

Procedural Minutes No. 6

**Dispute relating to Appointment of Coaches of different Bengal
Teams for the ensuing Cricket Season.**

Present :

For Mr. Saurasish Lahiri

Mr. Soumabho Ghose, Advocate.

Mr. Rishav Dutt, Advocate.

Ms. Akanksha Chowdhury, Advocate.

For CAB

Mr. Samrat Sen, Senior Advocate / Legal Counsel.

**The Minutes of the Proceeding held on 2nd September, 2026 at 4:30
p.m. at Dr. B.C. Roy Club House, Eden Gardens, Kolkata – 700021.**

Re: Sri Saurasish Lahiri.

Heard the Ld. Counsel appearing for the parties.

Mr. Ghosh Ld. Counsel appearing for Mr. Saurasish Lahiri, contended that though he does not dispute the authority of the President of the CAB under Rule 23 (1) (c) of the CAB Rules to constitute a committee for conducting any enquiry with regard to any matter where taking of any immediate decision is necessary but such power is also required to be exercised by the President in conformity with the provision of Rule 23 (1) (c) which runs as follows:-

“Rule 23 (1) (c). The President in consultation with the

Secretary may take any decision which calls for immediate attention

and such decision shall be valid, until the same is ratified by the Apex Council and or the concerned standing committing convened for the purpose”

Referring to the subject matter for which such a committee was constituted as reflected in the communication made by the President vide his letter dated 8th June, 2026, to the Undersigned, he contended that the notice which was issued by the Undersigned requiring the appearance of Mr. Saurasish Lahiri and another before the Undersigned, does not appear to be issued in conformity with the decision which was communicated by the President to the Undersigned, by his letter dated 8th June, 2026. He further contended that though it is reflected in the letter of communication issued by the President of CAB that a Sole Member Committee was constituted with the name of the Chairman but the notice was issued by such appointee as Ombudsman, of the Cricket Association of Bengal.

He further contended that his client has not made any complaint against the selection process which was conducted by CAB for appointment of coaches on different Bengal Teams for the ensuing Cricket Season. He further contended that his client has not even made any complaint against the Selection Committee Members as his client was not selected for such appointment by them before the Ombudsman. According to him, had such complaint being lodged by his client, that could have been decided by the Ombudsman under Rule 70 of the CAB

Rules. He thus contended that since such a situation had not been cropped up, the Ombudsman has no authority either to issue any notice or to deal with any such speculative issue under Rule 70 of the CAB rules.

Mr. Ghosh further contended that his client has felt aggrieved as it is found that in course of holding a meeting with the Members of the Selection Committee, certain aspersion was made by the Members of the Committee against his client in their replies to question-10 put to them by the Undersigned. He contended that since such aspersion has some adverse impact on the career of his client, such aspersions cannot be taken note of and should be directed to be expunged as no opportunity was given to his client to cross-examine the Members of the selection Committee with regard to such recording.

He further contended that since his client has not made any grievance for not selecting his client by the Members of the Selection Committee, his client ought not to have been involved in this proceeding.

He thus challenged the maintainability of this proceeding on the above grounds and also for the involvement of his client in this proceeding, for no good reason.

Let me clear the doubts of Mr. Ghosh, as to the reason for constitution of such a Committee and for holding an enquiry on the

related issue i.e. appointment of coaches of Different Bengal Teams for the ensuring cricket season.

In the very first paragraph of the letter dated 8th June, 2026, written by the President addressed to the Undersigned, the reasons for constitution of such a committee was recorded. The said paragraph runs as follows:-

“Recently, an unsavoury controversy has broken out as a result of the non-appointment of Shri Saurasish Lahiri and Shri Arindam Das as Coaches of different cricket teams of CAB for the ensuing Cricket Season”

It was also mentioned therein that “in order to address the issue, it is felt proper and appropriate to refer all issues relating to appointment of the coaches of the different teams of CAB for the ensuring cricket season to a ‘One Man Committee’, constituted specially for this purpose.”

The said communication does not indicate that the said issue was raised either on the complaint of Mr. Saurasish Lahiri or on the complaint of Mr. Arindam Das. As such, Rule 70 of the CAB Rule has no application in the instant case.

However, the notice which was issued by the Undersigned was printed in the letter head of, Ombudsman, the Cricket Association of Bengal, and as a result, some confusion might have arisen. It is made clear that though the notice was printed in the letter of head of

Ombudsman, the Cricket Association of Bengal but the same was not issued by the Undersigned in exercise of his authority under Rule 70 of the CAB Rules. It was indicated in the said notice that the addresses were required to be present before the High-Power Committee to express their grievance, if any, before the said Committee which will be considered by the Committee in the presence of the representative of CAB and / or the Selection Committee Members. Thus, the text of the said letter will indicate that this was not a proceeding under Rule-70, before the Ombudsman but this was an enquiry which was to be held to ascertain as to whether transparency was maintained in the process of selection of coaches, in terms of the communication made by the President of the CAB addressed to the Undersigned as aforesaid.

In fact, one common notice was issued addressed to both Mr. Saurasish Lahiri and Mr. Arindam Das.

Mr. Arindam Das appeared before the Undersigned and disclosed certain grievances. He contended that though he was eligible and offered his candidature for such selection but he was not even called for, in the interview. Such a complaint appeared to the Undersigned, as very serious in nature as it was represented before the Undersigned that an eligible candidate was excluded from the selection process even without inviting him to appear for the interview.

Though Mr. Saurasish Lahiri appeared through his Ld. Advocate on the first day of appearance but he sought for time for submission of representation. His prayer was allowed and as such the Undersigned could not read the mind of Mr. Lahiri as to whether he had any allegation against the members of the Selection Committee in the process of conducting the selection process, on that day.

Be that as it may, since the allegation of Mr. Arindam Das appeared to be very serious in nature, the Undersigned called the Members of the Selection Committee in an interview to ascertain from them the procedure which was adopted by them in the process of selecting the coaches. The only reason for which such interview was felt necessary was that the Undersigned really wanted to ascertain from the Members of the Selection Committee as to whether transparency was maintained and the Selection Procedure was uniformly applied to all the eligible candidates or not. These steps were taken by the Undersigned, even knowing fully well that the selection of coach is a subjective consideration of the Members of the Selection Committee over which no one has any control.

Be that as it may, an interview was held on 18th July, 2026, when all the Members of the Selection Committee participated in the interview and in course of such interview certain questions were put to them which they also answered in their own way.

It is true that the answer which was given by them to the question no. 10 recorded some aspersion against Mr. Lahiri and as such Mr. Ghosh is justified in submitting that this part of the evidence should not be taken note of, without giving his client an opportunity to cross examine the members of the said Selection Committee. In fact, he prays for expunging of that part of the recording, to avoid any future controversy.

The Undersigned can very well feel the sentiment of Mr. Ghosh's client and it is rightly submitted by him that if this part of the recording is used even against his client in different proceeding, his client's career may be adversely affected. As such, it is made clear, that the Undersigned will not consider this part of the recording while deciding the issue involved on the referred subject. It is further clarified that even this part of the recording cannot be used either by CAB or any other Authority in any other proceeding for affecting the career of Mr. Saurasish Lahiri. This part of the recording may be treated as expunged.

Even without taking note of that part of the recording, the Undersigned, by making an overall assessment of the statements made by the Members of the Selection Committee, has no reason to hold that selection procedure was not uniformly applied to all eligible candidates and/or the transparency was not maintained by the Members of the Selection Committee in the process of selection of Coaches. Selection process depends upon the subjective considerations of the Members of

the Selection committee who are all experts in the field and nobody has challenged their reputation either as a player or as a Selector.

It may be mentioned herein that Sri Arindam Das subsequently withdrew his complaint. Mr. Ghosh also, in course of his submission stated that his client has also not expressed any grievance either against the Members of the selection committee or against the selection process before the Undersigned or any other Authority.

As such, the Undersigned disposes of this enquiry by holding that the selection procedure was uniformly applied by the Members of the Selection Team to all the candidates and transparency in the process of selection of coaches was duly maintained by them in the process of selection of coaches.

With the above findings, the reference is disposed of.

CAB is directed to communicate this order to all concerned, at the earliest.

Jyotirmay Bhattacharya

Justice Jyotirmay Bhattacharya
Former Chief Justice High Court at Calcutta
Presently, Chairman of the Sole Member Committee