



2026:DHC:1246-DB



\$~17

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

+ W.P.(C) 4601/2013

MAHIPAL SINGH & ORSPetitioners

Through: None

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORSRespondents

Through: Ms. Anubha Bhardwaj, CGSC
with Mr. Vijay Misra, Adv. for R-1

Ms. Anjuman Tripathy and Ms. Amisha
Chauhan, Advs. for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER (ORAL)

11.02.2026

%

C.HARI SHANKAR, J.

CM APPL. 6064/2025

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the applicant in this application, though it has been called out twice. Yesterday, too, this matter was called out twice and there was no appearance on behalf of the applicant.

2. We have perused the application and find that it is *ex facie* not maintainable.

3. The application has been filed by Petitioner 2 in WP (C)



4601/2013. The writ petition, in its turn, challenged elections to the Amateur Kabaddi Federation of India¹ conducted in 2013. By judgment dated 3 August 2018, this Court held that the elections were invalid and appointed an Administrator to administer the affairs of the AKFI after removing Respondent 5 from the position of President of the AKFI.

4. The provocation for filing the present application is reflected in paras 4 to 6 of the application, which read thus:

“4. That the Respondent No. 5 entered into several contracts during her tenure as the President of AKFI regarding the conduct of various Kabaddi leagues and those leagues are still conducting their business as usual. That now after the aforementioned judgement, there are serious concerns about the legality and validity of those agreements/contracts given that Respondent No. 5's position was declared invalid by this Hon'ble Court.

5. That the Applicant contends that the contracts executed by Respondent No. 5 may not have adhered to due process and could have been carried out without proper legal authority, especially in light of the fact that her election to the office was subsequently quashed.

6. That these agreements/contracts involve substantial financial implications for AKFI and its affiliated units and the Applicant believes that it is in the interest of justice that the legality of these agreements/contracts be scrutinized by the Hon'ble Court.”

5. Following these assertions, the applicant has sought clarification from this Court on various aspects which are enumerated in para 7 which reads, thus:

“7. That the applicant, seeks permission from this Hon'ble Court to clarify the following:

¹ “AKFI” hereinafter



- a. Whether the contracts, agreements or arrangements entered into or made by Respondent No. 5 during her tenure as President of the AKFI are legally valid;
- b. Whether such contracts will continue to be enforced given that the position of Respondent No. 5 was declared invalid by this Hon'ble Court and;
- c. Whether AKFI is legally bound by the obligations and liabilities arising from these contracts.”

6. According to para 8 of the application, the aforesaid clarifications are required in order to avoid future legal complications and financial liabilities of the AKFI.

7. The application, as we have already observed, is, in fact, not maintainable in the writ petition.

8. The writ petition has already ruled on the challenge which was raised before the Court and appointed an Administrator to administer the affairs of the AKFI.

9. With the passing of the said order, this Court is rendered *functus officio* except if it is moved in review jurisdiction or for some clarification or modification emanating out of its judgment.

10. The Court cannot revive the proceedings and provide clarifications to avoid future legal complications. The issues highlighted in paras 4 to 6 of the present application are aspects which are outside the scope of the writ petition and may, without expressing any opinion thereon, constitute a fresh cause of action, should the applicant desire to pursue them.



2026:DHC:1246-DB



11. We, therefore, decline to answer the queries raised in para 7 of the present application as, to our mind, they cannot be answered once the writ petition already stands disposed of.

12. This would not, however, preclude the applicant from ventilating the issues raised in this application by means of appropriate legal proceedings in accordance with law.

13. The application is, accordingly, disposed of.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

FEBRUARY 11, 2026/AR