

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 24/08/2025

## Asianet Digital Network Pvt Ltd & Anr Vs Star India Pvt Ltd

Court: Delhi High Court

Date of Decision: Dec. 5, 2018

Hon'ble Judges: Rajendra Menon, CJ; V. Kameswar Rao, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: Jayant K. Mehta, M. P. Vinod, Rajeev Nayyar, Kunal Tandon, Siddharth Copra, Shashank Shekhar, Prateek

Jain

Final Decision: Dismissed

## **Judgement**

V. Kameswar Rao, J

CM No. 51131/2018 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

## LPA 677/2018

1. The present appeal has been filed by the appellants challenging the order dated November 19, 2018 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P. (C)

12337/2018, whereby the learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition.

2. The grievance of the appellants before the learned Single Judge was that, an order dated October 22, 2018 passed by the Telecom Disputes

Settlement and Appellate Tribunal, New Delhi (in short  $\tilde{A}\phi\hat{a},\neg \tilde{E}\omega TDSAT\tilde{A}\phi\hat{a},\neg \hat{a},\phi$ ), whereby the TDSAT has directed the application filed by the appellants to

be placed at the time of final consideration. The appellants had filed the said application for production of an agreement entered into between the

respondent and M/s K.C.C.L., who according to the appellants is one of its competitors. The respondent had taken a plea that the agreement is

confidential, which the appellants dispute.

4. According to the appellants and also contended by Mr. Jayant K. Mehta that the agreement is not confidential and the said issue has been well

settled the Supreme Court. This submission is disputed by Mr. Rajiv Nayyar, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the respondent.

5. During the course of his submissions, Mr. Mehta has contended that the information sought is required to be given much before the arguments are

advanced so that the appellants can argue on the same.

6. If that be so, liberty is with the appellants to file an appropriate application before the TDSAT in that regard and it goes without saying that the

same shall be considered by the TDSAT in accordance with law.

7. The appeal is dismissed.

CM No. 51132/2018

Dismissed as infructuous.