



\$~57

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10138/2023**

PADMAJA GARIKIPATI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rahul Mehra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. R. A. Iyer, Mr. Chaitanya Gosain
and Mr. Anand Thumbayil,
Advocates.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. R. Bala Subramanian, Sr.
Advocate with Mr. Ajay Digpaul,
CGSC with Mr. Kamal Digpaul, Ms.
Swati Kwatra, Mr. Vinayak Sharma
and Ms. Ishita Pathak, Advocates for
R-1.
Mr. Hrishikesh Baruah, Mr. Pranit
Pranav, Mr. Parth Goswami and Mr.
Akshay Kumar, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

27.09.2023

CM APPL. 49545/2023

1. Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that respondent no.2-Gymnastics Federation of India (*hereinafter referred to as 'GFI'*) vide its notification dated 07.09.2023 directed for the conduct of Annual General Body Meeting (*hereinafter referred to as 'AGM'*) of the said Federation on 29.09.2023 at 11:00 am. Besides others, the AGM is also scheduled to elect the office bearers and members of the executive



committee. He, therefore, submits that, on 29.09.2023, poll and result of the elections will take place and if that is done, the same would be in violation of the binding directions passed by this court on various occasions.

3. Learned senior counsel has specifically pointed out that in W.P.(C) 195/2010 titled *Rahul Mehra vs. Union Of India And Ors* vide detailed judgment dated 16.08.2022, the Division Bench of this court specifically directed that the Indian Olympic Association and National Sports Federation have to necessarily comply with certain directions including the mandate stipulated under the National Sports Development Code of India, 2011 (*hereinafter as 'Sports Code'*).

4. Learned senior counsel has also taken this court through an order dated 01.09.2023 passed in W.P.(C) 8691/2020, to highlight that the Division Bench of this court unequivocally made it clear that for all future elections, the respondent No.1-Union Of India (*hereinafter referred to as 'UOI'*) has to ensure strict compliance of the judgment delivered in W.P.(C) 195/2010 on 16.08.2022.

5. Learned senior counsel while drawing attention to the order passed on 22.09.2023, submits that respondent no.2-GFI was specifically called upon to take a position with respect to compliance of the said directions. He submits that respondent no.2-GFI in its additional affidavit has ostensibly admitted that there is no compliance of the directions passed by this court in W.P.(C) 195/2010.

6. While reading paragraph nos.6, 7, 9, 17, 18, and 19, he submits that there is an implied admission in the additional affidavit filed by the respondent no.2-GFI to the fact that respondent no.2-GFI is in non-compliance of the mandate of the order(s) passed by this court. Learned



senior counsel submits that various explanations are being offered to justify the non-compliance of certain issues, as has been enumerated in the order passed by the Division Bench of this court.

7. Learned senior counsel further contends that if there was any difficulty in compliance of the directions passed by this court, the remedy available to the respondents was to challenge the said order or to seek a clarification. However, at this stage, it cannot be argued that for any difficulty, the directions cannot be complied with. The directions are binding in nature as has been repeatedly held by the Division Bench of this court in its various orders. The elections notified by respondent no.2-GFI are in non-compliance of the orders passed by this court, therefore, deserve to be stayed.

8. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.2-GFI, by placing reliance on its additional affidavit, submits that the directions passed by this court in W.P.(C) 195/2010 have been complied with, in their letter and spirit. He, however, submits that some of the directions are not applicable for the National Sports Federation such as the present respondent no.2-GFI. Learned counsel submits that respondent no.1-UOI in its affidavit filed in W.P.(C) 8691/2020 has categorically stated that respondent no.2-GFI is in compliance with the terms of the Sports Code.

9. He has placed reliance on page no.42 of the additional affidavit which is a part of the affidavit filed by respondent no.1-UOI in W.P.(C) 8691/2020. Learned counsel then drew the attention of this court to the order dated 18.08.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Civil) bearing Diary No.25767/2022, wherein, the Indian Olympic Association (*hereinafter as 'IOA'*) has challenged the order passed by the Division Bench



of this court in W.P.(C) 195/2010 dated 16.08.2022. He submits that *vide* order dated 18.08.2022, in view of the serious concerns raised by the petitioner therein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court directed the parties to maintain *status quo*. He then referred to various proceedings to indicate that the Hon'ble Supreme Court is already seized with the matter to examine comprehensively as to whether the directions passed by this court can be uniformly made applicable to the Sports Federations or there can be any other mode to ensure that these Federations work for the better public interest.

10. Learned counsel for respondent no.2-GFI further refers to the order dated 10.10.2022 to highlight that the reports submitted by former judge of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, on the request of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, was considered and the matter was deliberated to some extent and Hon'ble Mr. Justice (Retd.) L. Nageswara Rao was requested to take a holistic perspective in the interest of Olympic Sports played in India while drawing up amendments to IOA constitution, consistent with the IOA's charter and other relevant aspects. According to him, some of the directions passed by this court are infeasible and since the issue in hand is already subject to the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, therefore, at this stage, no directions should be passed to withhold the elections in question. Learned counsel also submits that the directions passed by this court on 01.09.2023 in W.P.(C) 8691/2020 have already been challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

11. He also places reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *N.P. Ponnuswami v. Returning Officer, Namakkal*



*Constituency*¹, and on a decision of this court in the case of *The Yachting Association of India v. Boardsailing Association of India*².

12. Learned counsel for respondent no.2-GFI also submits that the petitioner is stranger to sports activities. According to him, in paragraph no.5 of the writ petition, it is clear that the petitioner is an Ophthalmologist who is neither contesting the election nor is a sportsperson in the field of gymnastics.

13. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.1-UOI supports the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.2-GFI and he submits that if the scrutiny proceedings of the nominations dated 23.09.2023 are perused, the same would indicate that the Returning Officer (*hereinafter referred to as 'RO'*) who happens to be a former judge of the High Court of Madras, has exhaustively considered all relevant aspects and has come to the conclusion that there was no impediment in conducting the election.

14. Learned senior counsel has extensively read over the proceedings dated 23.09.2023 to indicate that the RO has considered all decisions passed by this court from time to time and has also given his thoughtful consideration to the Sports Code. Learned senior counsel, therefore, submits that when the said proceedings are not under challenge at this stage, it would be inappropriate to stay the elections which are to be conducted on 29.09.2023.

15. He has also placed reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme

¹ (1952) 1 SCC 94

² 2013 SCC Online Del 3235



Court in the case of the *Supreme Court Bar Association. v. B.D. Kaushik.*³

16. In rejoinder submissions, learned senior counsel for the petitioner, by presenting a chart, explains that the plea taken by the respondents that there were compliances with the directions passed by the Division Bench of this court is completely misplaced. He submits that the mandate of the Division Bench of this court is not only limited to compliance of the 13 pitfalls as have been highlighted therein but it is to comply with the Sports Code as well.

17. Learned senior counsel further submits that there are as many as 25 compliances which unfortunately have not been complied with by the respondents. He submits that if the petitioner is directed to file an additional affidavit, he would indicate that each of the 25 requirements are not complied with, by the respondents in the instant petition. He also submits that it is not only a National Sports Federation i.e., respondent no.2-GFI that has to fulfil the compliances but also its constituent members which are State Sports Federations and District Sports Federations.

18. Learned senior counsel also submits that the petitioner is a practicing Ophthalmologist and she is also a judge for Gymnastics, certified FIG International Judges Brevet RGI category IV 2022-2024. He submits that the petitioner has been a National Judges Brevet (2017), and has been the coach-cum-manager of her gymnast daughter for national and international competitions. With reference to the exercise which was requested to be conducted by Hon'ble Mr. Justice (Retd.) L. Nageswara Rao, learned senior counsel submits that the draft constitution of IOA recognises all 13 mandatory requirements, as has been mentioned in the order dated

³ (2011) 13 SCC 774



16.08.2022. He further submits that pursuant to the drafted constitution of IOA, the IOA has also conducted the subsequent elections.

19. Learned senior counsel submits that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has clarified the aspects of the stay of the impugned decision in the pending SLP No.21910/2023 *vide* its order dated 17.07.2023 to the extent that the pendency of the SLP shall not stay any proceedings which may be pending before the High Court in relation to other Sports Federations.

20. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and perused the record.

21. The petitioner has genuine interest in the instant writ petition being coach-cum-manager of her gymnast daughter for national and international competitions. Besides the petitioner being a practicing Ophthalmologist, she is also a judge for Gymnastics, certified *FIG International Judges Brevet RGI category IV 2022-2024*. The disclosure made by the petitioner in paragraph no.5 of the writ petition, *prima facie*, fully entitles her to justify her locus. It is, thus, seen that at the instance of the petitioner, the grievance in question can be adjudicated.

22. This court in W.P.(C) no.1731/2023 titled as ***Pondicherry Basketball Association vs. Union Of India & Ors***⁴ has considered various earlier decisions and has recorded in paragraph no.50 that there is narrow scope to interfere into matters arising out of election. However, it has also been held that the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not completely barred in election matters. Paragraph nos.50 to 55 read as under:-

"50. It is thus seen that there is a narrow scope to interfere into matters arising out of elections. The scope becomes narrower when the election relates to parliamentary or legislative constituencies as the RP Act,

⁴ 2023:DHC:2993



provides for efficacious alternative remedy once the election is over. Similar principle applies in all such elections where the statute or scheme that provides for the election or regulates the same, itself provides for a mechanism for adjudication of election dispute.

*51. In the case in hand, it is conceded at bar that under the applicable Sports Code or MEG, there is no mechanism provided thereunder, to deal with the election dispute either by any authority or by any specialised tribunal. What has been argued by the respondents is that if there is no remedy provided, the aggrieved person has to file a civil suit and not a writ petition. Reliance is placed on a Division Bench decision of this court in the case of **Samadhan Swimming Club (supra)**. The Division Bench of this court in **Samadhan Swimming Club (supra)** in turn has relied upon the decision of the Division Bench of this court in the case of *S.D. Siddiqui v. University of Delhi & Ors.* 56 In paragraph No. 17 of **Samadhan Swimming Club (supra)** it has been held as under:-*

*“17. In so far as the judgments relied upon by Mr. Lohia are concerned, we find that three judgments [except *Bhailal Jagdish (supra)*], have been considered and dealt with by the learned Single Judge in the impugned order, with which conclusion we concur. The judgment in the case of *Bhailal Jagdish (supra)*, referred to by Mr. Lohia to contend that a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India confer powers of widest magnitude on the High Courts and this power must be invoked redressing wrongs and for passing suitable orders to effectuate its decision under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Suffice to state as stated above in view of the reliefs prayed in the petition and the subsequent developments including the fact that elections have been held and the members of the executive committee of the DSA have been elected whose personal right shall be effected, being not parties in the writ petition, the writ petition was rightly dismissed. The remedy for the appellants was to challenge the elections surely in accordance with law, which includes the dicta of this Court in the case of *S.D. Siddiqui v. University of Delhi*, 2006 (3) AD (Delhi) 290, wherein this court held as under:*

“Apart from the above, we are further of the opinion that if one wishes to challenge an election, he should file an election petition, if that is provided under the relevant statute or rules, and if there is no such provision in any statute or rule for election petition, then one has to file a civil suit for this purpose and not a writ petition.”

*52. If the decision in the case of *S.D. Siddiqui (supra)* is perused, the same would indicate that the dispute therein was with respect to the*



election of Delhi University Teacher Association. In paragraph Nos. 29, 30 and 31 it has been held as under:-

“29. In view of the above discussion, we are clearly of the opinion that the DUTA is not a State or an instrumentality of the State under Article 12 of the Constitution of India and it does not also perform any public functions. It is a purely private body working for the welfare of teachers of the University and affiliated colleges. There is no deep or pervasive control of the State over it. There is no averment that it is largely financed by the State. Hence, in our opinion, no writ lies against DUTA.

30. Apart from the above, we are further of the opinion that if one wishes to challenge an election, he should file an election petition, if that is provided under the relevant statute or rules, and if there is no such provision in any statute or rule for election petition, then one has to file a civil suit for this purpose and not a writ petition.

31. For the reasons given above, we uphold the impugned judgment of the learned single Judge giving our own reasons. There is no force in this appeal. The appeal is accordingly dismissed”.

*53. It is thus seen that the ratio of the decision in the case of S.D.Siddiqui (supra) is that unless the respondent falls within the definition of a ‘State’ or an instrumentality of the State, a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not maintainable. A Society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 is a purely private body working for the welfare of teachers of the University and affiliated colleges. The observations made in paragraph No. 30 are in the context of that case and, therefore, the same are not binding precedent for the issue involved herein. However, the Division Bench of this court in the case of **Samadhan Swimming Club (supra)** has non-suited the appellant therein on the ground that elections were already held and the members of the Executive Committee of the Delhi Swimming Association had already been elected who were not party to the case therein and their rights would be adversely affected. Hence the decision in the case of **Samadhan Swimming Club (supra)** is not a binding precedent deciding the issue contended by the respondent- that when the statute does not provide a remedy, the party must be relegated to the civil suit, and in no circumstance would a writ be maintainable.*

54. It is settled law that the existence of an alternative remedy does not affect the jurisdiction of the court to issue writs and there is no absolute bar against the same. It is a rule of policy, convenience and discretion rather than a rule of law. There cannot be a blanket ban on the exercise of such jurisdiction as that would effectively mean that the writ court is



denuded of its jurisdiction, provided under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, and consistently held by the courts of this land to be plenary, to entertain such writ petitions. The court can, and has in the past, in exceptional circumstances issue a discretionary writ, notwithstanding the fact that the statutory remedy has not been exhausted. However, in the instant case, it is seen that there is no efficacious alternative remedy provided under the applicable Sports Code or MEG. It is equally correct in law that in all cases where there is non-existence of an efficacious alternative remedy, the writ court does not come under an obligation to exercise its powers and can still leave the parties to file a civil suit before the competent court. However, before taking such a decision, the writ court may still examine as to what is sought to be agitated by the parties under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. If a dispute raised in writ proceedings is capable of being adjudicated without requiring any evidence to be adduced or witnesses to be cross examined, the writ petition can still be entertained.

55. The principle that jurisdiction of Article 226 is not barred in election matters has been recognised along with the caveat of it needing to be sparingly exercised. It is also to be seen that in exercising powers under Article 226, the court has to bear in mind that such an exercise is not creating any obstruction or interruption or protracting the election process in any manner. Once a wrong is found to have been conducted, the court cannot stultify itself by allowing the wrong to be consummated. Any situation that results in postponing the election or creating a situation where the sanctity of the election itself is at stake, is also to be avoided."

23. Paragraph no.19 of the decision passed in W.P.(C) 195/2010 dated 16.08.2022 reads as under:-

"Thirteen Pitfalls:

19. The petitioner has, in particular, raised the following issues apropos IOA's constitution, management structure and Rules. He contends that for the sake of good governance, meaningful promotion of sports and robust protection of interests of sportspersons in the country, these glaring anomalies need to be remedied in terms of the Sports Code:

(i) No entity like Life President.

(ii) Differential voting rights cannot be permitted.

(iii) Non-determination of the Electoral College by the IOA is in contravention of judicial orders and is contrary to the objectives of the Sports Code.

(iv) Only NSFs for Olympic disciplines should be members of the IOA with voting rights.



- (v) Age and tenure limits should be applied to all members of the Executive Committee ('EC') and General Assembly of IOA and not only to President, Secretary and Treasurer.
- (vi) EC's size should be reasonable and not unwieldy.
- (vii) There cannot be any restrictive, undemocratic clause, regarding elections to any post.
- (viii) IOA Constitution permits a person to hold offices for 20 years without undergoing a cooling-off period, this must be rectified in accordance with the law of the land, i.e., not more than three tenures alongwith cooling-off period(s).
- (ix) IOA must have independent Ethics, Athletes, Election and Arbitration Commissions, and Ombudsman, devoid of any control, direct or indirect, of the IOA. These Commissions must be funded by the Government from the budgetary allocation for NSFs including IOA.
- (x) Appointment of 25% prominent sportspersons of outstanding merit with voting rights in General Assembly and EC is mandatory in terms of clause 3.20 of 2001 Guidelines and para 9.3
- (xi) of the Sports Code.
- (xii) A person against whom criminal charges have been framed should not be permitted to be a member either of the EC or the General Assembly.
- (xiii) Persons seeking successive re-election for the same post must secure two-thirds majority.
- (xiv) The Sports Code must be made applicable to the IOA and to all NSFs."

24. On 01.09.2023, in W.P.(C) 8691/2020, the Division Bench of this court has reiterated that with respect to all future elections, the respondent no.1-UOI shall ensure strict compliance of the judgment delivered in W.P.(C) 195/2010 dated 16.08.2023. The matter is posted for further consideration on 06.10.2023. The order dated 01.09.2020 reads as under:-

"CM APPL. 36849/2023

The petitioner vide this application has approached this Court stating that elections have been held in respect of various sports associations in violation of the judgment dated 16.08.2022 delivered by this Court in W.P.(C). No. 195/2010. It has also been stated that apart from the elections which have already been held, elections in respect of 8 sports association's are likely to take place in the near future.

Issue notice. Learned Counsel for Union of India on behalf of respondent accepts the notice.



Let a detailed reply be filed on affidavit by the Union of India in the matter in terms of Annexure-B which is annexed with the application, positively within 4 weeks.

It is further made clear that in respect of all future elections, the respondent Union of India shall ensure strict compliance of the judgment delivered in W.P.(C) No. 195/2010 dated 16.08.2022.

List on 06.10.2023.

CM APPL. 39694/2023

Learned Counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present application as it is an application filed only for early hearing and clarification. The prayer is allowed. Accordingly, the application is dismissed as withdrawn.

CM APPL. 45229/2023

This is an application for the impleadment of Cerebral Palsy Sports Federation of India (CPSFI) as well as for release of necessary funds in respect of two events which are being held in Thailand and Australia.

Learned Counsel for the applicant has stated before this Court that the Association in question is in compliance of the Sports Code and, therefore, the Government of India be permitted to release the funds and the interim order shall not come in the way of the association.

In the considered opinion of this Court, in case, the applicant has complied with the Sports Code read with the judgement dated 16.08.2022 delivered by this Court in W.P. (C) No. 195/2010, the Government of India is certainly free to release the funds.

In view of the aforesaid, the application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 8691/2020 and CM APPL. 28033/2020, 28090/2020, 32616/2020, 33548/2020, 33549/2020, 757/2021, 2435/2021, 5435/2021, 7815/2022, 7816/2022, 29318/2022, 31934/2022, 32478/2022, 35858/2022, 5248/2023, 5249/2023, 5287/2023, 30009/2023 & 31600/2023

List on 06.10.2023."

25. It has been brought to the notice of this court that even the SLP against the said decision has been disposed of by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, meaning thereby, what is binding is not only the order dated 01.09.2023 passed in W.P.(C) 8691/2020 but the order dated 16.08.2022 passed in W.P.(C) 195/2010 as well.



26. When respondent no.2-GFI was called upon to take a specific position with respect to compliance of the directions passed by this court in W.P.(C) 195/2010, the said respondent in its additional affidavit in paragraph nos. 16 to 18 has stated as under:-

"16. I say that this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 01.09.2023 passed in WP (C) 8691/2020 directed the Union of India to ensure compliance of the judgment dated 16.08.2022 in all future elections of the National Sports Federation. I say that the Respondent No 2 was not a party to the said proceedings and no directions till date have been received from the Respondent No.1 Union of India to the Respondent No 2 to this effect (say that the Respondent No. 2 has come to know about the said order when the Applicant has filed the Application (which is presently being heard).

17. I say that in the judgment and order dated 16.08.2022, the Learned Division Bench deals with 'Thirteen Pitfalls'. Out of which, Issues No. (ii), (iii), (iv), (vi), (vii) and (viii) as recorded at paragraph 19 does not pertain to NSFs including GFI but only applicable to the Indian Olympic Association. These Issues pertain to the internal functioning of the Indian Olympic Association, which is a sue generis body.

18. I say that in relation to Issue Nos. (i), (v), (ix), (x), (xi), (xii) and (xiii) has some bearing on other NSFs. I say that the GFI has full regard to the orders passed by any Court of law and endeavors to follow the spirit of the judgment dated 16.08.2022. Although, the issue as to whether the judgment and order dated 16.08.2022 should at all be made applicable to the Respondent No. 2."

27. It is, therefore, discernible that the respondents have taken a stand that out of the 13 pitfalls noted in the order passed by the Division Bench of this court in W.P.(C) 195/2010, issue nos. ii, iii, iv, vi, vii and viii do not apply to a National Sports Federation. According to the respondents, these issues pertain to the internal functioning of the IOA, which is a *sui generis* body.

28. A perusal of paragraph no.18 of the additional affidavit would also indicate that respondent No.2-GFI in its understanding, endeavours to follow the spirit of the judgment dated 16.08.2022. At the same time, it also raises



doubt as to whether the judgment and order dated 16.08.2022 should at all be made applicable to respondent no.2-GFI.

29. It is, thus, seen that there is a dispute between the parties with respect to not only compliance of the directions passed by this court but also with respect to the very applicability of those directions to respondent no.2-GFI. Even the stand of respondent no.1-UOI in its affidavit in W.P.(C) 8691/2020 is not specific to the extent of confirming the compliance of the directions passed by this court.

30. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its order dated 17.07.2023 made it clear that the pendency of the said writ petition shall not stay any proceedings which may be pending before the High Court in relation to other sports federations.

31. It is, thus, seen that in the instant writ petition, this court has to adjudicate whether all the directions passed by this court in W.P.(C) 195/2010 are applicable to respondent no.2-GFI. The second issue which requires to be adjudicated is whether the respondent no.2-GFI is at all in compliance with the mandate under the Sports Code in addition to the directions passed by the Division Bench in W.P.(C) 195/2010.

32. As of now, the order dated 01.09.2023 passed in W.P.(C) 8691/2020 unequivocally states that in respect of all future elections, the respondent no.1-UOI shall ensure strict compliance of the judgment delivered in W.P.(C) 195/2020. Therefore, in the absence of there being full satisfaction with respect to the compliance of those directions, this court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner is able to make a *prima facie* case in its favour that the respondent no.2-GFI is in non-compliance of the mandate of the order dated 16.08.2022 passed in W.P. (C) 195/2010.



33. As long as the interim order dated 01.09.2023 passed in W.P.(C) 8691/2020 is in operation, respondent no.2-GFI is bound by the same. Respondent no.2-GFI cannot expect any dilution of the order of the Division Bench in the instant writ petition.

34. If the order dated 01.09.2023 is to be understood in its right perspective, the same clarifies that the order dated 16.08.2022 passed in W.P.(C) 195/2010 has full application on all National Sports Federations. Unless the respondents satisfy that they are in full compliance of the Sports Code and the directions dated 16.08.2022 in W.P.(C) 195/2010, they cannot be allowed to conduct any fresh election contrary to the said binding orders.

35. Unless the matter is fully heard by this court, at this stage, there is a serious doubt about compliance of the mandate of the Sports Code and the directions passed in W.P.(C) 195/2010 dated 16.08.2022.

36. Accordingly, it is directed that there shall be a stay of the impugned notice dated 07.07.2022 regarding the election of the office bearers and members of the executive committee of respondent no. 2-GFI till the next date of hearing.

37. The parties are directed to complete the pleadings before the next date of hearing.

38. In view of the aforesaid directions, the application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 10138/2023 & CM APPL. 39234/2023

39. Since the term of the present body is expiring on 04.11.2023, list for hearing on the date already fixed, i.e. on 12th October, 2023.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

SEPTEMBER 27, 2023

priya/p'ma/ss