

**BEFORE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA
FORMER JUDGE, SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
OMBUDSMAN, BIHAR CRICKET ASSOCIATION**

Mr. Aditya VermaApplicant No. 1/Complainant

Versus

BCARespondent

ORDER DATED 16 JUNE 2026

1. This order deals with the email dated 13.06.2026 sent by Mr. Aditya Kumar (Complainant No.1) seeking waiver of the fees fixed by the Ombudsman.
2. In the said email, Mr. Aditya Kumar has stated that the Bihar Cricket Association (BCA) should be responsible for payment of the fees of the Ombudsman and that he should not be required to pay any part of the same. He has, therefore, sought waiver of the fees payable by him.
3. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, by order dated 29.04.2026, directed as under:

"The fees of the learned Ombudsman along with other modalities shall be fixed in consultation with the parties."

4. The above direction shows that the Hon'ble Supreme Court used the word "parties". Had it intended that the BCA alone should bear the entire fees of the Ombudsman, it would have specifically said so. Therefore, I find no merit in the contention that only the BCA is liable to pay the fees of the Ombudsman
5. It may also be noted that the BCA is already paying the monthly honorarium of the Ombudsman. The reading fees fixed by me are

nominal and the hearing/session fees are being shared by a number of applicants.

6. During the hearing held on 11.06.2026, I had informed the parties and their learned counsel that I was revising the fee structure earlier proposed. The reading fees were reduced, while the session fees were kept unchanged but to be paid 50% by BCA and the remaining 50% to be shared by all the other parties. At that stage, no party or counsel raised any objection to the fee structure or to the sharing of the fees.
7. I may, however, clarify that if any party is genuinely unable to pay the fees fixed by me, it may file an appropriate application seeking waiver of the same. Such a request shall be considered on its own merits.
8. In the present case, I find no reason to grant any waiver. The applicant is represented by counsel and, in fact, by more than one counsel. The applicant also seeks to organize a tournament involving distribution of prize money. If the applicant is in a position to organize such a tournament and engage counsel from Delhi to represent him, I see no reason why he cannot pay the nominal fees fixed by me.
9. The request made by Mr. Aditya Kumar for waiver of fees is, accordingly, rejected.
10. The BCA is directed to upload a copy of this order on its Website.



**Justice Deepak Gupta (Retd.)
Ombudsman**