



\$~56 to 72

- * **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
- + **W.P.(C) 7982/2013, C.M. APPL.18654/2015 & 300/2016**
9X MEDIA PVT. LTD. & ORS Petitioners
- + **W.P.(C) 7983/2013**
B4U BROADBAND (INDIA) PVT. LTD. & ORS Petitioners
- + **W.P.(C) 7984/2013**
TV VISION LIMITED & ORS Petitioners
- + **W.P.(C) 7985/2013**
SUN TV NETWORKS LIMITED Petitioner
- + **W.P.(C) 7987/2013**
E 24 GLAMORU LIMITED Petitioner
- + **W.P.(C) 7988/2013**
PIONEER CHANNEL FACTORY PVT. LTD Petitioner
- + **W.P.(C) 7989/2013, C.M. APPL.4541/2014**
M/S NEWS BRADCASTER ASSOCIATION & ORS..... Petitioners
- + **W.P.(C) 276/2014, C.M. APPL.5897/2014**
SARTHAK ENTERTAINMENT PVT. LTD. Petitioner
- + **W.P.(C) 312/2014**
KALAI GNAR TV PVT. LTD. Petitioner
- + **W.P.(C) 544/2014**
CELEBRITIES MANAGEMENT PVT LTD & ANR..... Petitioners
- + **W.P.(C) 1150/2014, C.M. APPL.2408/2014**
M/S. MAA TELEVISION NETWORK LIMITED Petitioner



- + **W.P.(C) 2944/2014**
MEDIAWATCH - INDIA (A REGISTERED SOCIETY)
..... Petitioner
- + **W.P.(C) 3804/2014, C.M. APPL.7659/2014**
M/S. NDTV LIFESTYLE LIMITED AND ANR..... Petitioners
- + **W.P.(C) 6602/2014**
ODISHA TELEVISION LIMITED Petitioner
versus
TELECOM REGULATORY AUTHORITY OF INDIA
..... Respondent
- + **W.P.(C) 724/2014**
EENADU TELEVISION PRIVATE LIMITED Petitioner
- + **W.P.(C) 739/2014**
RAJ TELEVISION PRIVATE LIMITED Petitioner
versus
TELECOM REGULATORY AUTHORITY OF INDIA & ANR
..... Respondents
- + **W.P.(C) 4423/2016, C.M. APPL.18495/2016 & 27336/2016**
VIKKI CHOUDHRY AND ANR Petitioners
versus
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING AND ORS
..... Respondents
Through : Sh. Kunal Tandon, Sh. Shashank Shekhar, Ms. Niti Jain, Sh. Prateek Jain and Sh. Girdhar Singh, Advocates, for petitioner, in Item Nos. 56, 57, 58 and 61.
Ms. Maneesha Dhir, Sh. Saransh Gupta and Sh. Mahipal Singh, Advocates, for TRAI, in Item Nos. 56 to 71.



Sh. Abhishek Malhotra and Ms. Niyati Asthana, Advocates, in Item Nos.56, 59 & 60.
Ms. Payal Kakra, Sh. Sushant Chaturvedi, Sh. Divyam Dhyani and Ms. Tanya Gupta, Advocates, for interveners in Item Nos. 56 and 72.
Sh. Rahul Bhatia and Sh. Veeren Dua Kumar, Advocates, for petitioner, in Item No.62.
Sh. G.S. Mani, Sh. Lewis Edward and Sh. R.C. Sharma, Advocates, for petitioner, in Item No.64.
Sh. Samir Sagar Vasistha and Sh. Abhishek Pratap Singh, Advocates, for petitioner, in Item No.65.
Sh. Balaji Srinivasan and Ms. Garima Jain, Advocates, for petitioner, in Item Nos.66 and 67.
Sh. Devank Maheshwari, for Sh. Jasmeet Singh, CGSC, for UOI, in Item No.66.
Sh. Vikram Jetly, CGSC, for UOI, in Item No.67.
Sh. Maanav Kumar and Ms. Nupur, Advocates, for petitioner, in Item No.67.
Sh. Sandeep Mahapatra, Advocate, for petitioner, in Item No.71.
Sh. Anil Soni, CGSC, for UOI, in Item No.72.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

01.02.2019

Learned counsel for the parties shall file a joint compilation of the documents on record and also ensure that the written submissions – not exceeding five pages, are filed before the next date of hearing. The Court clarifies that W.P.(C) 7989/2013 shall be treated as the lead matter in respect of the rights of channels/news broadcasters. All counsel appearing for parties with similar grievance (similar to the petitioner in this case) shall collaborate and file joint written note of arguments.

Page 3 of 4



Similarly, *9X Media Pvt. Ltd and Ors. v. TRAI* [W.P.(C) 7982/2013] shall be treated as the lead petition for the rights of music broadcasters. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties with identical or similar grievances shall collaborate and ensure that a common written note of arguments of five pages is filed in this matter. The time allotted for arguments of all petitioners shall not exceed two hours. Likewise, the respondents are allowed one hour to make submissions and reply. List on 11.04.2019.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 01, 2019/ajk