



\$~79

\*

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

+

W.P.(C) 13657/2025 and CM APPL.56039/2025 (Stay),  
CM APPL.56040/2025 (u/O XXXII R 1)

FATEH JAHAAN SINGH DHALIWAL .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth Luthra, Sr. Adv., Mr.  
Pawanjit Singh Bindra, Sr. Adv., Mr.  
Keshav Singhal, Mr. Shivam Gaur,  
Mr. Aryan Kumar, Ms. Rashi Singh  
and Ms. Nandita Sharma, Advs.

versus

EQUESTRIAN FEDERATION OF INDIA & ORS.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Siddharth Nath, Mr. Asjad  
Hussain and Mr. Anunay  
Chowdhary, Advs. for R-1.  
Mr. Pragyan Pradip Sharma, Sr.  
Adv., Mr. Vinajay Bhandari, Mr.  
Ishaan Phukan, Ms. Teesha Mishra,  
Mr. Hardik Jain and Mr. Rustam  
Chaudhuri, Advs. for EC of EFI.  
Mr. Vikash Singh and Mr. Ujjwal  
Chaudhary, Advs. for R-3.  
Mr. Ishan Roy Chowdhury and Mr.  
Samar Bansal, Advs. for R-4 /  
observer.  
Mr. Udit Dedhiya, SPC and Ms.  
Apurva Sachdev, Adv. for UOI.  
Mr. Sandeep Sethi, Sr. Adv., Mr.  
Harkirat Singh and Ms. Shreya  
Mishra, Advs. for R-7.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA**

**ORDER**

**11.09.2025**

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 /227 of the  
Constitution of India, 1950 seeking the following prayers:



*“a) Issue appropriate Writ(s) of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order, direction to call for the complete record pertaining to the Impugned List dated 31.08.2025 (Annexure P-1);*

*b) Issue a Writ(s), of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order, direction thereby quashing the Impugned List dated 31.08.2025 issued by the Respondent No. 1 for being illegal, void and non-est since it fails to follow the extant guidelines issued by the Respondents, particularly the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2;*

*c) Issue appropriate Writ(s) of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order, direction to conduct selection trials for the purposes of selecting members of Indian Team for representing India at Youth Asian Games, 2025;*

*d) Issue appropriate Writ(s) of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order, direction to Respondent No. 3 to forward the list of successful athletes to the International Body(ies) for the purposes of participation in the Youth Asian Games, 2025*

*e) Issue appropriate Writ(s) of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order, direction in the form of ad-interim, ex-parte directions as sought in clause a) to d) of the Prayer Clauses”*

2. Though the matter has been listed before this Court on a number of occasions earlier, on account of the fact that the last date for submission of the selected riders in the upcoming 3<sup>rd</sup> Asian Youth Games at Bahrain, 2025 is fixed for 15.09.2025, the petition is being heard on interim relief.

3. Mr. Luthra and Mr. Bindra, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner submit that this Court, in the order dated 09.09.2025, had clearly noted that the respondent no.1 along with the Indian Olympic Association (IOA) would find the best plausible solution *qua* the disputes involved in the present petition. Learned senior counsel submit that Article 211 of the Equestrian Federation of India (EFI) Technical Guidelines, 2024 (Version 2) effective from 19.08.2024 (hereinafter referred to as “Guidelines, 2024”) stipulates that ordinarily the Indian team will be selected, based on trials if time permits, otherwise selection will be based on rider points as per Article 210 of the Guidelines, 2024 and carved out an exception for



participants of the Asian Championship / Asian Games / Olympic Games / World Equestrian Championship for whom it was mandated that selection trials will be held and the process will be governed by EFI's selection criteria. They further submit that since this upcoming Equestrian Event at Bahrain falls within the Asian Championships, thus, they insist that part 2 of the Article 211 of the aforesaid guidelines ought to have been made applicable to the participants.

4. The grievance of the petitioner is that while applying Article 211 of the Guidelines, 2024, the respondent no.1 / EFI has not complied with the mandate of Article 210 of the Guidelines, 2024, thereby depriving the petitioner and persons similarly situated of an opportunity of being at least within the consideration zone.

5. It is on that basis, learned senior counsel insist that the order dated 09.09.2025 was passed.

6. Mr. Bansal, learned counsel appearing for the learned observer, Mr. S.Y. Quraishi submits that the fact that the Bahrain Games were upcoming in the year 2025, was already pointed out and noted in his report dated 17.07.2025 which apparently, was ignored. He submits that keeping in view the time constraint and the necessity to send best sports persons to represent India in Bahrain Games, this Court may pass appropriate orders.

7. Mr. Sandeep Sethi, learned senior counsel appears for the respondent no.7, who is one of the successful selectees in the list of four candidates, whose names have already been submitted to the Organizing Committee of the Bahrain Games, 2025. He states that at this stage, in case, the said list for the selection process is interdicted, it would cause irreparable harm to the respondent no.7 and others who are duly selected by the respondent no.1/ EFI.

8. Mr. Vikash Singh, learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.3  
*W.P.(C) 13657/2025*

*Page 3 of 7*



/ IOA submits that in pursuance to the order dated 09.09.2025, the IOA had sent an e-mail requesting the Organizing Committee of the Bahrain Games, 2025 in case the last date of submission of entries for Indian Riders could be extended beyond 15.09.2025. He submits that after the passover granted by this Court, an e-mail was received by the IOA, whereby the Organizing Committee has conveyed its inability to extend the submission of entries beyond 15.09.2025.

9. This Court has heard the arguments of learned senior counsel and other counsel appearing for the respective parties.

10. Undoubtedly, Equestrian Event which is contemplated to be held in the month of October, 2025 is of international importance and our Indian Riders ought to be given full opportunity to showcase the best talent.

11. Keeping in view the fact that four names have already been sent and the last date of submission of entries being 15.09.2025, it may not be appropriate for this Court, at this moment and at this late hour to interdict the list which has already been submitted, particularly on the touchstone of allegedly having violated the Article 211 of the Guidelines, 2024.

12. Mr. Pragyan Pradip Sharma, learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent no.1 / EFI submits that it is only four out of eight, whose names have been sent by the respondent no.1/EFI to the Organizing Committee of the Bahrain Games, 2025.

13. Mr. Pragyan Pradip Sharma, learned senior counsel also submits that the Guidelines, 2024 relied upon by the petitioner in the present case, have not been acted upon by the respondent no.1/EFI and the selection process carried out has been done as per Article 213 of the EFI Technical Guidelines, 2021. He also submits that the participants have been finally selected as per selection procedure stipulated in Guidelines of 2021 and the list has already been submitted leaving no scope for further names to be



sent.

14. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner, while referring to page-364 of the petition, particularly Clause-9.2 of the Technical Handbook for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Asian Youth Games Bahrain, 2025 submits that so far as the event of “Jumping” is concerned, maximum eight athletes/horse combinations plus two reserve horses are entitled to be considered and sent, after finalization of the list.

15. Before suitable directions are passed, it would be pertinent to extract the order dated 09.09.2025, which reads as under:

*“1. The present matter has been received on transfer.*

*2. At the outset, learned senior counsel for the petitioner seeks to not press and give up the reliefs as sought in prayers ‘a’ and ‘e’ of the present petition, since the said reliefs are beyond the scope of writ jurisdiction.*

*3. As such, learned senior counsel for the petitioner seeks to press for the reliefs as sought in prayers ‘b’, ‘c’ and ‘d’ only.*

*4. Qua the relief sought by the petitioner in prayer ‘d’, this Court is of the considered view that the said relief being beyond the scope of Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is also not maintainable before this Court.*

*5. Attention of this Court has been drawn to Article 211 of the Equestrian Federation of India Technical Guidelines, 2024 (Version-2) effective from 19.08.2024, which reads as under:*

***“Article 211***

***Selection of Indian Team.***

*1. Indian Team will be selected based on trials if time permits otherwise selection will be based on rider points earned as per Article 210. This is not applicable for Asian Championship/ Asian Games/ Olympic Games/ World Equestrian Championship for which it is mandated that selection trials will be held and the process will be governed by the EFI’s selection criteria.”*



6. *After addressing arguments at considerable length on the first call, learned senior counsel for the respondent no.1 sought a pass over for seeking appropriate instructions. On the second call, learned senior counsel for the respondent no.1 submits that the respondent no.1 will endeavour to proceed ahead with the upcoming 3rd Asian Youth games (Bahrain), 2025 in the best interest of the Nation. For this, the appropriate steps will be taken during the course of the day and/ or maximum by tomorrow.*

7. *Learned counsel for the respondent no.3/ Indian Olympic Association submits that it will also join hands with the respondent no.1 in finding the best plausible solution qua the disputes involved in the present petition.*

8. *As such, renotify before the Roster Bench on 11.09.2025.”*

*(emphasis supplied)*

16. A perusal of paras 6 and 7 of the aforesaid order dated 09.09.2025 makes it clear and apparent that respondent no.1/EFI was to act in all earnest to carry out further selections in the most appropriate manner, which apparently has not been done.

17. The IOA had made a specific submission to join hands with the respondent no.1/EFI in finding the best plausible solution for the disputes. That too, apparently has not been done.

18. Be that as it may. In view of the fact that there was specific direction in para-6 of the order dated 09.09.2025, coupled with the fact that part-2 of the Article 211 seems to, *prima facie*, have not been implemented, this Court is of the considered opinion that the shortage of time impels this Court to direct the EFI to conduct fresh trials in respect of the remaining four participants permitting the petitioner and other similarly situated sports persons to furnish requisite and appropriate documents in respect of evaluation according to Article 211 read with Article 210 of the Technical Guidelines, 2024 (version-2), either by selection trials, if time permits, or else to apply the Rider Point method, as may be decided appropriately by



respondent no.1/EFI.

19. All the sports persons who consider themselves eligible to participate are at liberty to submit their requisite documents to the concerned authority of the respondent no.1/EFI within 24 hours. Upon receipt of such documents, the competent authority of respondent no.1/EFI is requested to evaluate the same and finalize the selection list. The said list, after finalization may be furnished to the Organizing Committee on or before 15.09.2025.

20. Let counter-affidavits be filed within a period of two weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks thereafter.

21. It is made clear that the list already sent of the four participants which includes the name of respondent no.7 has not been interdicted by this Court.

22. List on 30.01.2026 before the Roster Bench.

**TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J**

**SEPTEMBER 11, 2025/cl**