



\$~38

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7820/2024**

HAIDER ALI

..... Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Ali Md. Maaz, Advocate**

versus

BOARD OF CONTROL OF CRICKET IN INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: **Ms. Pratishtha Vij, Advocate for R-1/
BCCI
Mr. Ravi Prakash, CGSC with Mr.
Ali Khan, Mr. Chitvan Singhal,
Government Pleader and Advocates
for UOI/R-4**

%

Date of Decision: 28th May, 2024

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

JUDGMENT

MANMOHAN, ACJ: (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed as a Public Interest Litigation ('PIL') seeking a direction to Board of Control of Cricket in India ('BCCI') i.e., Respondent No. 1 herein and Delhi Capitals i.e., Respondent No. 2 herein, to pay substantial amount to Delhi Police towards the security



provided for the matches during the Indian Premier League ('IPL') seasons.

2. The Petitioner states that he is a social activist and has no personal interest in the outcome of the petition.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that he has learnt that for IPL matches held in Mumbai, the franchisee pays for the police deployment charges. He states that the issue of reimbursement to the local police has been considered by High Court of Judicature at Bombay in PIL bearing No. 52/2012 and in this regard, he relies upon orders dated, 02nd April, 2013 and 17th January, 2014 passed in the aforesaid PIL bearing No. 52/2012. He further relies upon a communication dated 10th July, 2017 addressed by the Indiawin Sports Private Limited [which runs the IPL franchise Mumbai Indians] to the Maharashtra Police confirming payment of charges against the invoices raised on the former towards the deployment of Police personnel during the IPL matches held in 2017

3.1 He states that similarly, the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan, the Jaipur Bench in its order dated 10th April, 2019 has registered a PIL taking note of the non-payment of arrears of dues by the sponsors and organizers of IPL matches payable to the Rajasthan Police for the IPL matches held in Jaipur and has taken an adverse view.

3.2 He fairly states that Delhi Police has not raised any invoices on Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for the IPL matches held in Delhi and there are no arrears payable to Delhi Police. He states that this PIL has, however, been filed on the plea that there is no cause for Delhi Police to not charge Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for the security provided during the IPL matches and collect revenues for the said services. He states that IPL matches have been held in Delhi since 2008 and if Delhi Police recovers fee for all the



matches held till date it would be entitled for a large sum.

4. Learned standing counsel for Respondent No. 4 states that Delhi Police has not negotiated any fee with Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for the security deployed during IPL matches and, therefore, there is no amount due and payable by Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to the Delhi Police.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having perused the record, we are of the considered opinion that no directions, as prayed for in the present petition, are maintainable.

6. A perusal of the documents filed on the record shows that the Maharashtra Police negotiated fee for the security deployed during the IPL matches held at Mumbai and the non-payment of the said fee was an issue under consideration before the High Court of Bombay in PIL No. 52/2012. The said PIL was disposed of after the payments were made to the Mumbai Police for the invoices raised.

7. Similarly, in the PIL registered before High Court of Rajasthan the issue noted by the Court was with respect to the default in payment of the dues by the sponsors and organizers of IPL matches for the services rendered by the Rajasthan Police Force.

8. However, in the present case, as noted above and admitted by the Petitioner, the Union of India and Delhi Police had elected not to charge any fee from Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for the IPL matches held at Delhi. Consequently, there are no outstanding dues payable by Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to either Union of India or Delhi Police. The decision of the Union of India or Delhi Police to not charge Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for the security provided during IPL matches is a policy decision which does not require any interference from this Court in the present PIL.



9. We do not find any merit in the submission of the Petitioner that there is notional amount due and payable by Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to Union of India and/or Delhi Police for the past matches held until 2022.

10. The present petition is accordingly dismissed. However, the present order shall not be construed as restricting or prohibiting the Delhi Police from raising any fees for past or future dues, if it so decides.

ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

MAY 28, 2024/mr/MG