the interests of the sport and the athletes. For this, it is further contended that elections of the Executive Committee of the DCBA be directed to be held



expeditiously as per the Constitution amended in the General Body Meeting dated 09.04.2021.

vii. In the alternative, and without prejudice to the foregoing submissions, the Respondent No. 2/BAI respectfully submits, and by way of suggestion, prays that this Court may be pleased to consider constituting a three-member *Ad-hoc* Committee, comprising one nominee each from the Union of India (Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports), the Government of NCT of Delhi, and the Badminton Association of India. Such an *Ad-hoc* Committee may be entrusted with the responsibility to administer and oversee the day-to-day affairs of the DCBA, to ensure that the interests of the sport of badminton and its players are effectively protected, and that all statutory compliances and structural reforms under the Sports Code are implemented in a time-bound and transparent manner during the interregnum, until a duly elected and Code-compliant Executive Committee assumes charge.

**Findings & Analysis:**

22. This Court, pursuant to its Order dated 26.09.2023 read with Orders dated 12.11.2024 and 10.12.2024, appointed Justice (Retd.) Pankaj Naqvi as the Administrator to examine the matters in issue and directed him to file a detailed report [hereinafter referred to as the “**Administrator’s Report**”], indicating the compliance of the 11 District Associations- [*New Delhi District Badminton Association, Central Delhi District Badminton Association, South Delhi District Badminton Association, South-East Delhi District Badminton Association, South-West Delhi District Badminton Association, North Delhi District Badminton Association,*



*North-East Delhi District Badminton Association, East Delhi District Badminton Association, Shahdara District Badminton Association, North-West Delhi District Badminton Association, and West Delhi District Badminton Association*]. The detailed report prepared by Justice Pankaj Naqvi (Retd.) places reliance upon the Sports Code and the continuing directions issued by this Court in ***Rahul Mehra*** (*supra*), wherein the governing law for recognition, affiliation and functioning of all National Sports Federations (“NSFs”) and their State Units has been conclusively settled. The ***Rahul Mehra*** (*supra*) judgment re-affirmed that compliance with the Sports Code is not directory but mandatory, and that the principle of “good governance in sports” has acquired constitutional underpinnings flowing from Articles 14 and 21. Federations or associations functioning contrary to these norms cannot continue to claim recognition or affiliation. The relevant portions of the Administrator’s report are as follows:

*“2. Accordingly, the undersigned is filing the present report: (A) giving an overview of the compliances under the National Sports Code and **Rahul Mehra Case**; (B) giving the status of compliance with the National Sports Code and **Rahul Mehra Case** by the District Associations; and (C) suggesting the way forward, including with respect to conduct of elections of Respondent No.1.*

*4. The National Sports Code, inter alia, contains “The Guidelines for Recognition of National Sports Federations”, as Annexure-II (“**Recognition Guidelines**”), which provides for various criteria for recognition of National Sports Federations (“NSF”) and they apply mutatis mutandis to State Level and District Level Associations in terms of the judgment in **Rahul Mehra Case (Para xiii)**.*

.....

*10. These requirements mutatis mutandis apply to District Associations and the State Associations as per the judgment in **Rahul Mehra Case**.”*

(Emphasis Supplied)

23. It is necessary to undertake a further analysis under the two sub-heads that follow, arising from the neutral and objective observations



contained in the Administrator's Report. These observations, viewed in the backdrop of the principles laid down by this Court in matters concerning sports governance, warrant careful judicial scrutiny to ensure that the functioning of the State Sports Association conforms to the standards of transparency, legality, and democratic accountability mandated under the Sports Code.

***I. Electoral Irregularities:***

24. The materials placed on record show that the constitutions filed by various District Units and by the DCBA between December 2024 and January 2025 merely reproduce these clauses in form but have not established any functional or procedural mechanism for their implementation, such as the criteria for identifying sportspersons, their mode of nomination or election, or ensuring their effective participation in decision-making and in conduct of tournaments. This demonstrates a pattern of cosmetic compliance rather than genuine adherence to the reform mandates envisaged under the Sports Code. The deficiencies in the documents placed on record further reveal a lack of substantive implementation, leaving the exercise as nothing more than paper compliance. Moreover, the continued presence of office-bearers who have exceeded the age of Seventy Years, further exemplifies the systemic disregard for statutory governance norms. The division bench of this Court in ***Rahul Mehra*** (*supra*) emphasized that such provisions are not directory but mandatory, forming the “bedrock of good governance” in sports administration. The relevant findings of the Administrator's Report are hereunder:

***“II. Organizational Structure and Good Governance***

***a. Constitution and structures embedded in the constitution***





.....  
*b. Size of Executive Committee and Age and Tenure Limits on Executive Committee members*

13. The Circular dated 20.09.1975 (Annexure XI to the National Sports Code) and circular dated 01.05.2010 (Annexure XIII to the National Sports Code) provide for age and tenure limits for office bearers (President, Secretary and Treasurer). Inter alia:

a. The office bearer must not be aged 70 years and above.

.....  
21. Fair and Transparent Elections: The National Sports Code (Clause 9.3) and the judgment in Rahul Mehra Case stress the importance of conducting fair, transparent, and democratic elections. They require adhering to the Model Election Guidelines (Annexure XXXVII to the National Sports Code) and ensuring equal voting rights or all eligible members.

.....  
34. Measures against Age Fraud: Clause 9.3 of the National Sports Code stipulates that sports associations need to implement measures to combat age fraud in sports.

42. The National Sports Code, the judgment in Rahul Mehra Case, and subsequent court orders such as the one dated 26.09.2023 passed in the present case, establish a clear framework for good governance in Indian sports. Sports associations must strive for full compliance to ensure a transparent, accountable, and athlete-centric sporting environment.

.....  
47. In his report dated 23.07.2021, Justice (Retd.) Brijesh Sethi observed that the alleged affiliation obtained by all the district associations relate prior to their formation. Furthermore, he noted that Respondent No.1 itself did not exist at the time the alleged affiliation was obtained.....”

25. In this view, this Court has placed reliance on the Division Bench judgment in **Rahul Mehra** (*supra*). The relevant extracts are as follows:

“51. In **Board of Control for Cricket v. Cricket Association of Bihar** (2016) 8 SCC 535, the Supreme Court has held that the upper age limit of 70 years should be applied to all members of the EC of the BCCI along with tenure restrictions for an EC member of not more than three tenures, with a compulsory cooling-off period between two terms.”

(Emphasis Supplied)



26. Pursuant to aforementioned findings in the Administrator's report, the relevant extracts of the **Rahul Mehra** (*supra*) are hereunder:

*"4. The objective of the Sports Code is the adoption of 'good governance' practices by the NSFs and the IOA. The 'Statement of Purpose' of the Sports Code reads as under:—*

*".....1.1 Sport development is a national priority, as it promotes active lifestyle, child and youth development, social inclusiveness, employment opportunities, peace and development, and above all a sense of belongingness and national pride....."*

*1.2. At the national policy level, sport is at par with public education and public health, and like them sport is a public good and sport development is a public function. It is for this reason that even though national sports bodies are autonomous in nature both, the Supreme Court of India and several High Courts have, in various judgments, maintained that although national sports bodies are not "State" within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, they come within the writ jurisdiction of High Courts under Article 226 of the Constitution of India because they perform state-like functions such as the selection of national teams and representing the country in international sports events and forums.*

*1.3. Globally, countries across the world have enacted laws or enunciated guidelines for the regulation of sports in public interest and in national interest. The need to regulate sports arises out of several considerations such as the need to prevent racism in sports, eradicate doping in Sports, prevent age fraud in sports, protect athletes' rights, prevent child abuse and sexual harassment in sports, protect gender equality in sports, prevent betting and gambling in sports, ban dangerous sports, promote professional management and managerial and financial accountability in sports, address anti-trust and competition policy issues related to sports, regulate sports broadcasting rights, regulate the price and entry to sports events, etc.*

*1.4. Government of India also has been, from time to time, taking various steps and initiatives to promote good governance practices in the management of sports at the national level in pursuance of Successive National Sports Policies. These policies are based on the Basic Universal Principles of Good Governance of Olympic and Sports movement and do not, in any manner, contradict or interfere with the autonomy of the national sports bodies in discharging their functions and duties in accordance with the International Olympic Committee Charter.*

.....



1.6. In the recent past Government has taken various steps to further improve the management of NSFs and sports in the country such as notification of the Anti-Doping Code, introduction of annual recognition of NSFs to ensure transparency and accountability of NSFs; enforcement of age and tenure limit in respect of office bearers of NSFs, including the Indian Olympic Association; bringing NSFs under the purview of Right to Information Act; measures to ensure free, fair and transparent elections by the NSFs; and measures to combat age fraud in sports, and guidelines for the prevention of sexual harassment of women in sports.

.....

## 2. Introduction

2.1 Sports and games form an essential part of human resource development. Government of India attaches utmost importance to sports for development and sports for excellence. It has been the endeavour of the Government to lay down procedures for effective coordination among various agencies involved in the promotion of sports and extend required infrastructure, training and other facilities to the sportspersons for achieving excellence in the international events.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

27. The Administrator’s scrutiny reveals that no contemporaneous record of electoral rolls, nomination papers, notifications of the RO, communications to the Registrar of Societies, or the presence of independent observers appointed by the Respondent No.2/BAI or the competent authority was ever produced. In the absence of such foundational documentation, the authenticity and legality of the electoral process cannot be established. For this, the Court relied upon **Rahul Mehra** (*supra*), and the relevant extract of the judgment is as follow:

“46.....The Government has publicly clarified its position that its order of 01.05.2010, restricting the age and tenure of the office bearers in NSFs, was issued after taking into account the existing scenario in NSFs as well as the views expressed by the courts and the Parliament.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

28. Since it is duly recorded in the Administrator’s Report that the



elections held in 2017 and 2023 stand vitiated on account of fundamental procedural irregularities, this Court cannot recognize the said elections as valid in law.

29. The material on record unequivocally demonstrates that 11 District Badminton Associations were shown to have been “affiliated” with the Respondent No. 1/DCBA on 15.03.2013. However, it is an undisputed fact that the Respondent No. 1/DCBA itself came into legal existence only upon its registration on 20.03.2013 under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, and was subsequently granted affiliation by the BAI on 22.03.2013. The Administrator, in his report, has correctly observed that an unregistered or non-existent body lacks the legal capacity to create or confer membership or affiliation rights upon any subordinate units, as such authority presupposes lawful existence and recognition.

30. In view of the above findings, and upon considering the Sports Code as well as the Administrator’s Report, this infirmity is not merely a procedural lapse but a substantive illegality that goes to the very root of the Association’s institutional legitimacy and undermines the principles of good governance in sports.

## **II. Financial Irregularities:**

31. The financial records submitted by several District Badminton Associations reveal significant irregularities and non-compliance with the financial transparency norms prescribed under the Sports Code. Numerous balance sheets were either unsigned, unaudited, or unsupported by corresponding bank statements or vouchers, thereby rendering them unverifiable. In one notable instance, pertaining to the *North Delhi*



*District Badminton Association*, it was found that tournament-related funds were deposited in and disbursed through the personal accounts of office-bearers, rather than through an institutional bank account maintained in the name of the Association. Such conduct constitutes a grave breach of financial propriety and institutional discipline. The handling of organizational funds through personal accounts of office-bearers violates the principles of transparency, segregation of funds, and fiduciary responsibility inherent in the Sports Code. Such practices undermine the credibility of the Association and raise serious doubts about the integrity of its financial administration. The Administrator's Report expressly records that only those District or affiliated Units which are "functioning actively and autonomously and are engaged in continuous promotion and development of the sport" are eligible for affiliation with a State Association. The Code further envisages that the composition of a State-level body must genuinely represent its functional district units, each of which must independently satisfy the criteria of democratic governance, regular activity, and financial transparency. The relevant findings of the Administrator's Report are hereunder:

*"79. Income and expenditure statement for the year 2024 was provided along with the Audit report for the Assessment Year 2023-24. The Audit report, as with other districts does not bear the signature of any office bearer of the Association. Further, for the Assessment year 2023-24 there appears to be no assessable income at all. This does raise the question as to how the Association functions and how they manage to conduct tournaments and other Association related activities.*

.....

*101. A very serious question is also raised when considering the bank statement along with the aforementioned poster of the tournament conducted in May 2023. It appears that the funds for the Tournament have not been collected in the Association's Bank Account and appear to have been collected in the personal bank accounts. There also appears to be no deposit from the said personal*



accounts, into the bank account of the NDDBA at any time after the tournament concluded. This illegality does raises serious questions as to the management of the Association indicating misappropriation of funds.

.....  
111. The balance sheets and Audit Reports that have been submitted are again made by the same Auditor and do not bear the signatures of any office bearers. As such, there is no record of the district's income and expenditures for previous years, including tournaments organization and association expenses.

.....  
119.....And again, it must be noted that none of the reports bear the signature of any of the office bearers of this District.....”

32. Accordingly, the failure of these District Associations to demonstrate independent functioning, coupled with the mechanical nature of their records, militates against the mandatory requirements of the Sports Code and invalidates their claim to valid affiliation with the DCBA.

33. Under the structural framework of the Sports Code, District Associations constitute the feeder organizations forming the electoral college of each State-level Association. The record reveals that the eleven District Badminton Associations affiliated to Respondent No. 1/DCBA are themselves non-functional, or otherwise non-compliant with the statutory and normative standards. In such circumstances, there exists no lawful or legitimate electoral college from which a representative State Executive Committee could be constituted.

34. Lastly, upon an independent and holistic consideration of the Administrator's report, the pleadings of the parties, and the statutory



framework governing sports bodies, this Court records the following findings:

- “(a) All eleven District Badminton Associations affiliated to the DCBA are non-compliant with the mandatory provisions of the Sports Code and the principles laid down in Rahul Mehra v. Union of India (2022);*  
*(b) There presently exists no lawful or verifiable electoral college for the conduct of elections to the Executive Committee of the DCBA;*  
*(c) The purported elections held in 2017 and 2023 are unverifiable and void in law, lacking the safeguards of independent supervision, published electoral rolls, and official notification as mandated under Clause 9 of the Sports Code;*  
*(d) The amended constitutions filed in 2024–2025 represent only formal compliance and fail to rectify substantive structural and governance defects; and*  
*(e) The interests of athletes, coaches, and players within the National Capital Territory of Delhi stand seriously prejudiced by the present administrative impasse and absence of a duly constituted, democratically elected, and Code-compliant governing body.”*

35. The Court accordingly holds that the existing governance framework of DCBA is inconsistent with the **Rahul Mehra** (supra) judgment. Without re-affiliation and restructuring, no free and fair election can be held. Compliance with the Sports Code is not optional but a statutory and constitutional obligation designed to secure transparency, fairness and athlete-centric administration of sports in India. The corrective measures above are therefore indispensable for restoring democratic governance of badminton in the National Capital Territory of Delhi. The relevant findings of the Administrator’s Report are hereunder:

**“142. Based on the documents and information provided by the District Associations, the undersigned has no hesitation in concluding that none of the district associations in the State of Delhi are compliant with the cumulative requirements of the National Sports Code or the Rahul Mehra Case.”**

*(Emphasis Supplied)*

36. The Administrator’s finding in this regard is thus both factually



substantiated and legally correct.

**A Way Forward:**

37. Needless to state, *on the touchstone of sports governance and constitutional fairness*, it is imperative to underscore that the ultimate object of the Sports Code and the directions in ***Rahul Mehra***(*supra*) is not merely regulatory but purposive in order to promote sports, nurture sporting talent, and safeguard the rights of sportspersons from administrative arbitrariness. Sports bodies derive their legitimacy not from control over institutions but from their role as facilitators of sportsperson excellence in the sport and inclusive participation. Any administrative or electoral manipulation which sidelines active players or genuine sporting contributors subverts the very spirit of the Code and violates Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution. The entire governance framework of a sports association must therefore be player/sportsperson centric, transparent, and development-oriented, ensuring that opportunities, funding, and representation flow to those who serve and advance the sport rather than to those who merely occupy positions of authority. The Court thus reiterates that the promotion of sports and protection of sportspersons welfare must remain the paramount consideration in any restructuring or reconstitution of the DCBA and its affiliated District Units.

**Conclusion**

38. In view of the foregoing analysis, and upon careful consideration of the comprehensive findings recorded in the Administrator's Report, this Court is satisfied that the structural, procedural, and constitutional deficiencies afflicting the DCBA and its District Units stand fully established.





39. With respect to the consistent findings recorded in the Administrator's Report, and keeping in view the mandatory governance standards prescribed under the Sports Code as well as the directions issued in ***Rahul Mehra*** (*supra*), this Court is of the considered view that the restructuring of the DCBA must proceed strictly in accordance with law. As proposed by the Administrator in his report, the process of verifying and granting affiliation to the DBA, followed by the preparation of a lawful and compliant electoral college and, thereafter, the conduct of elections in a fair and transparent manner, shall be undertaken in a structured and time-bound manner. Insofar as financial irregularities are concerned, it is a compulsory requirement that proper accounting and auditing procedures be adopted. The accounts must be duly maintained and audited annually by a registered Chartered Accountant in strict adherence to the Sports Code.

40. Therefore, the Administrator is requested to complete the entire exercise including scrutiny of district units, confirmation of affiliation, finalization of the electoral college, and conduct of elections to the Executive Committee of the DCBA within a period of four (4) months from the date of these directions. The directions are issued to ensure that the DCBA is realigned with the core objectives of the Sports Code, which include transparency, accountability, sportsperson governance, gender equity, and the incorporation of fundamental principles of good governance, so that the administration of badminton in the NCT of Delhi functions in the best interests of the sport and its players. The conclusions recorded in the Administrator's Report shall remain unchanged.

41. Accordingly, and relying upon the authoritative conclusions



2025:DHC:10752-DB



contained in the Administrator's Report, the present Appeal as well as the Writ Petition are liable to be dismissed.

42. The present Appeal, along with the pending applications, is dismissed.

**ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.**

**HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.**

**DECEMBER 03, 2025**

*s.godara/RGK*