SCRUTINY OF THE NOMINATION PAPERS

Ref: AICF /ELECTION/RO/008 Date: 10.11.2018

Attendance of the persons present in the Scrutiny of the Nomination Papers: The following persons are present.

1. Mr. Partha Sakha Datta, Returning Officer.
2. Ms. Anwesha Saha, Assistant to Returning Officer.
3. Mr. Paramhans Sahani , Assistant to Returning Officer.
4. Wazid Ali, Assistant to Returning Officer (Group –D)
5. S.K.Sharma
6. Md. Sayeed
7. Satyajeet Sarin
8. Arun Ramakant Kedar
9. V.D.Narayan
10. Bharat Narayan
11. Dikbi Gangkak
12. Vijay Kumar

Parthasakha Datta

1. Today a good deal of discussion has taken place in the presence of contesting candidates in the matter of Scrutiny of Nominations of the candidates who have filed nominations in respect of different posts.
2. There are 53 names in the list of Electoral College supplied to me by the President of All India Carrom Federation in FORM NO. 1. 52 nominations have been received in FORM NO.2 following which list of nominated candidates was finally published and displayed in the conspicuous place of my office in addition to E-mailing the same to the E-mail I.D of A.I.C.F with a request to the President/ General Secretary to put it in the website of their Federation. Accordingly AICF has in the afternoon of yesterday have displayed a signed copy of the list of nominated candidates. As par list of nominated candidates prepared in FORM 3 there are following posts

a) President	One Post
b) Executive President	One Post
c) Senior Vice president	One Post
d) Vice Presidents	Four Posts
e) General Secretary	One Post
f) Treasurer	One Post
g) Asstt. General Secretary	One Post
h) Joint Secretaries	5 Posts One post for each for

North, East, South, West and North East

i) Members Working Committee — Six Post

j) Director(Technical) — One Post

k) Director (Media) — One Post

l) Dy. Secretary (Marketing) — One Post

As against the above posts the following nominations have been received

a. President - 3

b. Executive President -3

c. Senior Vice President – 2

d. Vice President -8

e. General Secretary -4

f. Assistant General Secretary -2

g. Treasurer -3

h. Joint Secretary -10

i. Technical Director-1

j. Deputy Secretary Marketing -2

k. Director Media-1

l. Members Working Committee-13.

3. At the outset of the Scrutiny Mr.S.K.Sharma and Mr. Vijay Kumar submitted two representation in exactly identical language in identical paragraphs and in fact they are one representation alleging the following

a) State Associations of Tamil Nadu, Hyderabad, Tripura and Mizoram have not been included in the Electoral College without any reasons,.

b) The name of S.K.Sharma has not been included in the Electoral College without any reason.

c) Four new State Associations with new names and titles in place of existing State Associations of U.P, Pondicherry, Punjab and Orissa have been included.

d) Different 8 ineligible persons have been included in the Electoral College.

e) Legally valid General Secretaries of two properly State Associations of Kerala and Gujarat have not been accepted and instead four new names have been included who cannot contest election.

f) The name submitted by Presidents of Two State Associations namely Assam and Rajasthan have been accepted by rejecting the names submitted by the General Secretaries of those two State Associations.

Parthasarthi Dalbe

4. Mr. V.D.Narayan who has been authorized to make submissions at the table of Scrutiny by the General Secretary, AICF submits that it was Mr. S.K. Sharma who at the time of Scrutiny of the last election held in Guwahati in 2015 submitted before the Returning Officer of that Election the following

"Mr. S.K. Sharma and Mr. B.K. Haranth stated that returning officer should not interfere in the list of Electoral College finalized by the General Secretary of the Federation. After some discussion the returning the returning officer decided that it should be decided by the Federation *General Secretary/President after verifying the facts."*

5. Mr. Narayan further draws my attention to clause 6 of Model Election Guidelines in support of his submission that no person can be candidate for any of the post of election unless his name appears in the list of Electoral College and this is also applicable to Proposer and Seconder.

6. It appears FORM NO.2 itself signifies that the candidates must be one whose name would appear in the List of Electoral College and so far as Proposer and Seconder is concerned Clause 6 expressly makes the position clears.

7. The Returning Officer has no role to play in the question as to whether a person has been rightly or wrongly included or excluded from the list of Electoral College. As to the Returning Officer, sub-clause (6) of Clause 4 dealing with "Electoral College" says that the President/Secretary General shall also

furnish a duly authenticated copy of the list mentioned in sub-clause(5) to the Returning Officer as soon as may be after his appointment by the President of ----under clause (5) below." Clause 5 of the Guidelines speaks of Returning Officer in these words that the President of the Federation shall nominate a person as Returning Officer for conduct of election. The scope of jurisdiction of the Returning Officer(R.O) , as the " Guidelines" show is very limited. These Guidelines which I understand to have been framed by the Government of India in the Sports Ministry, allows the R.O to function only on the basis of the list of the authorized representatives of the Member States /Union Territories/Boards/Institutions in Form 1 as may be furnished by the President/ Secretary General of the Federation . A proper reading of the Clause 6 of the Guidelines shows that nomination in Form 2 has to be on the basis of the Form 1. not otherwise. Clause 7 dealing with Scrutiny of Nominations authorizes the R.O to scrutinize the nominations as may be received in Form 2. Now, sub-clause (2) of Clause 7 is important in this that at the scrutiny each candidate or his/her authorized representative shall have the right of audience to hear any objection in relation to nomination of a candidate for the post for which he/she has filed his/her nomination. A conjoint reading of the "Guidelines", to my understanding, leaves no scope to the R.O to determine as to who is rightly to be declared or adjudicated upon as 'Permanent Member'. This function is the internal function of the AICF vis-a-vis the affiliated unit. The fight between different individuals and the official body of the AICF or between one faction of a state unit and another

Parthasarathi Sen

faction of the same state unit or between one faction of a State unit and the official body of the AICF in the matter of deciding upon the question as to which body should be recognized as the legal and valid body so as to have legal right of of filing nomination for the purpose of election is not to be decided by the R.O. The " Guidelines" does not confer any power to the R.O to interfere with the decision of the President/General Secretary of the Federation. Had the "Guidelines " provided any such clause leaving any power to the R.O so as to decide as to who has right to file nomination then certainly assuming jurisdiction by the RO would have been proper and warranted but exercise of power not declared by the law would be counter productive in as much as in that case the R.O would have to explain his conduct not declared by the law in the Court of Law. As a corollary to the above, in the matter of Scrutiny of Nominations, the R.O has to hear objections as to only the validity of nomination filed by one candidate as against another. Closely studied, hearing objections does not extend to those whose names do not find any berth in Form 1 furnished by the President of the Federation. Therefore, though it may appear to be painful, the R.O has not been given any power to afford any hearing to those left out of the Electoral College.

8. Mr. S.K.Sharma submits in his representation that as per the model Election guidelines and rules of the Federation Election has to be held in the AGM and as AGM has not been convened the election is

bad in law. This objection cannot be raised at the table of scrutiny because here we are to consider which nomination paper survives the test of scrutiny. The question as to whether or why the AGM has been convened or not cannot be addressed to R.O since this is the internal business of AICF. The RO has to conduct the election as per the Model Election Guidelines and not to conduct sitting over the AGM.

9. Of the 52 nomination papers upon submissions , scrutiny and hearing of objections no candidate is found to be even nearing 70 years of age and barring few most of the candidate are self employed and/or dealing in business. On these point there has been too much of dispute .

10. As to the candidature of Neeraj Kumar Sampathy no objection has been raised by the rival candidates. Neeraj Kumar Sampathy whose name appears in Serial No. 5 of the Electoral College is accepted .

11. The candidature of another Presidential Candidate Mr Rakibul Hussain has also not been opposed by anybody. This candidate is said to be aged 55 years and is a Political Worker being a member of Legislative Assembly. Therefore, nomination paper of Rakibul Hussain whose name appears in Serial No.7 of the list of Electoral College is accepted .

12. Girish Bachharaj Vyas whose name appears in serial no.52 of the list of Electoral College for the post of Executive President remains not objected to by the rival candidates. His nomination is found to be valid and proper, hence accepted.

13. The candidature of Mr. S.K.Sharma who has given lengthy address is objected to by Shri V.D.Narayan representing Girish Bachharaj Vyas on the ground that the name of Mr. S.K.Sharma does not appear in the list of Electoral College. Mr. Sharma argues that the writing of the Serial No. in FORM NO.2 is not mandatory and that Electoral College has been prepared by the present President and Present General Secretary removing his name shockingly. He, of course, does not contest the point that the present President and Present General Secretary can prepare the list of Electoral College but they cannot remove the names without the approval of the Management Committee and his name was there in the Electoral College of the Election of 2015 . It is submitted by Mr. V.D. Narayan that the question of the preparation of Electoral College is outside the purview of R.O. It is further submitted by V.D.Narayan that Mr Sharma has been banned by International Carrom Federation and produces a letter dated 07.05.2016 addressed to AICF by ICF for a period of 4 years on the ground of causing harm to the image of Carrom in the world. Mr Sharma on the other hand produces a letter of ICF dated 19.05.2018 signed by Saeed Mohamed, Secretary General to the effect that ban has been lifted. Mr Narayan again

produces another letter of ICF by the President and Vice President of the ICF addressed to Saeed Mohamed warning Mr. Saeed Mohamed of issuing letter without the consent of the Executive Committee of ICF. At the same breath Mr. Sharma says that he is not a member of this ICF and he cannot be suspended and moreover no decision has been taken by the Board about his suspension and there has been no communication in this aspect by AICF. Mr V.D.Narayan submitted a copy of an E-mail dated 18.10.2017 addressed by AICF to a good number of people informing inter alia that Federation cannot communicate with Mr. S.K.Sharma as he has been banned for a period of four years from 2016. All the correspondences and Emails are taken on record. It is not necessary to go into details as to whether Mr S.K.Sharma has been banned or not validly or otherwise or ban has been lifted or not. It is not the jurisdiction of the R.O to enquire or call for explanation from AICF as to why the name of the S.K.Sharma does not appear in the list of the Electoral College . The function and jurisdiction of RO has been dealt with at Paragraph 7 above and no repeatation is called for .Hence the candidature of Mr. S.K.Sharma for the post of Execute President could not be accepted.

14. The candidature of Pradip Kumar Hazarika for the post of Executive President is also opposed by Mr. V.D.Narayan on the ground that his name also does not appear in the list of the Electoral College . Mr. Vijay Kumar on the other hand submits that Mr. Hazarika is the General Secretary of Assam Carrom

Association and he has right to cast vote and to be a candidate and willingly his name has not been included in AICF Electoral College and this has to be correctly included. Mr Sharma further submits that name of Mr. Hazarika has wrongly and intentionally excluded as per wrong interpretation of Clause 4 of the Sports Code General Secretary cannot be removed. Mr. Narayan draws attention to clause 4 (2) of the Guidelines which speaks for itself. Be that as it may, since the name of Mr. Pradip Kumar Hazarika does not appear in the list of Electoral College his nomination can not be considered to be valid one.

15. The Candidature of Mr. Baij Nath Singh is not objected to except the ground of age which is satisfied by Mr. V.D. Narayan by showing his Aadhar Card where in his age is shown as 69 years. Therefore, his nomination is accepted for the post of Sr. Vice President.

16. As regards Jaiprakash Thakur for the post of Sr. Vice President his nomination has not been objected to. Therefore, his nomination is accepted for the post of Sr. Vice President.

17. As regards the post of Vice President the candidature of Shivkumar Uday Lad is not objected to. Therefore, his nomination is accepted for the post of Vice President.

18. As regards the post of Vice President the candidature of Mahesh Sekhri is strongly opposed to by Mr Vijay Kumar and Mr. Sharma on the ground that he is a bank officer and cannot participate in the election in view of Govt. Of India Circular No. F.No.9-38/2016-SP-I dated 14.02.2017 and Govt. Of India

Circular No. 14-82/2009-SP-1V dated 04.02.2010. Para 2 of the Circular dated 04.02.2010 reads as follows :

" It is presumed that State Government /UT Administration have already framed similar rules/instructions for regulating the association of the Government Servants borne on their strength with the sport Associations/Federations. If not already formulated, it is requested that appropriate rules/instructions suitably incorporating the above mentioned provisions of the Govt. Of India may kindly be formulated.'

This paragraph does not relate to PSU's. Para 2 of the Circular dated 04.02.1017 reads as follows:

" The issue of holding elective post by the employees of Public Sector Undertaking (PSUs)/autonomous bodies of Union and State Government has been considered in this Ministry and this has been decided that employees of PSUs/autonomous bodies of Union/State Governments will also governed by the same principle as applicable to Government servants."

This circular refers to the circular dated 04.02.2010 wherein there was no mention of PSU's .In this connection I have been taken to the decision in W.P(C) 6159/2011 and W.P (C) 1980/2011 DATED 05.01.2012Shyam Singh Yadav Versus National Rifle Association Of India . Paragraph 5 of the Judgment is referred to which is this:

"On 04.02.2010, the Government of India through the Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports, Department of Sports, issued a circular addressed to the Chief Secretaries of all the State Governments and Union Territories, and to Sports Secretaries of Governments of all State Governments and Union Territories on the subject of adoption of norms relating to obtaining of prior governmental sanction for contesting and canvassing in elections to sport bodies. This circular took note of the fact that a number of government servants of the State Governments and the Union Territories Administration are holding posts in various sports associations and bodies at the national level, state level and district level. It pointed out that holding of elective office by government servants by the Central Government is regulated by the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964 [CCS (Conduct) Rules]. In terms of Rule 15(1) of the CCS (Conduct) Rules, previous sanction of the Central Government is required to hold an elective office in any body. Under Rule 12 of the CCS (Conduct) Rules, previous sanction of the Government or the prescribed authority is also necessary for a government servant, associating himself with raising of any funds or other collections, in pursuance of any object whatsoever."

The CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964 and the Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi provide that prior permission of Central Government is necessary in respect of Central Government Employees but in respect of PSU's no statutory rules have been shown and the Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi is also silent on this point. In this circumstances it is difficult to reject the candidature of Mahesh Sekhri . Hence, nomination of this candidate is accepted.

19.The candidature of Prabhjeet Singh Baccher for the post of Vice President is not objected to, hence accepted.

20.The candidature of Francis Serrao for the post of Vice President is not objected to hence accepted.

21. The candidature of Sandeep Verma for the post of Vice President is not objected to, hence accepted.

22. The candidature of Zulfiqar Ali for the post of Vice President is opposed by Mr V.D.Narayan and Mr. Arun Kedar on the ground that his name does not appear in the list of Electoral College and also the name of the Seconder does not appear in the list of the Electoral College. Mr Vijay Kumar submits that his name has been wrongly included. Firstly, what I have observed in paragraph 7 above applies here and secondly, the candidate as per the guidelines and as per the rules have to be member of Electoral College . Hence, the name of Zulfiqar Ali cannot be accepted.

23. The candidature of Rebeka Sultana for the post of Vice President is accepted as not been opposed to.

24. The candidature of Anil Kumar Gupta for the post of Vice President is accepted as not been opposed to.

25. As to the Post of General Secretary V.D.Narayan's candidature is objected by Mr. Vijay Kumar on the ground that he cannot participate because he works in L.I.C as Higher Grade Assistant and already served for 4 years in the Federation. The reasoning assigned to in respect of candidature of Mahesh Sekhri in paragraph 18 equally applies to the case of V.D.Narayan and, moreover, Mr. Narayan produced a letter of NOC dated 30.10.2018 issued by L.I.C conveying permission granted by the Competent Authority to contest Election to AICF .The letter is kept on the file. Therefore, candidature of V.D.Narayan is accepted.

26. The candidature of Bharati Narayan for the post of General Secretary is accepted as not been opposed to. Moreover, she is a first ttimer to the election and also produces a NOC from her employer dated 17.10.2018 which is kept on record.

27. The two nominations of Mr Vijay Kumar to the Post of General Secretary is accepted as not being opposed to.

28. As to post of Asst. General Secretary the candidature of Khursheed khan is not objected to, hence accepted.

29. As to post of Asst. General Secretary the candidature of Gaurav Sharma is not objected to, hence accepted.

30. For the post of Treasurer the two nominations of Arun RamKant Kedar is accepted as not being opposed to.

31. For the post of Treasurer the nominations of S.Shobanraj is opposed to by Arun Kedar on the ground that his name does not appear in the list of Electoral College. Mr Vijay Kumar submits that his name has been wrongly excluded. Firstly, what I have observed in paragraph 7 above applies here and secondly, the candidate as per the guidelines and as per the rules have to be member of Electoral College . Hence, the name of S.Shobanraj cannot be accepted.

32. The candidature of Mr. Mukul Kumar Jha for the post of General Secretary East is opposed by Mr Vijay Kumar on the ground that he is a school teacher. There is no document as to whether the school he serves is a Govt school or private school. Ordinarily a school teacher is not known to be a Central Govt Employee or State Govt. Employee. School is not a PSU. Hence, objection is over ruled and nomination is accepted.

33. The candidature of Sri Ranjan Mohanty for the post of General Secretary is opposed by Mr V.D.Narayan on the ground that his name does not appear in the list of Electoral College, while Mr. Vijay Kumar submits that his name has been wrongly excluded though his name was forwarded by the President of State Carrom Association. Firstly, what I have observed in paragraph 7 above applies here and secondly, the candidate as per the guidelines and as per the rules have to be member of Electoral College. Hence, the name of Sri Ranjan Mohanty cannot be accepted.

34-37. The candidatures of Dinanath Pilarehekar for the post of Joint Secretary North, of V.Subramani for the post of Joint Secretary South, Of Bharti Narayan for the post of Joint Secretary North, of Aarif Ahmad Khan for the post of Joint Secretary North (Aarif Ahmad Khan's name appears at Serial No.26 in the list of Electoral College) are accepted as not opposed.

Parthasarathe Dutta

38. The candidatures of Bibek Goswami for the post of Joint Secretary North East is opposed to by Mr. Vijay Kumar on the ground that Mr Goswami cannot represent Assam because Assam is represented by Mr. P.K.Hazarika. This objection is overruled on the ground that the name of the P.K.Hazarika does not appear in the list of Electoral College while the name of Bibek Goswami appears in the list of Electoral College . Hence the nomination of Bibek Goswami is accepted.

39. The candidatures of Dikbi Gangkak for the post of Joint Secretary North East is accepted as not being opposed to.

40. The candidature of Mrs Nirmala Mahant is opposed to by Mr Arun Kedar on the ground that her name is not included in the list of Electoral College nor the names of the proposer and seconder do not appear in the list of Electoral college. Mr Vijay Kumar sought to represent Mrs Nirmala Mahant but Mr Kedar submits that Mr Vijay Kumar has no authority to represent her.Hence the candidature of Nirmala Mahant is not accepted.

41. The candidatures of Kakula Subba Rao for the post of Joint Secretary South is accepted as not being opposed .

42. The candidatures of Bharat Bhusan for the post of Technical Director is accepted as not being opposed .

43. The candidatures of Vrajesh Jindal for the post of Dy. Secretary Marketing is opposed by Mr Vijay Kumar on the ground that his name has been wrongly included in the list of Electoral College. Firstly, what I have observed in paragraph 7 above applies here and secondly, the candidate as per the guidelines and as per the rules have to be member of Electoral College. Hence, the name of Vrajesh Jindal is accepted.

44. The candidatures of Aamir Khan for the post of Dy. Secretary Marketing is not opposed . Hence accepted.

45. The candidatures of Prem Das for the post of Director (Media) is accepted as not being opposed to.

46 . The candidatures of Madhya Pradesh Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee is accepted as not being opposed to.

47. The candidatures of Pondicherry Amateur Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee is opposed by Mr Vijay Kumar on ground that Pondicherry is represented by S.Uday Kumar and Mr Raja Kanu .The Submision of Mr Vijay Kumar is not borne out by records . ence, candidature of Pondicherry Amateur Carrom Association is accepted.

48. The candidatures of Chandigargh Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee is accepted as not being opposed to.

49. The candidatures of Uttar Pradesh Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee is opposed by Vijay Kumar on the ground that U.P Carrom Association is not the original Carrom Association but the name of this Association appers in Serial No.46 of the Electoral College. Hence accepted.

50. The candidatures of Himalchal Pradesh State Carrom Association, , of Delhi Carrom Association , of Haryana Carrom Association, of All Arunachal Pradesh Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee are accepted as not being opposed to.

51. The candidatures of Orissa State Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee is opposed by Mr V.D.Narayan on the ground that the name of the seconder does not appear in the list of Electoral College. Hence rejected

52. The candidatures of Andhra State Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee is accepted as not being opposed to.

53. The candidatures of Gujrat State Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee is opposed by Mr V.D.Narayan on the ground that the name of the seconder is not included in the list of Electoral College. Hence not accepted.

54. The candidatures of Chattisgarh Pradesh Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee is accepted as not being opposed to.

55. The candidatures of Meghalaya Carrom Association for the post of Member Working Committee is accepted as not being opposed to. Hence FORM -4 is as follows:

All India Carrom Federation

Election of Office Bearers and Members of Managing Committee, (Working Committee) AICF

FORM 4

LIST OF VALIDLY NOMINATED CANDIDATES

NAME OF THE POST	NAME, SL. NO. IN ELECTORAL COLLEGE LIST OF CANDIDATE	Name of Member State/ Union Territory/ Board/ Institution
PRESIDENT	NEERAJ KUMAR SAMPATHY-5	Andhra State Carrom Association
PRESIDENT	RAKIBUL HUSSAIN - 7	Assam Carrom Association
PRESIDENT	RAKIBUL HUSSAIN - 7	Assam Carrom Association
EXECUTIVE PRESIDENT	GIRISH BACHHARAJ VYAS – 52	VidarbhaCarrom Association
SENIOR VICE -PRESIDENT	BAIJ NATH SINGH – 46	Uttar Pradesh Carrom Association
SENIOR VICE-PRESIDENT	JAIPRAKASH THAKUR-44	Rajasthan CarromAssocition
VICE -PRESIDENT	SHIVKUMAR UDAY LAD – 36	Maharashtra Carrom Association
VICE -PRESIDENT	MAHESH SEKHRI – 14	Chandigarh Carrom Association
VICE - PRESIDENT	PRABHJEET SINGH BACHHER – 53	VidarbhaCarrom Association
VICE -PRESIDENT	FRANCIS SERRAO -19	Goa Carrom Association
VICE -PRESIDENT	SANDEEP VERMA-15	Chhattisgarh Pradesh CarromAssociaiton
VICE -PRESIDENT	REBEKA SULTANA-12	Carrom (29") Association of Bengal
VICE -PRESIDENT	ANIL KUMAR GUPTA-51	The Uttranchal State CarromAssociaition
GENERAL SECRETARY	VIVEK DHEESH NARAYAN - 17	Delhi Carrom Association

GENERAL SECRETARY	BHARTI NARAYAN -18	Delhi Carrom Association
GENERAL SECRETARY	VIJAY KUMAR-16	Chhattisgarh Pradesh State Carrom Association
GENERAL SECRETARY	VIJAY KUMAR-16	
ASSTT. GENERAL SECRETARY	KHURSHEED KHAN – 34	M.P. State Carrom Association
ASSTT. GENERAL SECRETARY	GAURAV SHARMA-23	Haryana Carrom Association
TREASURER	ARUN RAMAKANT KEDAR – 37	Maharashtra CarromAssociaiton
TREASURER	ARUN RAMAKANT KEDAR – 37	Maharashtra CarromAssociaiton
JOINT SECRETARY EAST	MUKUL KUMAR JHA – 28	Jharkhand State CarromAssociaiton
JOINT SECRETARY WEST	DINANATH PILARHEKAR – 20	Goa Carrom Association
JOINT SECRETARY SOUTH	V. SUBRAMANI – 30	Karnataka State Carrom Association
JOINT SECRETARY NORTH	BHARTI NARAYAN – 18	Delhi Carrom Association
JOINT SECRETARY NORTH	AARIF AHMAD KHAN -26	Jammu & Kashmir State Carrom Association
JOINT SECRETARY NORTH EAST	BIBEK GOSWAMI – 8	Assam Carrom Association
JOINT SECRETARY NORTH EAST	DIKBI GANGKAK-2	All Arunachal Pradesh Carrom Association
JOINT SECRETARY SOUTH	KAKULA SUBBA RAO-6	Andhra State Carrom Association
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR	BHARAT BHUSHAN – 9	Bihar State Carrom Association
DY. SECRETARY MARKETING	VRAJESH JINDAL – 21	Gujarat State Carrom Association
DY. SECRETARY MARKETING	AAMIR KHAN-27	Jammu & Kashmir State Carrom Association
DIRECTOR MEDIA	PREM DASS - 24	Himachal Pradesh Carrom Association
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	MADHYA PRADESH CARROM ASSOCIATION - 34	
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	PONDICHERRY AMATEUR CARROM ASSOCIATION - 49	

MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	CHANDIGARH CARROM ASSOCIATION – 14	
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	UTTAR PRADESH CARROM ASSOCIATION-46	
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	HIMACHAL PRADESH STATE CARROM ASSOCIATION - 24	
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	DELHI CARROM ASSOCIATION – 17,	
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	HARYANA CARROM ASSOCIATION-23	
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	ALL ARUNACHAL PRADESH CARROM ASSOCIATION-1	
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	ANDHRA STATE CARROM ASSOCIATION-5/6	
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	CHATTISGARH PRADESH CARROM ASSOCIATION-15/16	
MEMBER WORKING COMMITTEE	MEGHALAYA CARROM ASSOCIATION- 38/39	

Returning Officer,

Place: New Delhi

Date: 10.11.2018