

## SC Verdict on BCCI Reforms

### Why in news?

\n\n

\n

- Supreme Court has approved a new draft constitution for the Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI), making few alterations to Lodha Committee recommendations.

\n

- Click [here](#) to know more on the recommendations

\n

\n\n

### What are the highlights of the verdict?

\n\n

\n

- **Representation** - Lodha panel's call for “one state, one vote” was to ensure representation for every state in the BCCI.

\n

- It had also asked for only one association from each state to be considered a full member and have voting rights.

\n

\n\n

\n

- The Supreme Court has rejected this recommendation.

\n

- The court disagreed that cricket could prosper only if the BCCI was represented by every State and Union Territory.

\n

- The court noted that territoriality as a basis of exclusion would be problematic.

\n

- As, this would ignore cricketing culture in some state, the history and contributions by such associations to cricket's prosperity.

\n

- Instead, the court restored full BCCI memberships to three associations in Gujarat and Maharashtra each.

\n

- **Cooling-off period** - Lodha panel report makes officer-bearers either at state or BCCI level not eligible to contest for a succeeding election.
- They would have to serve a three-year cooling period following each term.
- The BCCI objected to this stating office-bearers needed a form of continuity to apply the knowledge and experience.
- This is essential to strengthen the administration of the game as well as to strengthen the BCCI's role in the ICC.
- The Court has found a middle ground, balancing the two views.
- It allows all office-bearers to serve two consecutive terms (six years) before they serve a necessary cooling-off period.
- Nevertheless, it sticks to the maximum cumulative term of nine years.
- These include terms at both state and BCCI level, and/or a combination of both.
- Notably, all the present office-bearers have served 9 or more years.
- **Membership** - SC agreed with BCCI's view in giving full membership status for Services Sports Control Board, Railways and Association of Universities.
- There is a concern that the ruling power has control over these institutional votes.
- So Lodha panel had recommended stripping them of full membership to end government influence on BCCI's functioning.
- BCCI however argued against this saying that the Railways had employed more cricketers than any other institution.
- **Apex council** - The court upheld the panel's recommendation of an "apex council" to professionally manage the BCCI.
- The council would consist of a Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer and other officers.
- These must be recruited on a transparent and professional basis.
- It will, for the first time, have well-rounded representation, including players

and women cricketers.

\n

- The new structure will allow employed professionals to execute the decisions made by the Apex Council, making the BCCI functioning more professional.

\n

- **Selectors** - The court modified the number of selectors from the current three to five.

\n

- It observed that a “broad-based selection committee” was required to tap the talent pool spread across the country.

\n

- **Besides**, SC retained the Lodha panel suggestion of barring government ministers or servants from holding cricket office.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu, Indian Express**

\n

