



COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA

Case No. 24 of 2025

In Re:

Mr. Adikessavaperoumal Baskar Sinouvassane
54, Perumal Naidu Street, Muthialpet,
Pondicherry-605003

Informant

And

Karate India Organisation
G-1, Plot No. 18B, B Block Community Centre, Janakpuri,
New Delhi-110058.

Opposite Party

Coram:

Ms. Ravneet Kaur
Chairperson

Ms. Sweta Kakkad
Member

Mr. Deepak Anurag
Member

Order under Section 26(2) of the Competition Act, 2002

1. The present Information has been filed by Mr. Adikessavaperoumal Baskar Sinouvassane (“**Informant**”) under Section 19(1)(a) of the Competition Act, 2002 (“**Act**”) against Karate India Organisation (“**KIO**”/ “**Opposite Party**”/“**OP**”).
2. As per the Information, the Informant is a world level Karate referee. KIO has been registered on 13.03.2020 under the Companies Act, 2013 (“**Companies Act**”) with the Registrar of Companies at Delhi (“**ROC**”) and is involved in regulating and developing Karate sport in India.
3. It has been alleged in the Information that KIO got itself registered with the word “India” in its name without requisite approval in the form of “No Objection Certificate” from the Government of India, in violation of Section 4(3) of the Companies Act. The Informant has also alleged violation by KIO of an order dated 16.10.2018 of Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, which prohibits unrecognised federations from using the words “India”/“Indian” in their name or conducting national championships.



4. It has been stated that KIO has not been authorised by the Government of India and the Informant does not want to be associated with an unauthorised entity. Therefore, the Informant is not able to get an opportunity to work under a legally authorised organisation.
5. The Informant has further alleged that using its Incorporation Certificate, KIO has misrepresented itself before the World Karate Federation and obtained affiliation as a *de facto* national body, conducting national championships, selecting Indian teams and collecting money from the athletes without authorisation from the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports.
6. It has been stated that on 17.08.2020, KIO amended its Memorandum of Association (“MoA”) to assume the role of regulating and developing Karate sport in India, despite not being recognised by the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, Government of India. It further amended its MoA on 13.03.2022 to assume the authority as the sole organisation to develop and promote Karate sport in India.
7. The Informant has sought the following reliefs against KIO from the Commission:
 - (i) direction to ROC for either removing the word “India” from the registration of KIO or cancellation of KIO’s registration,
 - (ii) direction to KIO for removal of the word “India” from its name,
 - (iii) annulment of its amended objectives accepted by ROC,
 - (iv) prohibition from controlling and regulating Karate sports in India,
 - (v) prohibition from conducting national championship(s) and selection of Indian teams and athletes for international events,
 - (vi) investigation of its financial activities, and
 - (vii) imposition of punishment on the Directors of KIO under Section 447 of the Companies Act.
8. The Commission considered the matter in its ordinary meeting held on 01.10.2025 and decided to pass an appropriate order in due course of time.
9. The Commission has considered the Information along with the material available on record and notes that the allegations raised by the Informant primarily pertain to contravention of either the provisions of the Companies Act or the orders/directives of the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports. The Commission notes that none of the allegations pertain to violation of the provisions of the Act. Since, the subject matter of the allegations is not related to competition issues, the Commission finds that these do not merit further examination.



10. Having perused the material available on record, the Commission is of the view that no *prima facie* case of contravention of provisions of the Act is made out against KIO and hence, directs to close the matter under provisions of Section 26(2) of the Act.
11. The Secretary is directed to communicate the order to the Informant, accordingly.

Sd/-
(Ravneet Kaur)
Chairperson

Sd/-
(Sweta Kakkad)
Member

Sd/-
(Deepak Anurag)
Member

New Delhi
Date: 15.10.2025