

Game, Set & Match Monthly

Gaming and Sports Law Newsletter (March 2026)

GAMING NEWS UPDATE

1. OGAI PORTAL GOES LIVE IN PARTS AS INDIA'S ONLINE GAMING FRAMEWORK AWAITS FULL ROLLOUT

The Online Gaming Authority of India's ("OGAI") digital backend appears operational in a limited, incomplete form, even as the broader compliance regime is still being built out. For industry participants, that means the statutory architecture is ahead of its practical implementation, creating short-term uncertainty around registration, governance, and filing workflows. This also suggests regulators are prioritising phased rollout over a fully finished launch, which is common in large-scale compliance systems but leaves room for transitional ambiguity.

For gaming businesses, a partially live portal is not just an IT issue; it affects when and how legal obligations can actually be discharged in practice. Until the framework is fully functional, operators may need to stay close to

notifications, procedural updates, and any interim guidance issued by MeitY or OGAI. That makes this a useful moment for compliance teams to map likely registration and reporting steps against the draft rules rather than waiting for perfect administrative readiness.

[Read more](#)

2. CENTRE SOFTENS ONLINE GAMING RULES. SOCIAL GAME REGISTRATION TO REMAIN VOLUNTARY

The Centre is reportedly easing the upcoming online gaming rules so that social games can operate without mandatory registration, reflecting a more industry-friendly approach after stakeholder feedback. The change preserves the core split in the framework: social games are treated as low-risk, e-sports require registration, and online money games remain prohibited.

[Read more](#)

SPORTS NEWS UPDATE

1. CAS UPHOLDS WADA APPEAL AGAINST NADA DECISION, AGAINST INDIAN WRESTLER RADHIKA

In a significant anti-doping development reported in March 2026, the Court of Arbitration for Sport ("CAS") upheld an appeal by the World Anti-Doping Agency ("WADA") against a decision of the National Anti-Doping Agency ("NADA") exonerating Indian wrestler Radhika following an adverse analytical finding for clenbuterol, a prohibited substance known to enhance endurance and reduce body fat.

The athlete had tested positive in November 2022, but was cleared by NADA in May 2024 on the basis of a contamination defence, supported by a subsequent negative test. WADA challenged this decision before CAS, arguing that NADA's investigation was procedurally deficient. CAS accepted WADA's submissions, noting, *inter alia*, the absence of corroborative evidence supporting the contamination claim, failure to analyse the athlete's biological passport data, and an unexplained delay of approximately 19 months before the athlete was interviewed. On this basis, CAS set aside NADA's decision, directed a fresh investigation, and the athlete has been provisionally suspended pending the outcome.

[Read more here](#)

2. SUPREME COURT DISMISSES PETA'S SLP CHALLENGING GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE OF KAMBALA

In a notable development concerning the regulation of traditional sporting events, the Supreme Court, by order dated March 10, 2026, dismissed a Special Leave Petition filed by PETA India challenging a Karnataka High Court judgment which had permitted the conduct of Kambala (traditional buffalo races) beyond the coastal districts of Dakshina Kannada and Udupi. The petitioner had contended that the exemption granted under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 (as amended for Karnataka) was limited to regions where Kambala is traditionally practiced, and that extending such events to non-traditional areas amounted to an impermissible expansion of a narrow statutory carve-out. It was further argued that such expansion facilitates commercialisation of the activity under the guise of cultural practice.

The Supreme Court declined to interfere with the High Court's ruling, effectively affirming that Kambala cannot be restricted solely to specific districts, and permitting its conduct in other parts of the state. The decision reflects judicial deference towards the cultural character of traditional sports, while also indicating a reluctance to narrowly interpret statutory exemptions where such activities are framed as part of broader regional

heritage. At the same time, the ruling leaves open broader questions relating to animal welfare and the permissible scope of such exemptions under existing jurisprudence.

[Read more here](#)

3. DELHI HIGH COURT GRANTS DYNAMIC INJUNCTION AGAINST IPL 2026 PIRACY

In March 2026, the Delhi High Court granted dynamic and dynamic+ injunctions in favour of JioStar, the official broadcast and digital rights holder for the Indian Premier League (IPL) 2026 season, restraining unauthorised livestreaming through rogue websites and mobile applications. Recognising the scale of digital piracy in live sports broadcasting, the Court not only curbed identified infringing platforms but also permitted the rights holder to notify other rogue websites, mirror links and applications for prompt blocking without requiring fresh judicial proceedings.

The 'dynamic+' relief further extends to mobile applications and future variants, addressing the rapid migration of piracy across platforms. Directions were also issued to internet service providers and relevant government authorities to ensure expeditious compliance. The order underscores the Court's acknowledgement that real-time enforcement mechanisms are critical in protecting time-sensitive sports broadcasting rights, and reflects a continued shift towards adaptive, technology-responsive remedies in intellectual property enforcement within the sports sector.

[Read more here](#)

4. DELHI HIGH COURT GRANTS PERSONALITY RIGHTS PROTECTION AGAINST AI DEEPFAKES

The Delhi High Court, by order dated March 25, 2026, granted interim protection to Gautam Gambhir in a suit concerning the unauthorised creation and dissemination of AI-generated deepfakes, including face-swapped videos, morphed visuals and voice-cloned content falsely attributed to him. The impugned content included fabricated announcements and endorsements that had garnered significant public traction online.

The Court *prima facie* recognised that a well-known public personality enjoys proprietary rights in their name, image, voice and likeness, and that unauthorised commercial or misleading

exploitation of these attributes, including through emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, constitutes a violation of personality and publicity rights. Accordingly, the Court directed intermediaries and online platforms to take down identified infringing content within a stipulated timeline and restrained further dissemination.

[Read more here](#)

5. SWISS FEDERAL SUPREME COURT ALLOWS REVISION OF CAS AWARD IN JORDAN CHILES OLYMPIC DISPUTE

The Swiss Federal Supreme Court has granted a request for revision filed by American gymnast Jordan Chiles and USA Gymnastics in relation to a CAS award arising from the women's floor exercise final at the Paris 2024 Olympic Games. The dispute originated from the reallocation of the bronze medal following a CAS ad hoc award, which held that the athlete's scoring inquiry had been submitted outside the prescribed one-minute deadline. Subsequent to the award, the athlete identified new audio-visual evidence indicating that the inquiry may, in fact, have been made within time.

The Swiss Federal Supreme Court accepted that the newly discovered evidence met the threshold of "decisive evidence" under Swiss arbitration law, noting that it could materially affect the outcome of the dispute. The Court further observed that procedural irregularities, including notification issues and significant time constraints during the expedited Olympic arbitration process, may have impaired the athlete's ability to present her case fully. While the Court rejected separate challenges relating to the independence and impartiality of the arbitral tribunal, it allowed the request for revision and remitted the matter to CAS for reconsideration in light of the new evidence.

[Read more here](#)

6. IOC INTRODUCES NEW GENDER ELIGIBILITY POLICY FOR WOMEN'S OLYMPIC CATEGORY

The International Olympic Committee has announced a new policy governing eligibility for the women's category in Olympic sport, marking a significant shift toward a uniform, science-based standard across all disciplines.

Under the policy, participation in women's events will be restricted to biological females, determined

through a one-time genetic screening (SRY gene test). The rule will come into effect from the 2028 Los Angeles Olympics and will also apply to qualification events and other IOC competitions.

The IOC has stated that the policy is aimed at ensuring fairness, safety, and integrity in competition, based on the view that athletes who have undergone male puberty may retain performance advantages in strength, endurance, and power, even after hormone treatment.

Athletes who do not meet the eligibility criteria will not be permitted to compete in the women's category but may participate in male or open categories. Limited exceptions may apply in specific medical cases, such as certain differences of sex development (DSDs).

The policy follows an extended consultation process and is intended to create a consistent global standard, replacing the earlier framework where individual international federations set their own rules.

The announcement has sparked significant global debate, with supporters framing it as necessary to protect women's sport, while critics have raised concerns regarding inclusion, human rights, and the scientific basis of sex verification methods.

[Read more](#)

7. DELHI HIGH COURT REFERS LEGENDS LEAGUE MEDIA RIGHTS DISPUTE TO MEDIATION

The Delhi High Court has referred a dispute between JioStar India Pvt. Ltd. and Absolute Legends Sports Pvt. Ltd. concerning the media and commercial rights of the Legends League Cricket Masters T20 tournament to mediation, while declining to grant interim injunctive relief.

The dispute arose under a Media Rights Agreement relating to the broadcast and commercial exploitation of the league. JioStar had approached the Court under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 seeking to restrain the respondents from creating third-party rights or dealing with the media rights pending resolution of the dispute.

The Court, however, refused to grant such interim protection, noting the need for the tournament to proceed. At the same time, it directed the respondents to disclose all commercial transactions and receivables, and to deposit receivables with the Court toward admitted liabilities, while permitting use of funds for operational expenses.

Recognising the possibility of an amicable resolution, the Court referred the parties to the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre for settlement through mediation.

[Read more](#)



DSK Legal Knowledge Center

Contact Details for any queries: knowledge.management@dsklegal.com

Mumbai

1701, One World Centre,
Floor 17, Tower 2B,
841, Senapati Bapat Marg,
Mumbai - 400013.
Tel +91 22 6658 8000

Mumbai

C-16, Dhanraj Mahal,
3rd Floor,
Apollo Bunder, Colaba,
Mumbai - 400001.
Tel +91 22 6152 6000

New Delhi

Max House, Level 5,
Okhla Industrial Area, Phase 3,
New Delhi - 110020.
Tel +91 11 4661 6666

Dubai

Bay Square,
Building 12, P 03, Dubai,
United Arab Emirates
T: +971 50 450 4026

Bengaluru

201, 2nd floor, Prestige Loka,
7/1 & 7/7, Brunton Road,
Craig Park Layout, Ashok Nagar,
Bengaluru - 560025.
Tel +91 80 6954 8770

Pune

Ground Floor, 1 Modibaug,
Ganesh Khind Road, Shivajinagar,
Pune - 411016.
Tel +91 20 6684 7600

Abu Dhabi

3112, 31, Tamouh Tower,
ADGM, Abu Dhabi,
Al Reem Island, UAE
T: +971 50 450 4026

✉ contactus@dsklegal.com

 [DSK Legal](#)

 www.dsklegal.com

Disclaimer

This document intends to provide general information on a particular subject/s and is not an exhaustive treatment of such subject/s and is intended merely to highlight issues. It is not intended to be exhaustive or a substitute for legal/professional advice. The information is not intended to be relied upon as the basis for any decision which may affect you or your business and does not constitute legal advice and should not be acted upon in any specific situation without appropriate legal advice. DSK Legal shall not be responsible for any loss whatsoever sustained by any person relying on this material.