

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

108

CWP-5579-2025

Date of Decision : February 28, 2025

ANUBHAV KHANNA

-PETITIONER

V/S

PUNJAB CRICKET ASSOCIATION AND OTHERS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Petitioner in person (Through V.C.)

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The prayer wrapped in the instant writ petition appertains to issuance of writ of quo warranto, thereby removing the respondent No.3 from the membership of the Apex Council of Punjab Cricket Association.

2. The petitioner, who is presently residing in Abu Dhabi (U.A.E.), claims himself to be the Special Power of Attorney holder of Maharaj Saran Khanna resident of Kurukshetra, and, he has caused appearance through virtual platform.

3. During the course of arguments, the first query posed by this Court to the petitioner was, as to how a person appointed as Member of the Apex Council of Punjab Cricket Association can be considered to be holding a public office. In his endeavour to answer this query, the petitioner although cited the averments enclosed in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the instant writ petition to submit that, BCCI and its affiliated organizations are amenable to the writ jurisdiction of this Court, however, he failed to satisfy this Court that the post of Member in the Apex Council of Punjab Cricket

Association, as held by the respondent No.3, falls within the domain of “public office”.

4. During the course of further arguments, this Court posed another query to the petitioner, as to what is his interest behind filing the present writ of quo warranto and as to how he, while being residing abroad, gained knowledge about the respondent No.3 to be holding the membership of Apex Council of Punjab Cricket Association, and, holding the post of Assistant Advocate General in the office of Advocate General, Punjab. This query was hesitatingly responded to by the petitioner and he submitted that, the respondent No.3 is his brother-in-law and the sister of the respondent No.3/petitioner’s wife has lodged an FIR No.120 dated 15.07.2021 against him and his parents at P.S. City Fazilka under the provisions of IPC and Dowry Prohibition Act.

5. Since the factum regarding relationship between the petitioner and the respondent No.3, besides the registration of FIR (supra), has been concealed in the present writ, hence this Court was led to pose another query to the petitioner as to what were the reasons for him to make concealment of such material facts. The petitioner was unable to make any answer to this query, rather he took shelter under the umbrella of inadvertent mistake. This excuse of inadvertence omission is not acceptable inasmuch as the facts (supra) have deliberately been concealed by the petitioner from scrutiny of this Court.

6. Although this Court is well aware about the legal proposition that, locus standi may not be an issue for invoking the writ of quo warranto, however, the writ of quo warranto cannot be used as tool for settling personal

vengeance.

7. In summa, this Court finds the present writ petition to be totally frivolous and hence does not have any option but to dismiss it with exemplary costs. Consequently, the present writ petition is **dismissed with costs of ₹ 50,000/-** to be deposited in the Poor Patient Welfare Fund of P.G.I.M.E.R., Chandigarh.

February 28, 2025
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No