



W.P. No.13859-2025

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT INDORE**

**BEFORE**

**HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUBODH ABHYANKAR**

**ON THE 2<sup>nd</sup> OF MAY, 2025**

**WRIT PETITION No. 13859 of 2025**

***MINOR SUKHMAN SINGH THROUGH HIS FATHER SHRI  
KULJEET SINGH HUNJAN***

*Versus*

***ADDITIONAL REGISTRAR AND OTHERS***

---

**Appearance:**

***Shri Neeraj Kumar Soni - Advocate for the petitioner.***

***Shri Kushal Goyal- Dy. A.G. for the State.***

***Shri Ajay Bagadia Senior Advocate with Shri Devansh Awal-  
Advocate for the respondent Nos.2 and 3.***

---

**ORDER**

Heard.

**2]** This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following reliefs:-

“Therefore, the petitioner humbly prays that this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to:

a) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or order to directing respondent no. 2 and 3, MPCA to reinstate the petitioner’s son in the divisional level Under- 13 tournament organized in the duration of 2024-2025 and permit him to participate.

b) Issue a writ for the eligibility of a cricket player for the boys U-13 MPCA determination of age process of any player has to be declare null and void and set aside the present selection process and issue the direction to the R-2 and R-3 to revise the process of age determination which is to be fair and just.



W.P. No.13859-2025

- c) Issue a direction or any appropriate writ against the respondent No.2 and 3 regarding the present process of verification of the age of the petitioner and other players who would participate in other tournaments due to maintain the transparency of selection process.
- d) Issue any other relief, which this Hon'ble court deems fit in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case."

3] The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 09.04.2025, whereby, the respondent M.P. Cricket Association has rejected the petitioner's representation holding that his skeletal age, as on 01.09.2025, would be 15.5 years, although his actual age is less than thirteen years. The petitioner has challenged the criteria adopted by the respondent in arriving at the proper age of the petitioner, as according to the petitioner, even as on 01.09.2025, he would be entitled to play, giving the concession of six months, which was earlier granted to him.

4] A reply to the petition has also been filed, and Shri Ajay Bagadiya, learned senior counsel for the respondent Nos.2 and 3 has referred to the Eligibility Rules of MPCA, and it is submitted that to ascertain the proper age of a player, Tanner-Whitehouse Test (also called TW3 test), in which the skeletal maturity of a player is ascertained, is applied.

5] Counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the checklist for eligibility rules/conditions wherein, it is provided that the age of the players above ten years and less than thirteen years is ascertained in the applicable entry year, as on the cutoff date *i.e.*, 01<sup>st</sup> of September of the tournament year, by applying the TW3 test. It is submitted that the petitioner's entry year was 2022-23, wherein, it was found that his skeletal age is 13.5 years as on 01.09.2023, however, the petitioner was still allowed to play in that year in the age group of under 13 years, after giving the leeway of around six months. It is submitted that the procedure is that every year, one year is



W.P. No.13859-2025

added to the TW3 age to come to the proper skeletal age of that particular year, and hence, in the year 2024-2025, two years have been added to his age of 13.5 years, which was in the year 2022-2023. Thus, it is submitted that the skeletal age of the petitioner would be 15.5 years as on 01.09.2025 when the tournament starts, and in such circumstances, he cannot be allowed to play in the age group of Under-13 years, and even after giving the leeway of six months, he cannot be said to be a player under thirteen years, as his skeletal age is 15.5 years.

**6]** Counsel has also drawn the attention of this Court to Annexure-R/3, wherein, in similar circumstances, the claim of the player was rejected.

**7]** Heard counsel for the parties and perused the record.

**8]** From the record, it is found that so far as the MPCA Players Eligibility Rules and Procedure is concerned, which is filed along with the reply, it is provided that all the players are required to undergo the skeletal maturity test as provided under the Players Registration Rules and Procedure. It is also found that as per the impugned order, the skeletal age of the petitioner in the year 2022-23, as on 01.09.2023 was 13.5 years, in which year, he was also allowed to play, by giving the concession of six months, whereas, in the year 2024-2025, i.e., after two years, his skeletal age has become 15.5 years, adding two years to his earlier age, which was determined in the year 2022-2023.

**9]** In such circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the respondents have rightly rejected the claim of the petitioner to play Under-13 tournament, as his skeletal age has been found to be 15.5 years as per the Rules and Procedure of MPCA, which is applicable to all the players alike. This court is also of the considered opinion that the action of the



W.P. No.13859-2025

respondent in applying the TW3 test to all the players cannot be said to be arbitrary, unjust or discriminatory, and on the contrary, this appears to be the only way to ensure that no player shall have the undue advantage over the other players of his age group only because of his superior built, which is in conformity with the higher age group.

**10]** In such circumstances, it cannot be said that the petitioner has been discriminated in any manner, and accordingly, the petition being devoid of merits, is hereby *dismissed*.

**(SUBODH ABHYANKAR)**  
**JUDGE**

Bahar