

# Sudhanshu Mittal vs Union Of India And Anr on 12 June, 2020

**Author: C. Hari Shankar**

**Bench: C. Hari Shankar**

\$~2

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI  
+ W.P.(C) 3364/2020 and CM Nos.11911/2020, 11912/2020,  
11913/2020

SUDHANSHU MITTAL	... Petitioner
Through:	Mr. Shyam Divan, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Ankur Chawla, Ms. Meenakshi Chatterjee, Mr. Jayant Mohan and Ms. Sanam Tripathi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.	... Respondents
Through:	Mr. Vikas Mahajan, CGSC for Respondent No.1/Union of India Ms. Mrinalini Sen Gupta and Ms. Nihaarika Jauhari, Advs. for the Respondent No.2 Mr. Siddharth Luthra, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Chetan Anand and Mr. Akash Srivastava, Advs. for the Respondent No.3 Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Aditya Singh, Adv. for the Indian Olympic Association/Respondent No.3. Ms. Shyel Trehan and Ms. Bhagya K. Yadav, Advs. for the Respondent No.4

CORAM:  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

ORDER

% 12.06.2020 This matter has been taken up for hearing by video- conferencing.

CM No.11913/2020 (exemption from notarised affidavit)

1. This application seeks exemption from filing a notarised copy of the affidavit and vakalatnama. In view of the administrative order dated 4th April, 2020, passed by this Court, the application is allowed subject to the petitioner filing a notarised copy of vakalatnama and affidavit within one week of resumption of normal court work.

2. The application is allowed and disposed of in the above terms.

CM No.11912/2020 (exemption)

1. This application seeks exemption from filing certified copies of the annexures. In view of the administrative order dated 4th April, 2020, passed by this Court, the application is allowed subject to the petitioner filing certified copies of the annexures within one week of resumption of normal court work.

2. The application is allowed in the above terms.

W.P. (C) 3364/2020 and CM No.11911/2020 (for stay)

1. Issue notice to the respondents to show cause as to why rule nisi be not issued.

2. Counter affidavits be filed within four weeks with advance copy to the petitioner who may file rejoinder thereto, if any, within two weeks thereof.

3. Notice is accepted on behalf of Respondent No.1 by Mr. Vikas Mahajan, learned Standing Counsel and on behalf of Respondent No.2 by Ms. Mrinalini Sen, learned counsel.

4. Notice is accepted on behalf of Respondent No.4 by Ms. Shyel Trehan, learned counsel.

5. Two learned Senior Counsel claim to be representing Respondent No.3, namely Mr. Siddharth Luthra and Mr. Dayan Krishnan. Their instructing counsel are at liberty to file their respective vakalatnamas. The question of the counsel who would be competent to represent Respondent No. 3 would be addressed later in these proceedings. For the time being, I have allowed Mr. Dayan Krishnan, learned senior counsel, who is instructed by Mr. Aditya Singh as well as Mr. Siddharth Luthra, learned senior counsel, instructed by Mr. Chetan Anand, to address arguments on the issues before the court.

6. The affidavit of Respondent No. 3, forwarded to the Court Master, through email, is taken on record.

7. This petition, at the instance of a member of the Ethics Commission of the Indian Olympic Association (IOA), assails a set of communications, dated 19th May, 2020, addressed by Respondent No. 4 (Dr. Narinder Dhruv Batra), to various members of the Ethics Commission, and the Arbitration Commission, of the IOA, which states that the terms of the said members have come to an end. These letters are identically worded and, for ready reference, a copy of the letter addressed

to the present petitioner Mr. Sudhanshu Mittal, Vice President of the IOA is reproduced thus :

"IOA/Section VI-18-Ethics Commission/2020/0125 19th May, 2020 To, Mr. Sudhanshu Mittal Vice President Indian Olympic Association (By email:mail@sudhanshumittal.com) Sub: Ethics Commission of Indian Olympic Association Dear Mr. Mittal, In continuation to our letter dated 19.02.2018, on behalf of the Indian Olympic Association, your term has come to an end and we would like to thank you for all your efforts as Member of IOA Ethics Commission.

We look forward to your continued contribution in other committees/commissions of IOA.

With warm regards, Sd/-

Dr. Narinder Dhruv Batra Copy to

1. Secretary General, IOA"

8. Mr. Shyam Divan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner, assails the above decisions, of Respondent No. 4, on a number of grounds, which may be enumerated, for the sake of convenience, thus:

(i) The reference, in the letters, to the coming to an end, of the "term" of the petitioner and other members of the Ethics Commission or the Arbitration Commission of the IOA, is essentially in the nature of a red herring, as, in fact, there was no reference, either in the letter dated 19th February, 2018, or in any other official communication, to any "term" of the said officials.

(ii) The two communications, dated 19th February, 2018, whereby the Ethics Commission, and the Arbitration Commission, of the IOA, were constituted, read thus:

Letter constituting the Arbitration Commission " 19th Feb. 2018 IOA/168 To, National Sports Federations & States Olympic Associations Formation of Arbitration Commission of Indian Olympic Association Dear Sirs, As provided in the Constitution of Indian Olympic Association to resolve the issues arising within the member National Sports Federations, State Olympic Association and IOA etc. The Indian Olympic Association has constituted Arbitration Commission under the able Chairmanship of Justice (Retd.) Mr. Madan Mohan Ghidiyal.

The composition of the Arbitration Commission is as follows:

1. Justice (Retd.) Mr. Madan Mohan Ghidiyal -

Chairman

2. Justice(Retd.) Ms. Aruna Suresh - Member
3. Justice (Retd.) Mr. Kailash Gambhir - Member
4. Justice (Retd.) Mr. J.C.S. Rawat - Member
5. Justice (Retd.) Mr. B.C. Kandpal - Member
6. Mr. L.P. Nathani, (Ex.Advocate General) - Member
7. Mr. Vishwapati Trivedi (Retd. IAS) - Member
8. Mr. P.K Tripathi (Retd. IAS) - Member
9. Mr. D.K.Mishra (Retd. IAS) - Member
10. Mr. B.S. Siddhu (Retd. IPS ) - Member
11. Mr. D.C. Mishra (Retd. IPS) - Member With Warm Regards, Sd/-

(Dr. Narinder Dhruv Batra)"

Letter constituting the Ethics Commission "19th Feb. 2018, IOA/169 To, National Sports Federations & States Olympic Associations Formation of Ethics Commission of Indian Olympic Association Dear Sirs, As per Constitution of Indian Olympic Association, we have constituted Ethics Commission under the able Chairmanship of Justice (Retd.) Mr. V.K. Gupta.

The composition of the Ethics Commission is as follows :

1. Justice (Retd) Mr. V,K. Gupta - Chairman
2. Justice (Retd.) Mr. Bhanwar Singh - Member
3. Shri Uma Kant Uniyal, (Ex. Advocate General)  
- Member
4. Shri Deepak Jyoti Ghildiyal (Reld, IPS)  
- Member

5. Shri Vijay Kumar (IPS) - Member

6. Shri Sudhanshu Mittal- Vice President IOA

- Member

7. Shri Anil Khanna- Life President All India Tennis Association - Member

8. Smt. Sudarshan Pathak - Hockey India

- Member

9. Shri Shiva Keshwan - Luge - Member"

These documents do not reflect any term, for which the members of these two commissions of the IOA were appointed.

(iii) Clause V of the Memorandum of Association of the IOA (annexed, with the Rules and Regulations of the IOA, as Annexure P-13 to the writ petition) states that the IOA shall constitute the Athletes Commission, the Arbitration Commission and the Ethics Commission, as per the Olympic Charter. It would not, therefore, be permissible to tinker with the constitution of these commissions, save and except in accordance with the rules and procedures stipulated in that regard.

(iv) Rule 7 of the Rules and Regulations of the IOA, deals with the "Annual General Meeting" (hereinafter referred to as "AGM") of the IOA. Sub-rule 7.1, under the said Rule 7 sets out the powers, functions and duties of the AGM, of which Clause 7.1.7 specifically refers to "(appointment of) committees or sub-committees, as and when necessary". The duties of office bearers of the IOA are enumerated in Rule 16 of the Rules and Regulations of the IOA, of which Clause 16.1 deals with the post of President (presently held by Respondent No. 4, whose actions are under challenge). Clause 16.1.4, thereunder, reads thus :

"The President of IOA may propose the formation of various IOA Commission/Committees and the Members of those Committees and Commission subject to ratification by the Executive Council and/or the General Meeting."

The president of the IOA, therefore, merely proposes the formation of various commissions/committees of the IOA and the members thereof, and the proposal of the President has to be ratified by the Executive Council and/or the General Meeting of the IOA. The president of the IOA, therefore, is not the appointing authority of the members of the Ethics Commission or of the Arbitration Commission but merely makes a proposal in that regard. The appointment of the members crystallises when the proposal, as put up in the AGM, is approved by the Executive Council and the General Meeting of the IOA.

(v) A reading of the minutes of the AGM of the IOA, held on 14th December, 2017 at 10 a.m., reflects (at page 71) that the petitioner was elected as one of the Vice Presidents of the IOA. Thereafter, vide serial no.9 of the said minutes, the House authorised Respondent No. 4 and Mr. Rajiv Mehta, Secretary General, IOA to appoint / nominate the Chairman / Convenors / Members in the commissions and committees of the IOA.

(vi) The first Executive Council meeting of the IOA, held on 2nd June, 2018, vide Agenda Item No. 2, ratified the appointment of the members of the Ethics Commission and the Arbitration Commission. The lists of members of the Ethics Commission and the Arbitration Commission, whose appointments were so ratified, as reflected at serial nos. (K) and (L) thereunder, and reads thus :

" K) ETHICS COMMISSION Justice (Retd) Mr. V.K. Gupta - Chairman Justice (Retd.) Mr. Bhanwar Singh - Member Shri Uma Kant Uniyai, (Ex. Advocate General) - Member Shri Deepak Jyoti Ghiidiyal (Retd. IPS) - Member Shri Vijay Kumar (IPS) - Member Shri Sudhanshu Mittal· Vice President IOA - Member Shri Anil Khanna- Life President All India Tennis Association - Member Smt. Sudarshan Pathak - Hockey India - Member Shri Shiva Keshwan - Luge - Member (Athlete) (L) ARBITRATION COMMISSION Justice (Retd.) Mr. Madan Mohan Ghildiyal - Chairman Justice (Retd.) Ms. Aruna Suresh - Member Justice (Retd.) Mr. Kailash Gambhir - Member Justice (Retd.) Mr. J.C.S. Rawat - Member Justice (Retd.) Mr. B.C. Kandpal - Member Justice (Retd.) Mrs. Usha Mehra - Member Justice (Retd.) Mr. R. S. Sodhi - Member Shri L.P. Nathan (Ex. Advocate General) - Member Shri Vishwapati Trivedi (Retd. IAS) - Member Shri P.K Tripathi (Retd. IAS) - Member Shri D.K.Mishra (Retd. IAS) - Member Shri B.S. Siddhu (Retd. IPS ) - Member Shri D.C. Mishra (Retd. IPS) - Member"

(vii) The appointment of the Members of the Arbitration Commission and the Ethics Commission of the IOA, so ratified, was further ratified, by the Special General Body Meeting of the IOA, convened on 10th August, 2018. A reading of Agenda Item 5 of the minutes of the said meeting reveals that the appointment, of the aforementioned members of the Ethics Commission and the Arbitration Commission of the IOA, were approved in the Special General Body Meeting.

(viii) Resultantly, the President of the IOA, i.e. Respondent No.4, merely proposed the names of the persons to be appointed as members of the Ethics Commission and the Arbitration Commission of the IOA, and the appointments fructified and crystalised only when they were ratified by the executive council on 2nd June, 2018, and further ratified in the Special General Body Meeting of the IOA, held on 10th August, 2018.

Thus was eminently in accordance with the Memorandum of Association and the Rules and Regulations of the IOA. The appointment of the Members of the Ethics Commission and Arbitration Commission of the IOA, thus regularly effected and ratified twice, first by the Executive Counsel and, later, in the Special General Body Meeting of the IOA, could not have been unilaterally undone by Respondent No. 4, as President of the IOA.

(ix) The term of appointment of the members of the Ethics Commission is to be found in the "Rules of Ethics Commission of Indian Olympic Association", as amended after 27th March, 2019 and annexed as Annexure P-8 to the writ petition. The term of appointment of the Members of the Ethics Commission is set out in clause D of the "Statutes of the IOA Ethics Commission", forming part of the aforesaid Rules. For ready reference, clause D may be reproduced thus :

"D. Term of appointment of Commission members

1. The duration of the term of a

Commission member is four years. Such term is renewable. The term of a person who is a Commission member by virtue of his or her IOA membership shall end when such person ceases to be an IOA Member. He or she may however be appointed as a Commission member in the category of persons who are not IOA Members.

2. The term of office of a Commission member takes effect on the day of his/her appointment is approved by the IOA Executive Board.

3. In the event of the Chairman being impeded from performing his or her duties as Chairman, the longest serving member of the Commission shall perform these functions. In the event of death, resignation or inability of a member to perform his or her functions, the member shall be replaced. Any member of the Commission who is to be replaced shall remain in office until a replacement has been approved by the IOA Executive Board.

4. A Commission member may be removed from office only by a decision of the IOA Executive Board and with the approval of two-

thirds of the Commission members, the member concerned being heard by the Commission."

(Emphasis supplied) The various afore-extracted sub-clauses of clause D of the statutes of the Ethics Commission of the IOA, clearly stipulate the term of appointment of members of the Ethics Commission of the IOA, as four years, to commence from the date of approval of the appointment by the executive board of the IOA. As the appointment of the members of the Ethics Commission, of which the petitioner was one, took place, in the present case, on 2nd June, 2018, the aforesaid period of four years would come to an end only on 2nd June, 2022, and it did not lie within the province of Respondent No. 4, even in his capacity as president of the IOA, to unilaterally curtail this period, by a terse communication to the members.

(x) Further, sub-clause 4 of clause D (extracted hereinabove) indicates that a member of the Ethics Commission of the IOA may be removed from office only by a decision of the IOA executive board and with the approval of two-thirds of the members of the Ethics Commission, after grant of an opportunity of hearing. The decision, of the Respondent No.4, to unilaterally curtail the tenure of the members of the Ethics Commission (including the petitioner) did not, therefore, have the requisite sanction of law, and was in fact, contrary to the statutes of the IOA.

(xi) Mr. Divan fairly states that there is no such express provision regarding the term of members of the Arbitration Commission of the IOA, but submits that, as the term of the Ethics Commission of the IOA is four years, the term of the members of the Arbitration Commission ought, therefore, to be treated as four years. In any case, he submits, it is not open to the petitioner to unilaterally curtail the tenure of any member of the Arbitration Commission either.

(xi) Rule 18.3 of the Rules and Regulations of the IOA, which reads thus :

"18.3. Other Commissions/Committees All required Commissions/Committees will be formed by the President to be ratified by the Executive Council or by the Annual/Special General Meeting."

Reading Rules 16.1.4 and Rule 18.3 in conjunction and juxtaposed with each other, it is clear that the ratification, by the Executive Council, or by the Annual/ Special General Body Meeting of the IOA, is mandatory, for formation of the Ethics Commission of the IOA, and the power of the President, in that regard, is limited to proposing names.

9. Accordingly, Mr. Shyam Divan submits that a clear prima facie case, warranting grant of ad interim injunction, has been made out, in favour of his client. He also submits that the balance of convenience would be in favour of grant of such injunction, as the members of the Ethics Commission and the Arbitration Commission are high ranking officials, and there is no complaint against any of them. Disbanding the said Commissions at this point, in his submission, would be contrary not only to the interest of sports in general but also contrary to the public interest of the nation at large.

10. Mr. Dayan Krishnan, learned Senior Counsel, supports and adopts the submissions of Mr. Shyam Divan.

11. Mr. Siddharth Luthra, learned Senior Counsel, who, like Mr. Dayan Krishnan also claims to represent Respondent No.3, draws my attention, initially, to the opening remarks of the President, IOA, in the minutes of the first Executive Council meeting of the IOA, held on 2nd June, 2018, specifically to the following paragraph in the said remarks:

"We have made important committees, and commissions in IOA and all the names are on our website, the names of all the committee's and commissions were announced, the President informed the council that not all committee/commission were for full time but some were for limited period also."

Mr. Luthra points out therefore that the President of the IOA had informed the Executive Council that some of the committees/commissions enjoyed only limited period of tenure.

12. He, thereafter, drew my attention to Agenda Item No. 1, in the said meeting, whereby the minutes of the executive council, of 9th November, 2017, were approved and ratified by the house of the IOA. It was pointed out that, at the very commencement of the said paragraph, it was noted that



the President had informed the house that the list of the various committees/commissions and other staff appointments stood uploaded on the website of the IOA. In conjunction therewith, Mr. Luthra invites my attention to page 265 of the writ petition, which sets out the following list :

"MEMBERS OF IOA ETHICS COMMISSION 2017-2019

- 1) Justice (Retd.) Mr. V.K. Gupta Chairman
- 2) Justice (Retd.) Mr. Bhanwar Singh Member
- 3) Mr. Uma Kant Uniyal, Member (Ex.Advocate General)
- 4) Mr. Deepak Jyoti Ghildiyal, Member (Retd. IPS)
- 5) Mr. Vijay Kumar (IPS) Member
- 6) Mr. Sudhanshu Mittal Member
- 7) Mr. Anil Khanna Member
- 8) Mrs. Sudershan Pathak Member
- 9) Mr. Shiva Keshavan Member"

13. Mr. Luthra seeks to submit that the reference, to "2017-2019", at the head of the afore-extracted list, which had been uploaded on the website of the IOA and to which Agenda Item No. 2, in the minutes of the First Executive Council Meeting dated 2nd June, 2018, supra made reference, clearly indicated that the term of the members of the Ethics Commission - including that of the petitioner, was only from 2017- 2019.

14. Mr. Luthra also sought to submit that various members of the Ethics Commission of the IOA, while responding to the impugned communications dated 19th May, 2020, addressed to them - in which it was specifically stated that their tenure had come to an end - had expressed their desire not to continue, which impliedly amounted to an acknowledgement that their term had indeed come to an end. He also points out that no interim injunction, against the Members, who, themselves were not interested in continuing with their assignments, could be granted by this Court.

15. Ms. Shyel Trehan, learned counsel representing Respondent No. 4, has invited attention to the afore-extracted list of members of the Ethics Commission of the IOA and sought to contend that this list was, in fact, part of the Rules and Regulations of the Ethics Commission. At best, therefore, she submits that the reference, at the head of this list, to the "2017-2019" period may be treated as representing an internal conflict in the body of the Rules and Regulations, as it was contrary to the stipulation, in the Rules and Regulations, that the term of members of the Ethics Commission would be four years.

16. Having heard learned Counsel, I have applied my mind to the prima facie merits of the submissions advanced by both sides.

17. The petitioner, admittedly, is a member of the Ethics Commission of the IOA, and not a member of the Arbitration Commission of the IOA. In his capacity as a member of the Ethics Commission, and as Vice-President of the IOA, it may be permissible for him, to point out perceived irregularities in the decision, of Respondent No. 4, in the communications addressed by him to the members of the Arbitration Commission. However, as no member of the Arbitration Commission has joined as a petitioner in these proceedings, I am restraining the scope of this interim order to the impugned communications, insofar as they affect the petitioner and other members of the Ethics Commission of the IOA, though notice has been issued on the writ petition in general.

18. I am also inclined to do so, in view of the fair submission, of Mr. Shyam Divan, that there was no prescribed or stipulated statutory period of tenure of Members of the Arbitration Commission of the IOA, as exists in the case of the Members of the Ethics Commission.

19. Apropos the impugned communications dated 19th May, 2020, addressed to the members of the Ethics Commission of the IOA, by Respondent No. 4, I am of the view that, for the following reasons, a clear prima facie case exists, in favour of the petitioner :

(i) The rules of the Ethics Commission of the IOA clearly stipulates a period of four years as the term of appointment of the member of the Ethics Commission, to take effect from the date of approval of the appointment by the Executive Committee of the IOA. The said approval, in the present case, having taken place on 2nd June, 2018, the tenure of the Members of the Ethics Commission could not have been curtailed prior thereto, without any due sanction of law therefor. It is a well settled principle, enunciated by the Supreme Court in inter alia, Dr. L. P. Agarwal vs. U.O.I.1 that a tenure appointment cannot be curtailed, prior to the expiry of tenure, unless a provision to do so exist in the applicable rules and regulations, and for a good reason.

(ii) The minutes of the AGM, dated 14th December, 2017, followed by the minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting dated 2nd June, 2018 and the ratification of the said minutes in the Special General Body Meeting of the IOA, dated 10th August, 2018 do not indicate that the appointment of the members of the Ethics Commission of the IOA was for any stipulated tenure.

(iii) In view thereof, I am unwilling, prima facie, to accept the recital of "2017-2019" figuring at the end of the list of members of the IOA (reproduced at Para 11, supra), as representing a two year tenure of the appointment of the said members. No such tenure is reflected in any of the minutes, whereby the appointment was proposed, recommended, made or approved.

The reasons for entering the recital, "2017-2019", at the head of the list of members is not immediately apparent; in any event, it cannot supersede the specific stipulation, in the rules and

regulations of the Ethics Commission, delineating the tenure of the members of the Ethics Commission as four years. I am unable to accept the submission, of Ms. Shyel Trehan, that the reference to "2017-2019", at the head of the list of members of the Ethics Commission should be regarded as implying a conflict in the rule position.

(iv) The Rules of the Ethics Commission, to which Mr. Divan invited my attention, clearly not only sets out the term of (1992) 3 SCC 526 appointment of members of the Ethics Commission as four years, but also stipulates that a member of the Ethics Commission could be removed only by the Executive Committee of the IOA, with approval of 2/3rd of the members of the Executive Committee, after grant of personal hearing. It was, *prima facie*, therefore not permissible for Respondent No. 4 to unilaterally issue letters to the members of the Ethics Commission, stating that their tenure had come to an end.

(v) Even otherwise, the record does not disclose the basis on which it was presumed, in the impugned letters dated 19 th May, 2020, by Respondent No.4, that the term of the members of the Ethics Commission had come to an end. Mr. Divan is correct in pointing out that there was no earlier communication or meeting, wherein any term of appointment had been fixed, for the members of the Ethics Commission. Rather, the letters (extracted hereinbefore) whereby the Ethics Commission was constituted, including the present petitioner as a member thereof, does not stipulate any tenure, or term of appointment of the said members. As such, even on facts, the reference, to the coming to an end of the term of appointment of the members of the Ethics Commission, as contained in the impugned communications dated 19th May, 2020, does not appeal to this court.

20. I am also in agreement, *prima facie*, with Mr. Divan's submission that the Respondent No.4 could not, unilaterally, have taken a decision to discontinue the tenure of the members of the Ethics Commission, or determined that the term of the said members had come to an end. No material to indicate that the said decision was ever put to the Executive Committee or were put up before or ratified by the Executive Committee or by the Special or Annual General Body Meeting of the IOA. The decision, indeed, appears to be a totally unilateral decision of the Respondent No.4, which, *prima facie*, is not sustainable in law.

21. In view thereof, I am of the opinion that a clear *prima facie* case has been made out, for staying the operation of the impugned communications, dated 19th May, 2020, insofar as they apply to the members of the Ethics Commission of the IOA, is made out. I am also in agreement with Mr. Divan that, as the said members have been holding office since 2018, and the period of four years would expire only in 2022, and there is on record, no complaint against any of the said members, or any other justifiable reason to treat the term of appointment of the Ethics Commission having come to an end, the balance of convenience would also in favour of staying the operation of the said orders.

22. If such stay is not granted and the orders are allowed to take effect, I am of the view that irreparable loss would enure to the Members of the Ethics Commission including the petitioner.

23. Learned counsel for the respondents pray for an opportunity to respond to the present IA for interim relief, and, therefore, request that the present order be ad interim in nature, till the next date of hearing.

24. As such and for the reasons aforementioned, the impugned letters dated 19th May, 2020, insofar as they apply to the members of the Ethics Commission of the IOA (including the present petitioner), shall stand stayed till the next date of hearing.

25. Let notice issue on the CM, to the respondents, to file response within four weeks with advance copy to the petitioner who may file rejoinder thereto, if any.

26. As noted hereinabove, till the next date of hearing in the CM, the operation of the impugned letters, insofar as they apply to the members of the Ethics Commission of the IOA (including the petitioner), shall stand stayed.

27. Apropos Mr. Luthra's submission that one of the members of the Ethics Commission had expressed their desire not to continue in their capacity as such a Member, it would be open for him to place the necessary documents in that regard and on the basis thereof, seeking variation in this order, if deemed appropriate.

28. Renotify on 30th July, 2020.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

JUNE 12, 2020 kr