

**ANNEXURE IV**  
**OFFICE OF THE ELECTORAL OFFICER, BOARD OF CONTROL FOR CRICKET**  
**IN INDIA (BCCI)**  
**BCCI GENRAL ELECTIONS 28 SEPTEMBER 2025**  
**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

The following are the summary of findings of Electoral Officer in respect of objections filed against Representatives of Eligible Members:

Date: 19<sup>th</sup> September, 2025

Shri A. K Joti, Electoral Officer,

BCCI General Elections' 2025

Email: [electoral.officer@bcci.tv](mailto:electoral.officer@bcci.tv)

| <b>Sr.<br/>No.</b> | <b>MEMBER<br/>ASSOCIATION</b>               | <b>SUMMARY OF FINDINGS</b>   |
|--------------------|---|--|
| <b>1.</b>          | <b>PUNJAB CRICKET<br/>ASSOCIATION (PCA)</b> | <p>1. Mr. Rakesh Handa, Life Member of Punjab Cricket Association, regarding Eligibility of Mr. Harbhajan Singh to Represent PCA in the BCCI General Elections – 2025 on the ground that it is unconstitutional. It is alleged that a Complaint before the Hon'ble Ombudsman has already been filed challenging the Appointment of Mr. Harbhajan as PCA's 'Chief Cricketing Advisor' and the same is pending till Date. It is further alleged that the Mr. Harbhajan has already represented PCA at the 93<sup>rd</sup> AGM on 29.09.2024.</p> <p>2. It is also alleged that the continuation of his dual role constitutes a direct conflict of interest under Articles 38, 40 &amp; 41 of the BCCI Constitution and therefore the nomination of Mr. Harbhajan Singh as PCA's representative be kept in abeyance till the final adjudication</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>of the Complaint filed before the Hon'ble Ombudsman.</p> <p>3. A Reply has been filed by Mr. Amarjit Singh, President, PCA against the Objections of Mr. Handa. It is submitted that Mr. Harbhajan was appointed as Chief Advisor by the Apex Council vide meeting dated 19.06.2022 and re-appointed by the Apex Council vide meeting dated 02.08.2025, however, formal consent of Mr. Harbhajan Singh has yet not been received. Further the post of 'Chief Advisor' is Honorary and Advisory in nature with no Financial Benefits, Administrative Powers or Enforceability. The nomination of Mr. Singh to represent PCA in the BCCI General Elections – 2025 does not give rise to conflict of interest in terms of Memorandum and Rules and Regulations of PCA</p> <p>4. It is further submitted that the Complaint filed by Mr. Rakesh Handa regarding the re-Appointment of Mr. Harbhajan Singh as the Chief Advisor of PCA, vide email dated 02.09.2015 before the Hon'ble Ombudsman-cum-Ethics Officer, PCA, has yet not been decided and the matter is kept for Preliminary Hearing on 19.09.2025.</p> <p>5. Considering the Objections raised as well as the Reply against the same it is to be noted that the Complainant has not been able to substantiate as to how the Nomination of Representation filed by Mr. Harbhajan Singh is invalid or ineligible. Further, the Formal Consent of Mr. Harbhajan to accept his Appointment as an 'Advisor' to PCA is still pending and since the matter related is presently sub-judice before the Hon'ble Ombudsman-Cum-Ethics Officer, PCA, it is not appropriate for the Electoral Officer to go into the Question of Examining the same. The Electoral Officer does not have the Jurisdiction to Examine or Pass an Order regarding the said Appointment.</p> <p>6. Furthermore, on the Verification of Nomination Application</p> |
|--|--|--|

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    |  | <p>Filed on behalf of Punjab Cricket Association nominating Mr. Harbhajan Singh as the Representative of PCA is found to be complete in all aspects. The allegations posed by Mr. Rakesh Handa are not legally tenable.</p> <p>7. Taking into account the Facts stated above, the Objections stands Rejected.</p>   |
| 2. | <b>UTTAR PRADESH CRICKET ASSOCIATION</b> | <p>1. Mr. Pradeep Singh has filed Objections regarding Eligibility of Uttar Pradesh Cricket Association to participate in the BCCI General Elections - 2025. Verbatim Objections have also been received on behalf of Mr. Upendra Yadav, Anil Viddoliya, Yogesh Kr Kulshreshtha, Vedika Dwivedi and Ankesh Vashishtha. The Objections are filed on the ground that the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 19.08.2025 in Writ-C No. 7825 of 2025 has directed the Principal Secretary, Department of Sports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, to examine the grievances against UPCA wherein prayers include:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) <i>Removal of the words "Uttar Pradesh" from the corporate name of UPCA.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) <i>Immediate suspension or cancellation of the company's registration for non-compliance with legal mandates.</i></p> <p>2. It is alleged by the Complainants that afore said Judicial Directive casts a direct shadow on the legitimacy of UPCA's very identity and its right to represent the state of Uttar Pradesh. It is also alleged that the ROC, Kanpur, has filed Nine (9) criminal cases (Case Nos.: 86205/2025, 86208/2025, 92054/2025, 90112/2025, 90114/2025, 92053/2025, 92055/2025, 90118/2025, and 99912/2025) against UPCA and its officials before the Special Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kanpur and these cases pertain to serious financial irregularities and gross violations of the Companies Act, 2013 therefore an</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>entity under such severe criminal prosecution for financial malfeasance cannot be deemed a fit and proper member of the BCCI.</p> <p>3. It is alleged that UPCA has admitted liability and paid over ₹70 lakhs in outstanding GST to the Government of Uttar Pradesh for evasion, demonstrating a pattern of disregard for Statutory Financial Obligations. Therefore, Allowing UPCA to nominate a Representative would mean allowing a Vote to be casted by an Organization whose very right to exist in its current form is under a legal cloud and active Judicial Scrutiny.</p> <p>4. It is further alleged that the Hon'ble High Court has specifically directed the removal of "Uttar Pradesh" from the association's name and the immediate suspension or cancellation of its Registration for non-compliance and therefore UPCA shall be disqualified.</p> <p>5. A Reply has been filed Mr. Ankit Chatterjee, CEO of UPCA against the Objections raised by the Complainants. It is submitted that UPCA is a not-for-profit Organization Registered u/s 25 of the Companies Act, 1956 (Presently u/s 8 of the Companies Act 2013) vide CIN - U92411UP2005NPL030360 is duly Affiliated with the BCCI to represent the state of Uttar Pradesh in BCCI as a member of BCCI and for undertaking cricketing activities in Uttar Pradesh. Therefore, UPCA, being a Full Member of the BCCI, is entitled to exercise its right to Represent, nominate the candidature for the positions announced and exercise its Voting Rights.</p> <p>6. That it is a matter of record that the Members of UPCA, in their 19th Annual General Body Meeting, held on October 23, 2024, had passed a Resolution pursuant to the provisions of Article 8 (3) (j) of the Articles of</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>Association of Uttar Pradesh Cricket Association, and Shri Rajeev Shukla was appointed to act as the UPCA's Representative on BCCI and/ or similar Organization (s) and authorised to attend and vote (both electronically &amp; physically) at their Annual General Meetings, postal ballots and other Meetings, held up to the date of the Twentieth Annual General Meeting, for and on behalf of UPCA. Therefore, Mr. Rajeev Shukla is an Authorised Representative of UPCA on the BCCI.</p> <p>7. That Para 9 of the notice dated September 06, 2025, issued by the Electoral Officer regarding the captioned General Elections – 2025 of the BCCI, clearly provides that the objections, if any, to the names in the Draft Electoral Roll can be made only by a Member of the concerned State Cricket Association affiliated to the BCCI or by a Member of the District level Cricket Associations Recognised by the concerned State Cricket Association. It is a matter of record that the Complainants are neither a Member of UPCA nor a Member of an District Cricket Association Recognised by UPCA.</p> <p>8. It has also been submitted that no Order has been passed by the Hon'ble High Court to Derecognise UPCA. The Petition has been disposed off with the Direction to the Principal Secretary of Sports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow, to look into the matter and Issue an Order in eight Weeks. Also, the Complaints filed against UPCA are pending and there hasn't been a single Notice issued and no adverse order against UPCA has been passed. Further, the Complainant's allegations regarding the Financial Delinquencies are baseless. Therefore, removal of the name of UPCA from the draft Electoral Roll on the mere allegations of some Third Party, who</p> |
|--|--|---|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>has no right to interfere, shall neither be constitutional nor just and equitable.</p> <p>9. Considering the Objections raised as well as the Reply against the same it is to be noted that the Allegations posed against the inclusion of UPCA in the Draft Electoral Roll dated 13.09.2025 are without any legal reasoning. Further, On perusal of the Order passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, Lucknow Bench on 19.08.2025, it is to be noted that the Order has Directed the Principal Secretary of Sports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow to look into the matter. The relevant extract of the said Order is produced herein below:</p> <p><b><i>“5. The petitioner has made a representation on 14.04.2025 to the Regional Director (North), Ministry of Corporate Affairs, New Delhi and he has also made a representation on 17.07.2025 to the Directorate, Government of Uttar Pradesh, for a prompt direction to opposite party Nos. 3 and 4 to remove the name 'Uttar Pradesh' from its name.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>6. There are other allegations in the present representation, which we do not feel it necessary to advert to.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>7. This petition is disposed of with the direction to opposite party No. 2, Principal Secretary of Sports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow to look into the grievance raised by the petitioner and pass an appropriate order after giving an opportunity of hearing to opposite party Nos. 3 and 4. Such order should be passed within a period of eight weeks from the date a copy of this order is placed before him.”</i></b></p> <p>It is important to note that Order has not passed any adverse Orders against UPCA and therefore the contention of the</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>Complainants that Hon'ble High Court has specifically directed the removal of the word "Uttar Pradesh" from the Association's Name and the immediate suspension or cancellation of its Registration for non-compliance is not Acceptable and is misleading.</p> <p>10. Further, the Criminal Complaints allegedly filed against UPCA is also sub-judice before the relevant Authorities of the Uttar Pradesh Govt./GOI and therefore cannot be taken into consideration.</p> <p>11. Moreover, as per the BCCI Memorandum of Associations and Rules and Regulations (as per judgement dated 9<sup>th</sup> August 2018 and 14<sup>th</sup> September 2022 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 4235 of 2014 &amp; connected matters);</p> <p>Rule 3 (ii) A reads as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>“Each state shall be represented by a state cricket association duly recognised by the BCCI and such associations shall be Full Members.</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>.... 28. Uttar Pradesh”</i></b></p> <p>From the above, it is concluded that UPCA is a Full Member of BCCI.</p> <p>Further, as per Rule 4(1), Each Full Member shall have one Vote, to be exercised through its authorised Representative. Therefore, UPCA being the Full Member of BCCI has the right to Vote in the Elections held by BCCI.</p> <p>12. Furthermore, on the Verification of Nomination Application Filed on behalf of Uttar Pradesh Cricket Association nominating Mr. Rajeev Shukla as the Representative of UPCA is found to be complete in all aspects. The allegations posed by Mr. Pradeep Singh &amp; Others are not legally tenable.</p> <p>13. Taking into account the Facts stated above, the Objections stands Rejected.</p> |
|--|--|--|

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 3. | <b>KARNATAKA STATE CRICKET ASSOCIATION</b> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. VM Manjunath, Life Member Karnataka Cricket Association, has filed Objections regarding Eligibility of Mr. Raghuram Bhat Represent KSCA in the BCCI General Elections – 2025 ground of Criminal Investigations and Public Accountability as Mr. Raghuram Bhat allegedly is named as one of the accused in the unfortunate stampede incident that happened on 04.06.2025 at Chinnaswamy Stadium and he still remains under active investigation by the relevant Authorities and therefore accepting his Nomination would raise questions about the integrity and reputation of the BCCI, and goes against the principles of good governance.</li> <li>2. It is alleged that KSCA has not filled the Secretary and Treasurer positions within 45 days as stipulated in the by-laws and hence becomes a Member in default.</li> <li>3. A Reply has been Filed by Mr. Shubhendu Ghosh, CEO KSCA, against the Objections raised by Mr. Manjunath. It is submitted that the FIR is lodged against the Administrative Committee of the KSCA and not against Mr. Raghuram and the same is sub-judice before various Authorities. That there has not been a single adverse order against Mr. Raghuram till date. The Hon’ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P. No. 16387/2025 (GM-RES) challenging the FIRs lodged against the Association has ordered the Respondents to not take any precipitative/ coercive steps against the Petitioners in relation to the FIRs filed. Further, the Hon’ble Court of Karnataka has taken <i>suo moto</i> cognizance of the incident which is numbered as W.P. No. 16530/2025 (Suo Moto) and in none of the matters adverse orders against KSCA or Shri. Raghuram Bhat have been made.</li> <li>4. It is submitted that in accordance with Rule 15B(xiii) of our KSCA Bye-laws, any member is entitled to attend the</li> </ol> |
|----|--|--|



|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>Annual General Meeting of the BCCI. There is no contravention of any of the provisions to nominate Mr. Raghuram and He has been properly appointed in a duly constituted Managing Committee meeting.</p> <p>5. That the Bye-laws of the State Association under Rule 6A(ii)(f) [Disqualification of Office Bearer] and 6B(ii)(f) [Disqualification of Managing Committee], the relevant clauses read as follows –</p> <p><b>Rule 6A(ii)(f)</b> <i>has been convicted by a Court of Law for commission of a criminal offence and sentenced to imprisonment.</i></p> <p><b>Rule 6B(ii)(f)</b> <i>has been convicted by a Court of Law for commission of a criminal offence and sentenced to imprisonment; or</i></p> <p>In the instant case, the matters are only at Investigation stages and even a Charge Sheet has not been Filed, the question of any disqualification does not arise.</p> <p>6. With regards to the non-compliance of provisions of not holding Elections for the vacant posts of the Treasurer and Secretary within 45 days, it is submitted that the said Rule is only directory in nature and need not be strictly complied with. That there are no prohibitions in the BCCI Bye-laws or KSCA Bye-laws to decide what action can be taken in the event of non-filling of the vacancy within the suggested period.</p> <p>7. That as per Rule 15 B (xxvii), the Managing Committee is the final authority to interpret the Rules, more so, also in respect of matters not provided for in the Bye-laws. Hence, there is no legal impediment for the present Managing Committee to nominate a person to attend the BCCI AGM and accordingly the objection is liable to be rejected.</p> <p>8. Considering the Objections raised as well as the Reply against the same it is to be noted that as per the Order dated</p> |
|--|--|--|

|    |                                      |  |
|----|--------------------------------------|--|
|    |                                      | <p>06.06.2025 in W.P. No. 16387/2025 (GM-RES), the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka has ordered that no precipitative/ coercive steps shall be against the Petitioners (KSCA) in relation to the FIRs filed. Therefore, it would not appropriate for the Electoral Officer to decide the validity of the Nomination Mr. Bhat on the basis of the FIR filed against the Administrative Committee of KSCA.</p> <p>9. Moreover, as per the By-laws of the BCCI and also KSCA, disqualification of a Member or a Office Bearer can only take place if the concerned Member has been Convicted or Sentenced to Imprisonment. Mere filing of an FIR or Complaint or Case against any individual does not amount to Conviction and therefore the allegations by the Complainant are not legally tenable. Further, even the Charge-Sheets have not been filed in the said FIR.</p> <p>10. With regards to the pending vacancies of the posts of Office Bearers and the Elections of the KSCA is concerned, it is not the jurisdiction of the Electoral Officer to comment or examine the same, the Complainant shall approach the Appropriate Authority for the same.</p> <p>11. Furthermore, on the Verification of Nomination Application Filed on behalf of Karnataka State Cricket Association nominating Mr. Raghuram Bhat as the Representative of KSCA is found to be complete in all aspects. The allegations posed by Mr. VM Manjunath are not legally tenable.</p> <p>12. Taking into account the Facts stated above, the Objections stands Rejected.</p> |
| 4. | <b>ARUNACHAL CRICKET ASSOCIATION</b> | <p>1. Mr. Suraj Tayam, Permanent Member of Arunachal Cricket Association, has filed Objections regarding Eligibility of Mr. Nabam Vivek to Represent ARCA in the BCCI General Elections – 2025 on the ground that Mr. Nabam has completed Six (06) continuous years in office and therefore</p>  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>is ineligible under BCCI Rule 6(4) &amp; 6(5)(f) – “mandating a cooling-off period after six years” and ARCA Rule 13(C) – Disqualifying Office Bearers post after expiry of the tenure.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. It is alleged that the tenure of Mr. Nabam expired on 28.08.2025 and he is illegally holding the post since 29.08.2025 and has deliberately suppressed the details regarding his tenure as Hon. Joint Secretary of ARCA which lasted for 30 days (from 29.08.2019 to 28.09.2019) in order to bypass the six-years cap and cooling off requirements mandated by BCCI Rule 6(4).</li> <li>3. Mr. Tayam has also made the submissions regarding other office bearers allegedly violating the tenure norms, namely Mr. TC Tok, Mr. Kabak Geda and Mr. Yab Lala. It is prayed that the ineligible office bearers be barred from attending the BCCI AGM and direct ARCA to conduct immediate elections to restore lawful representation.</li> <li>4. A reply has been filed by Mr. Nabam Vivek against the Objections raised by Mr. Tayam. It is submitted that ARCA got Official Affiliation as Permanent Member of BCCI in the month of September’ 2019 only. Before affiliation there were many Office Bearers in various capacities in the association as ARCA was unaware of the rules as per the Lodha commission. Therefore the six years tenure of present office bearers including Mr. Nabam Vivek will end on 25.10.2025 and therefore Mr. Nabam is eligible for the AGM.</li> <li>5. On seeking clarification from BCCI regarding the date of ARCA affiliation to BCCI as Full Member it has been found that the date of said Affiliation is 21.08.2028.</li> <li>6. Considering the Objections raised as well as the Reply against the same it is to be noted that even if the tenure of Mr. Nabam Vivek is counted cumulatively from the year</li> </ol> |
|--|--|--|

|    |                                |   |
|----|--------------------------------|---|
|    |                                | <p>2019, following are the Posts held by Him:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hon. Joint Secretary (29.08.2019 to 28.09.2019) – Tenure held for Thirty (30) Days.</li> <li>• Hon. Vice President (29.09.2019 to 24.10.2022) – Tenure held for Three (03) Years.</li> <li>• Hon. Secretary (25.10.2022 to till date) – Tenure for Three (03) will be over on 25.10.2025.</li> </ul> <p>In view of the details stated above, the date of completion of ‘Six (06) years’ comes down to 25.09.2025 and therefore on the date of filing the Nomination for Representation i.e. on 09.09.2025, Mr. Nabam’s Nomination does not attract Rule 6(4) of the BCCI Constitution.</p> <p>7. Further, with regards to the Complainant’s grievance pertaining to the violations of the Tenure Norms by the other Office Bearers of ARCA is concerned, the Complainant may File the same before the Appropriate Authority. The Electoral Officer does not have the Jurisdiction to Examine or Pass an Order regarding Administrative matters of ARCA.</p> <p>8. Furthermore, on the Verification of Nomination Application Filed on behalf of Arunachal Cricket Association nominating Mr. Nabam Vivek as the Representative of ARCA is found to be complete in all aspects. The allegations posed by Mr. Tayam are not legally tenable.</p> <p>9. Taking into account the Facts stated above, the Objections stands Rejected.</p> |
| 5. | <b>GOA CRICKET ASSOCIATION</b> | <p>1. Mr. Vipul Phadke, President of Goa Cricket Association has filed Objections regarding Eligibility of Mr. Rohan Gauns Dessai to Represent GCA in the BCCI General Elections – 2025 on the ground Nomination of Mr. Dessai has not been forwarded by the Authorised representative of GCA as it is the Secretary, as per clause 6(E)(3)(b) of GCA Constitution,</p>   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>who is empowered to carry out all the correspondences in the name of Association and Mr. Dessai's Nomination is forwarded by the Joint-Secretary. It is alleged that in the case of vacancy, the power lies with the President as per Clause 6 (E) (1) (c) to fill the same and therefore the President vide Emergency Committee Meeting dated 18.03.2025 appointed Shri Shamb Desai, Vice President, GCA as Acting Secretary, GCA and therefore the authority lies with Mr. Shamba.</p> <p>2. It is alleged that as per Clause 6 (E)(6)(x) of the GCA Constitution, the Managing Committee has the power to appoint "one of its members" to represent the Association in BCCI or any other body/institution/committee in or outside the State of Goa and Mr. Rohan Dessai is not a Member of the Managing Committee therefore He could not have been recommended to represent GCA.</p> <p>3. It is also alleged that as per the Advisory dated 27.08.2019 by the Committee of Administrators appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, for a person to be eligible to attend the AGM of BCCI and participate in BCCI elections as a member representative, the said representative shall be a member of the electoral college of member association, which he seeks to represent in the BCCI and as per the list of eligible voters and as per Clause 3(i) of GCA Constitution, Mr. Rohan Dessai is not an eligible voter.</p> <p>4. In accordance with the Hon'ble High Court's order dated 12.09.2025 in Writ Petition (F) No. 2379 of 2025 a meeting was held on 12.09.2025 and two separate resolutions were prepared nominating Mr. Vipul and Mr. Rohan respectively. It is alleged that 5 Members of the Managing Committee, including the Joint-Secretary and the Treasurer, refused to Sign the Minutes of the Meeting. The Members were separately asked vide emails by the President, Secretary and</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>the CEO to sign the Minutes of the Meeting even then it was not signed by the Members. It is alleged that in absence of the duly signed Minutes of the Meeting, no valid Resolution could have been issued.</p> <p>5. Mr. Harish Shinde, CEO of GCA, has also reiterate the statements of Mr. Vipul. He has stated that in meeting dated 12.09.2025 the name of Mr. Vipul Phadke was proposed by the Secretary Shamba Naik Dessai which was not objected by anyone. The name of Mr. Rohan Gauns Dessai was proposed by Mr. Rupesh Naik , Jt. Secretary and seconded by 4 members which was objected by Mr. Vipul Phadke and the Secretary on the ground of clause 6 (E) (6) (x) of the GCA Constitution and the advisory of COA dated 27.08.2019 regarding the requirement of the Representative to be a part of the Electoral College of the State Association. The Treasurer and the Joint Secretary stated that two separate resolutions be prepared one nominating Mr. Phadke and one nominating Mr. Dessai and both be sent to the BCCI. The minutes were refused to sign minutes by the Members of the Committee.</p> <p>6. Mr. Shinde has also submitted a legal opinion of Advocate Ninad Laud opining in favour of the stand taken by Mr. Phadke and Mr. Shinde with respect to the requirement of a Representative to be a part of the voting list of the concerned State Cricket Association.</p> <p>7. A Reply has been filed by Mr. Rohan Gauns Dessai against the Obections raised by Mr. Vipul Phadke. It is submitted that Mr. Rohan, had been elected to and serving on the Managing Committee of the GCA since the year 2022 thereafter He was also elected as the Joint-Secretary of BCCI in consequence to which Mr. Dessai had to resign from the Post of Secretary of GCA on 01.03.2025 in compliance with BCCI Rule 14(8) which states that “<i>no</i></p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p><b><i>councillor, once elected, shall hold any office in a Full Member Association</i></b>". It is contended that the act of compliance by Mr. Rohan shall not be used a tool for disqualification.</p> <p>8. It is submitted that as per Rule 6 of the BCCI Rules and Regulations, a person is prohibited to contest elections after holding two consecutive terms (Six Years) therefore Mr. Rohan is entitled to stand for the elections for another year and from the Rules of Procedure it is clear that only the Representative of Full Members BCCI can contest elections for the post of Office Bearers.</p> <p>9. That Mr. Phadke deliberately did not inform or call of the Meeting of Management Committee after receiving the Election Notification dated 06.09.2025. The Joint-Secretary after having independently finding out about the Notification, formally requested Mr. Phadke to call an urgent meeting and communication to the Five (05) Members of the Committee. Since, the meeting could not happen because inaction of Mr. Phadke, the Committee Members approached the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa in Writ Petition No. 2379/2025(F) and vide order dated 12.09.2025, the Hon'ble Court directed the GCA to hold a Meeting on the very same day at 2:00 PM to decide on the Nomination.</p> <p>10. That the Managing Committee vide Resolution dated 12.09.2025 nominated Mr. Rohan as the Representative of the GCA. It is also submitted that as per Rule 6(D)(vii) the said resolution stands valid. It is also pointed out that Mr. Phadke, the Vice President and the CEO were not desirous to forward the Nomination of Mr. Rohan as the Representative of GCA and therefore in peculiar facts and circumstances, the Joint Secretary forwarded the decision taken by the Majority of the Managing Committee members</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>in terms of Rules of GCA and in furtherance of compliance with the with the Order dated 12.09.2025.</p> <p>11. It is submitted Mr. Dessai is a Life Member of GCA under the definition of 'Members' given under Rule 1(m) of the GCA Rules (as amended on 24.02.2019).</p> <p>12. It has been pointed out that under Rule 6(ii) of the GCA Rules, the Committee has power to 'interpret' its regulations and bye-laws. The Committee, as the repository of this power has by majority vote, exercised and interpreted the scope of its authority to interpret the term member Rule in 6(E)(6)(x) to mean any member of the GCA as defined under its Rules and has accordingly chosen to nominate Mr. Rohan.</p> <p>13. It is further submitted that BCCI Constitution contains no stipulation that a State's Representative must be a serving Office-Bearer and the Advisory issued in the year 2019 does not have the effect of overriding the Rules and Regulations of BCCI and GCA; ultimately the eligibility to represent the GCA and and/or to stand for elections to a post in the BCCI must be governed by the Rules and Regulations of the BCCI. That the Advisory has been effectively superseded by the definitive amendments to the BCCI Constitution approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its judgment dated 14.09.2022 in BCCI vs. Cricket Association of Bihar, (2022)19SCC30.</p> <p>14. That the President's actions are a textbook example of the "vested personal interests" and "concentration of power" that the Supreme Court sought to dismantle. That the Objection regarding the Validity of the Resolution on the basis of duly signed minutes of the meeting is hyper technical in nature. That it is trite law that a Resolution is passed the moment it secures the requisite Majority Vote in a validly convened Meeting. In the meeting of 12.09.2025,</p> |
|--|--|---|



|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>the motion to nominate Mr. Rohan Dessai was carried by a by a 5-3 vote. At that moment, the Resolution came into legal existence. Thereafter, Mr. Phadke in his capacity as President and Mr. Shamba Desai in its capacity as Vice President and also the Acting Secretary of the GCA were bound to have complete the ministerial task of communicating the same to the BCCI. That the signing of minutes is a matter of record-keeping. The refusal of a dissenting minority to sign the minutes cannot retroactively nullify a Decision validly made by the Majority.</p> <p>15. Considering the Objections raised as well as the Reply against the same it is to be noted that essentially the issue comes down to the Validity of the Resolution and Rohan Dessai's Right to be Nominated as the Representative of the GCA for the BCCI General Election – 2025. On perusing the documents submitted by Mr. Rohan, more particularly the letters signed by the Members of the Managing Committee verifying and endorsing the facts and contentions of Mr. Rohan Dessai pertaining to the inaction on the part of Mr. Phadke and the CEO in forwarding the Nomination of Mr. Rohan as Representative of GCA, it is clear that the Managing Committee had duly conducted the Meeting and passed the Resolution in favour of Mr. Rohan Dessai and therefore the question of the validity of the Resolution and the lack of authorisation with the Joint-Secretary to forward the Nomination does not arise.</p> <p>16. It is clear from the Documents and communication records placed before the Office of the Electoral Officer, that the Resolution passed by the Managing Committee is valid. Further, the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa in Writ Petition No. 2379/2025(F) and vide order dated 12.09.2025, had directed the GCA to hold a meeting on the very same day at 2:00 PM to decide on the nomination. The Relevant</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>extract of the same produced herein below:</p> <p><i>“6. In any case, at present, since the issue before us is not as to who shall be entitled to be nominated as the petitioners though have suggested a name, Mr Kantak representing the respondents has expressed difficulty as regards the said name, as according to him, strictly as per the GCA Rules and Advisory, the said person cannot be send as a representative of GCA. Mr Kantak is, however, agreeable for forwarding the name of any of the petitioners amongst the five as they are presently the members of the GCA and as per the Byelaws, their nomination would be validly accepted by BCCI.</i></p> <p><u><i>In any case, we are not desirous of getting into the controversy as we deem it appropriate to leave it to respondent no.1 to convene and emergent meeting for taking such a decision as it is the submission of the respective counsel appearing for the petitioners that the right of interpretation of any terms/Rules is ultimately to be decided by the Managing Committee as per the Byelaws and if a meeting is convened, the members will have a due deliberation upon the nomination to be made to the BCCI which is expected to be forwarded before 8.00 pm.</i></u></p> <p><i>7. Mr Kantak representing the President of GCA make a categorical statement before us that the meeting is convened at 2.00 pm in the office of the GCA, Porvorim, and by accepting</i></p> |
|--|--|---|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p><i>the said statement, which is made by the counsel for the petitioners, we direct that no fresh notice of meeting shall be communicated either to the petitioners or to respondent nos. 2 and 3. However, Mr Kantak submit that a notice shall be forwarded to respondent no.4 via WhatsApp message or any other Mode of Communication so that he also has an intimation of today's Managing Committee meeting scheduled at 2.00 pm.</i></p> <p><u><i>It is open for the members to deliberate and take a decision upon forwarding a nomination to the BCCI before the scheduled timeline.</i></u></p> <p><i>Needless to state that the nomination/representation shall be forwarded to the BCCI before the timeline fixed by it.”</i></p> <p>It is clear from the above extract of the Judgement that the Hon'ble High Court had placed the responsibility and decision on to the Members regarding the Nomination of the Representative and therefore in view of the aforesaid, the decision of the Members of the Managing Committee is to be treated final.</p> <p>17. Further, the duty performed by the Joint-Secretary in order to submit the Nomination of the GCA Representative in prescribed timeline given in the Notification dated 06.09.2025 is well within its powers as prescribed under Rule 6(D)(vii) of GCA Rules. The relevant extract of the same is produced below:</p> <p><i>(vii) A resolution in writing in an emergency circulated by the Hon. Secretary in his absence the</i></p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p><i>Joint Secretary in consultation with the President and in his absence, the Vice-President and agreed to by the majority of the members of the Committee shall be valid as if taken at the Meeting. Provided however that such resolution will be rectified and entered into the Minutes of the next meeting thereof.</i></p> <p>That, since the contentions and documents placed before the Office of the Electoral Officer sufficiently demonstrates the deliberate inaction of the President and Vice President who is also the Acting Secretary in forwarding the Nomination of Representative of GCA, the Nomination forwarded by the Joint-Secretary in furtherance of the decision taken by the Members of the Managing Committee shall be considered valid.</p> <p>18. With regards to the contentions taken by Mr. Shinde, CEO of GCA, it is clear that the Managing Committee refused to sign the Minutes of the Meeting wherein Mr. Phadke was nominated as the Representative. Mr. Shinde's Reply makes it abundantly clear that the Managing Committee's decision was to Nominate Mr. Rohan and in view of the Hon'ble High Court's Order dated 12.09.2025, directing the Members of the Committee to make the decision of Nomination, Mr. Shinde's email dated 12.09.2025 regarding 'non-participation of GCA in the present AGM' is of no significance. Further, the Legal Opinion submitted by him is not binding upon the Office of Electoral Officer and therefore the same is not accepted.</p> <p>19. Furthermore, there is no provision in the BCCI Bye-laws as well as the Election Notification and Rules of Procedures dated 06.09.2025 Issued by the Electoral Officer, BCCI, which debars a Member of the State Cricket Association on the basis of Voting Rights given in the concerned State</p> |
|--|--|---|

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | <p>Cricket Association. As per the said Notification the requirement with respect to the Membership is only limited to the fact that the ‘Representative should be a Member of the concerned State Cricket Association’. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for the Electoral Officer to ascertain the Voting Rights of Mr. Rohan in GCA especially when the Managing Committee has already decided on the aspect of Mr. Rohan’s eligibility to be a Representative of the GCA.</p> <p>20. Furthermore, on the Verification of Nomination Application Filed on behalf of Goa Cricket Association nominating Mr. Rohan Gauns Dessai as the Representative of GCA is found to be complete in all aspects. The allegations posed by Mr. Vipul Phadke are not legally tenable.</p> <p>21. Taking into account the Facts stated above, the Objections stands Rejected.</p>  |
| <b>6. HYDERABAD CRICKET ASSOCIATION</b> |  | <p>1. Mr. Ramakrishna Udupa, Secretary – Classic Cricket Club which is a Member Hyderabad Cricket Association has filed Objections regarding Eligibility of Mr. Sardar Daljeet Singh to Represent HCA in the BCCI General Elections – 2025 on the ground that the Resolution passed by the Apex Council of HCA Nominating Mr. Singh is invalid as the current Apex Council lacks quorum.</p> <p>2. It is alleged that a Writ Petition has been filed against HCA on several illegality including the AGM and the matter is sub-judice in which the next date of Hearing is 19.09.2025, thus the current body lacks the moral right to continue. That the President, Secretary and the Treasurer were arrested and thus the Apex Council of HCA does not have a quorum.</p> <p>3. It is further alleged that Hon’ble High Court of Telangana had appointed Justice Naveen Rao Guru to administer the body in lines of the appointment of a Single Man Committee by Supreme Court in 2022 and therefore an</p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>invite to attend the BCCI AGM may be extended to Hon'ble Justice Naveen Rao Garu instead of Apex Council of HCA.</p> <p>4. A reply has been filed by Mr. Sardar Daljeet Singh against the Objections raised by Mr. Udupa. It is submitted that The current procedure has been duly supervised by the Hon'ble Justice P. Naveen Rao (Retd.), Court-appointed Supervisory Committee, and is in strict conformity with HCA's Bye-laws. That the allegations pertaining to the AGM proceedings and Judicial Directions, it is submitted that Justice P. Naveen Rao (Retd.) vide order dated 10.09.2025 specifically directed the CEO to transcript the Resolutions passed in the said meeting and the officiating President can approve the same.</p> <p>5. That the resolution nominating HCA's representative was passed with quorum duly satisfied. The list of members present includes: Acting President, Secretary, Councillor, ICA representatives, and C&amp;AG nominee. Thus, quorum and validity are fully met. The Supervisory Committee has itself endorsed the Apex Council's resolution nominating the Acting President to represent HCA before the BCCI.</p> <p>6. Considering the Objections raised as well as the Reply against the same, it is to be noted the Resolution dated 11.09.2025 passed by the Apex Council nomination Mr. Singh as the Representative of HCA has been duly approved and signed by the Hon'ble Justice P. Naveen Rao (Retd.) on 12.09.2025. Further, the said Resolution has been signed by the Five (05) Members of the Apex Council and thus the question of the validity of the said Resolution does not arise.</p> <p>7. Further, admittedly the Writ Petition No. 25015 of 2025 filed against the HCA is still sub-judice before the Hon'ble High Court of Telangana, therefore, it will not be</p> |
|--|--|---|

|    |                                   |   |
|----|-----------------------------------|---|
|    |                                   | <p>Appropriate for the Electoral Officer to interfere till the Final Order of the Hon'ble High Court is delivered. Moreover, there has not been a single contention taken by the Complainant that pertains to the violations of any Rules under the BCCI Constitution and therefore the allegations posed by the Complainant are also outside the jurisdiction of the Electoral Officer.</p> <p>8. Furthermore, on the Verification of Nomination Application Filed on behalf of Hyderabad Cricket Association nominating Mr. Sardar Daljeet Singh as the Representative of HCA is found to be complete in all aspects. The allegations posed by Mr. Ramakrishna Udupa are not legally tenable.</p> <p>9. Taking into account the Facts stated above, the Objections stands Rejected.</p>   |
| 7. | <b>BARODA CRICKET ASSOCIATION</b> | <p>1. Dr. Darshan Banker - Ordinary Member No. 1732 along with Mr. Bhupendra P Patel - Life Member No. 791, Mr. Jatin J Vakil – Ordinary Member No 635, Mr. Samir Sethi – Ordinary Member No. 1734, Mr. Mehul B Patel - Ordinary member No. 1735 of Baroda Cricket Association have filed Objections regarding Eligibility of Mr. Pranav Amin to Represent BCA in the BCCI General Elections – 2025 on the ground that Mr. Pranav Amin remains President from 27.09.2019 completing his tenure of Six Years on 26.09.2025 (still continuing) so he has to go for cooling off period of three years starting from 26.09.2025. It is alleged that BCA had held Election on 26.02.2023 instead of September' 2022, violating the constitution of BCA/BCCI.</p> <p>2. It is alleged that as per Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgment dated 22.09.2022 Members of Apex Council/Managing Committee also to be treated as Office Bearer &amp; all rules applied to them as Office Bearer. Mr Pranav Amin was a</p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>Managing Committee Member for 13 years from the year 2006 till he got elected as President in September 2019. Therefore, Mr Pranav Amin spent almost 19 years at BCA as Office Bearer without getting into cooling off period of 3 years as well as on the post way beyond 9 years. This is absolutely CONTEMPT of Hon'ble Supreme Court's Judgement dated 14.09.2022.</p> <p>3. It is further alleged that the Form A, B &amp; C filed by Mr. Pranav Amin, are misleading by mentioning False Information.</p> <p>4. A reply has been filed by Mr. Pranav Amin against the Objections raised by Dr. Darshan Banker and Others. Mr. Pranav Amin has submitted that the result was declared by the Electoral Officer on 20.2.2023 for his 2<sup>nd</sup> term as an Officer Bearer/President and therefore, the period of 3 years of his 2<sup>nd</sup> term as an Office Bearer starts from 20.02.2023 and is no provision in the Constitution of BCA or even BCCI to apply his term retrospectively from a 'Back Date'</p> <p>5. It is also submitted by Mr. Amin that the allegations of scheduling of election in February 2023 as violation of the Constitution of BCA/BCCI is an after-thought and is baseless and if the objections had any substance or were bonafide, the same would have been raised when He was elected as President of BCA on 20.2.2023.</p> <p>6. It is denied that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its judgment dated 22.9.2022 directed Managing Committee members to be treated as Office bearers and therefore it is also denied that He has served for 19 years as an Office bearer. It is submitted that He has completed only one Full Term and the 2<sup>nd</sup> term is ongoing.</p> <p>7. It has also been submitted that BCA has approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India seeking directions vide IA No. 196907/2025 in Civil Appeal No. 4235/2014 on the</p> |
|--|--|---|



|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>issue of conducting of Election since the mandatory Term of three (03) Years is not yet completed by the elected Office Bearers and the same is also important in view of the recently enacted National Sports Governance Act, 2025</p> <p>8. Considering the Objections raised as well as the Reply against the same it is to be noted that the it is a settled position that the Members of the Managing Committee are not 'Office Bearers' in terms of the Definition provided in the BCCI Constitution and therefore the allegation of Dr. Darshan &amp; Others regarding the same is incorrect.</p> <p>9. Further, it is an admitted fact that Mr. Amin's 1<sup>st</sup> Tenure as President was from (27.09.2019 to 26.09.2022) and thereafter He was again elected as the President on 20.02.2023 and therefore He is not required to go under the mandatory 'cooling off Period of 3 Years' as his Tenure for Six (06) years has not been completed as yet.</p> <p>10. As per the Definition of the terms 'Office Bearers' given under the BCCI Rules and Regulations Clause 1 (A) (v) does not include the 'Members of the Managing Committee'. Also, the Hon'ble Supreme Court's Order dated 22.09.2022 does not mention about 'Management Committee Members' to be included and defined as 'Office Bearers', therefore the entire allegation of Dr. Darshan that Mr. Amin has held the post of Office Bearer for 19 years cannot be accepted.</p> <p>11. The grievance of the Complainants regarding the Elections not being held in September' 2022, cannot be entertained at the present stage as the same Issue should have been raised at the relevant point in time before the relevant Appropriate Authority under the BCA Constitution.</p> <p>12. Furthermore, on the Verification of Nomination Application Filed on behalf of Baroda Cricket Association nominating Mr. Mr. Pranav Amin as the Representative of BCA is</p> |
|--|--|---|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>found to be complete in all aspects. The allegations posed by Dr. Darshan Banker &amp; Others are not legally tenable.</p> <p>13. Taking into account the Facts stated above, the Objections stands Rejected.</p> |
|--|--|--|

-----

Shri A. K Joti, Electoral Officer,  
BCCI General Elections - 2025  
Email: [electoral.officer@bcci.tv](mailto:electoral.officer@bcci.tv)