$~

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

% *Judgment reserved on: 24.07.2026*
Judgment pronounced on: 27.10.2026
Judgment uploaded on: 29.10.2026

 # CNR No. DLHC 010315492026

\+ **W.P.(C) 9908/2026**

MS. NILOFER GHUMAN .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rishikesh Kumar, Advocate

versus

DELHI AND DISTRICT CRICKET ASSOCIATION ....Respondent

Through: Mr. Saurabh Chadda with Mr. Rohit Bhagat and Ms. Aprajita, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

JUDGMENT

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

1. The petitioner has invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court, praying for grant of following reliefs:

> "...a. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction directing Respondent No. 1/DDCA to act upon and give effect to the sanction/affiliation granted to the Petitioner vide letter dated 25.08.2020 bearing Ref. No. 390/2020 for conducting the Covid-19 Cricket Series/Willingdon Cup, subject to compliance of applicable rules and reasonable conditions;
>
> b. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing Respondent No. 1/DDCA to

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59

provide to the Petitioner a copy of the applicable BCCI/DDCA SOPs, guidelines, rules, conditions and procedure governing State-affiliated/franchise- based T-20 leagues/tournaments, including those applied for Delhi Premier League or any similarly placed league;

c. Direct Respondent No. 1/DDCA to process and grant all appropriate sanctions/permissions required for conducting the Willingdon Cup/Covid-19 Cricket Series under the aegis/affiliation of DDCA, in terms of the earlier sanction granted to the Petitioner;

d. Direct Respondent No. 1/DDCA to consider and confirm availability of Arun Jaitley Stadium/Feroz Shah Kotla Ground for the inaugural edition of the Willingdon Cup and/or for such matches as may be permissible, including semi-finals/finals, on terms not less favourable than those extended to similarly placed cricket leagues/tournaments;

e. Direct Respondent No. 1/DDCA to provide access, in accordance with law and applicable privacy/data-protection norms, to necessary details/data of DDCA-registered players, including men and women players, umpires, scorers, referees, physiotherapists, support staff and other relevant personnel required for smooth conduct of the Willingdon Cup;

f. Direct Respondent No. 1/DDCA to issue/process NOCs and/or permissions in respect of DDCA-registered players for participation in the Willingdon Cup/Covid-19 Cricket Series, subject to the same conditions as applicable to other similarly situated DDCAaffiliated/ permitted leagues;

g. Direct Respondent No. 1/DDCA not to act discriminatorily against the Petitioner and to apply the same SOPs, criteria, norms and conditions to the Petitioner' tournament as have been applied to Delhi Premier League or any other similarly placed franchise-based T-20 league/tournament;

h. In the alternative, direct Respondent No. 1/DDCA to refund the sanction/licence fee of ₹1,00,000/- along with appropriate interest from the date of deposit, without prejudice to the Petitioner' right to claim damages/compensation before the appropriate forum;

i. Award costs of the present petition in favour of the Petitioner and against Respondent No. 1/DDCA..."

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case, as set out in the petition, are that petitioner had proposed to conduct a franchise-based T-20 cricket tournament, initially styled as the "Covid-19 Cricket Series" and subsequently as the "Willingdon Cup", for promotion of cricketing talent in Delhi. The proposal was submitted to respondent No. 1/Delhi & District Cricket Association (**DDCA**) on 22.07.2020, pursuant to which certain further particulars were sought by the DDCA and were furnished by the petitioner. Thereafter, the DDCA issued a sanction/affiliation letter dated 25.08.2020 bearing Ref. No. 390/2020 in favour of the petitioner. Pursuant thereto, the petitioner deposited a sum of ₹1,00,000/- towards the sanction/licence fee with the DDCA in September, 2020. The petitioner contends that, despite the aforesaid sanction and payment of the requisite fee, the proposed tournament could not be conducted and the DDCA failed to provide the requisite SOPs, permissions, stadium availability, player-related data and NOCs, despite repeated representations and follow-ups, including a request dated 06.12.2021 for availability of the Arun Jaitley Stadium. The petitioner further relies upon the subsequent launch of the "Delhi Premier League" by the DDCA in 2024, contending that a substantially similar franchise-based T-20 tournament was permitted while its own sanctioned tournament was not taken forward. A legal notice dated 28.08.2025 was thereafter issued to the DDCA seeking, *inter alia*, the requisite permissions and facilities for conducting the Willingdon Cup. Alleging that no effective action was taken by the DDCA despite the sanction granted

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59

in 2020 and the subsequent representations, the petitioner has approached this Court seeking the reliefs as noticed hereinabove.

3. At the outset, the learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 1/DDCA opposed the present petition and argued that the dispute in question is purely a civil dispute. De hors the aforesaid objection, the learned counsel for the DDCA contended that the petitioner had attempted to mislead this Court and had suppressed several material facts. He first drew the attention of this Court to the memo of parties accompanying the petition, wherein only one petitioner, i.e., Ms. Nilofer Ghuman, had been impleaded. He thereafter pointed out that, in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the petition, the description of two petitioners had been provided, i.e., petitioner no. 1, stated to be a sports management company incorporated in 2016, i.e., D.R. Tigers Private Limited, and petitioner no. 2, Ms. Nilofer Ghuman, stated to be the Director of petitioner no. 1. The learned counsel thereafter contended that the company in question, i.e., D.R. Tigers Pvt. Ltd., stood struck off in the year 2022, and yet there was not even a single averment in this regard in the entire petition.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, on the other hand, submitted that there was a typographical error in this regard, since, while drafting the petition, reference had initially been made to petitioner no. 1, D.R. Tigers Pvt. Ltd., but the same was subsequently corrected and the company was removed as a petitioner. However, inadvertently, such reference to two ‘petitioners’ may have continued to appear in certain paragraphs of the petition.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59

5. The learned counsel for the DDCA, however, pointed out that even the Board Resolution filed along with the Vakalatnama in the present petition was forged and fabricated. It was submitted that the said Board Resolution recorded that it had been passed at a meeting held on 20.05.2026, whereas the date appearing beneath the signatures on the said resolution was 10.08.2024. It was further pointed out that, in any event, since the company, i.e., D.R. Tigers Pvt. Ltd., had been struck off in the year 2022 itself, neither could any such Board meeting have been held thereafter, nor could any such resolution have been passed by the company. It was contended that, despite being aware of these facts, the learned counsel had drafted and filed the present petition. In support of his submissions, the learned counsel for the DDCA also placed on record the status of the company reflected as "Strike Off" on the official website of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, as well as Gazette Notification bearing no. CG-DL-W-14022022-233388, dated 12.02.2022, and Gazette Notification bearing no. CG-DL-W-23042022-235331, dated 23.04.2022. It was, thus, argued that the present petition was liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs.

6. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner sought permission to withdraw the present petition with liberty to file afresh. However, in view of the material placed before this Court, this Court was not inclined to accede to the request made on behalf of the petitioner.

7. Submissions **heard** and material available on record perused.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59

8. In the present case, this Court notes that as regards the status of petitioner no. 1, D.R. Tigers Pvt. Ltd, the petition describes petitioner no. 1 as a company incorporated in the year 2016 and primarily refers to the proposal, stated to have been submitted by the said company, to the DDCA, the sanction/affiliation granted by the DDCA on 25.08.2020 and the payment of ₹1,00,000/- towards the sanction/licence fee.

9. However, the documents placed on record by the learned counsel appearing for the DDCA show that the name of D.R. Tigers Pvt. Ltd. had already been struck off from the records of the Registrar of Companies. As per the records of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs placed before this Court, the company was struck off in the year 2022. The relevant Gazette Notification bearing no. CG-DL-W-14022022-233388, dated 12.02.2022, *inter alia*, records that Notice was being given to several companies for the purpose of striking off companies under Section 248(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, that the Registrar of Companies had a reasonable cause to believe that such companies had not been carrying on any business or operation for a period of two years, which at Serial No. 2326 records the name of D.R. Tigers Private Limited. The subsequent Gazette Notification bearing no. CG-DL-W-23042022-235331, dated 23.04.2022, has also been placed on record, which *inter alia* pertains to Section 248(5) of Companies Act. In the said Notification, the name of D.R. Tigers Private Limited is mentioned as Serial No. 2230. Thus, in terms of Section 248(5) of the Companies Act, the name of the company in

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59

question was struck off from the register of companies, which was published in the Gazette Notification dated 23.04.2022. Furthermore, the status of the company, on the website of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, is also shown as "Strike Off".

10. Thus, the company had ceased to remain on the records of the Registrar of Companies much before the present petition was filed. The petition, however, does not disclose this fact anywhere. There is no averment setting out that the company was struck off, when it was struck off, or what was the status of the alleged rights of the company thereafter.

11. The chronology of events pleaded by the petitioner is also noteworthy. The petitioner has referred to the events of the years 2020 and 2021, including the submission of proposal, grant of sanction, etc. The petitioner then refers to the launch of the Delhi Premier League in the year 2024 and states that one legal notice dated 28.08.2025 was also issued to the DDCA, and the said legal notice, inter alia, mentions about representations submitted by the petitioner to the DDCA in the year 2025. The present petition was thereafter filed in the year 2026. However, even the legal notice dated 28.08.2025, addressed to the DDCA, did not disclose that D.R. Tigers Pvt. Ltd. had already been struck off from the records of the Registrar of Companies.

12. It is also pertinent to note that, as admitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner himself, while drafting the petition, he had

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59

mentioned about two petitioners, i.e. petitioner no. 1 [D.R. Tigers Private Limited] and petitioner no. 2 [Ms. Nilofer Ghuman], which is evident from the Synopsis, List of Date and Events, and even paragraphs 11 and 12 of the petition, but later, he had attempted to remove the references to the petitioner no. 1 [D.R. Tigers Private Limited] and had also removed its name from the Memo of Parties.

13. Therefore, it is apparent that the learned counsel had removed petitioner no. 1, D.R. Tigers Private Limited, from the Memo of Parties, which, in the circumstances noted above, could have been done on account of the fact that the company had already been struck off from the records of the Registrar of Companies, but the same fact was not disclosed to this Court.

14. There is another crucial, *rather shocking*, fact which merits consideration. Along with the writ petition, a Board Resolution dated 20.05.2026, purportedly passed by the company i.e. D.R. Tigers Private Limited – authorising petitioner Ms. Nilofer Ghuman, being its Director, to, *inter alia*, sign, verify, execute and swear the Writ Petition, etc. for filing the same before this Court, and to engage, appoint and instruct Advocates including M/s Rishikesh Kumar & Sheenu Priya, Advocates, to represent the Company before this Court – has been filed on record. As revealed during the course of arguments, the said Board Resolution is apparently false and fabricated, as though it mentions to have been passed in a meeting held on 20.05.2026, the signatures appearing below the said resolution bear the date 10.08.2024. Most importantly, the company

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59

in question had already been struck off from the records of the Registrar of Companies in the year 2022, as per the documents placed before this Court; and thus, no such board resolution could otherwise have been passed.

15. This Court is not, in the present proceedings, required to undertake any forensic examination of the said document or to record a finding as to the commission of any criminal offence. However, these facts cannot be ignored while considering whether the petitioner had approached this Court with full disclosure of the relevant facts.

16. When the aforesaid fact was put to learned counsel for the petitioner, the explanation offered was that it was the petitioner who was responsible for the said document (board resolution), and that the counsel had acted upon the instructions received from the client.

17. However, the learned counsel subsequently tendered an apology and sought permission to withdraw the present petition. He also assured this Court that greater care would be exercised in future while drafting and filing pleadings and documents before the Court.

18. In view of the apology tendered and the assurance given by the learned counsel, this Court does not deem it necessary to examine the matter any further. It is expected that the learned counsel shall remain careful in future and ensure that the pleadings and documents filed before the Court are duly verified.

19. The petition is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59

20. However, it is clarified that this Court has not examined the petitioner's grievance against the respondent, and no opinion is being expressed on the merits of the case.

21. The judgment be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 27, 2026/zp
TS

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:ZEENAT PRAVEEN
Signing Date:29.10.2026
18:29:59