



The Petitioner has further prayed for an interim order for restraining the Respondent from disconnecting its signals.

2. I would mention few facts which are not disputed by the parties. The parties had written agreement for the year 2011 it expired on 31.12.2011. The Respondent by a letter dated 25.10.2011 wrote to the Petitioner asking for the necessary documents for entering into fresh agreement for the year 2012. A similar request was reiterated in the latter dated 8.12.2011. Further, a request was made for Subscriber Line Report along with other documents to be submitted by the Petitioner.

The Petitioner vide its letter dated 30.12.2011 supplied the list of cable operators along with its subscriber base to the Respondent. However, on 2.2.2012 the Respondent informed the Petitioner again wherein certain discrepancies in the document provided by the Petitioner were pointed out.

3. According to Petitioner, it supplied the information as requested by the Respondent on 13.2.2012 again and requested by the Respondent to enter into subscription agreement. However, on 21.2.2012 the Respondent issued a notice under Regulation 4.1 of the Interconnection Regulation and informed the Petitioner that its signals would be de-activated as the Petitioner did not execute the

affiliation agreement for the period 1.1.2012 to 31.12.12. On 27.3.2012 the Respondent further issued a public notice under Regulation 4.3 for disconnecting the signals of the Petitioner on the ground of non-renewal of the agreement. The Petitioner however, submits that to the knowledge of the Petitioner, Respondent did not issued the public notice in vernacular as required under the Regulation.

4. The Petitioner further submits that it has supplied all the information including S.L.R. as required under the regulations for renewal of the subscription agreement still the Respondent has not entered into agreement. On the other hand the Respondent submits that in fact, it is the Respondent who has been requesting the Petitioner to come forward and begin the process of negotiation for renewal of the agreement, the Petitioner has failed to provide full details about its SLR. It points out that the Subscriber Line Report did not mention complete address of the cable networks and therefore the Respondent was unable to verify the SLR particulars. Till date the Petitioner has not supplied its true and correct SLR to the Respondent.

5. I have perused the record produced by the parties. The earlier agreement was valid up to 31.12.2011 and subscription amount was for Rs. 1,54,125/- p.m. for three bouquet of channels. The main dispute seems to be that the Petitioner has failed to

supply the correct SLR. I have gone through the SLR shown at p. 34 of the paper book. It shows that there are 21 operators having the subscription base of 1651 and it contains full details about area of operation and address of the operators. The information provided for Local cable operator is sufficient and Respondent can easily verify the same. Page 35 of the paper book shows the list of 78 direct subscriber in Awas Vikas Colony. The list contains the name and house numbers of the subscribers.

6. I am not able to appreciate as to what information is required by the Respondent for verification. If any other information is required, the Respondent could have asked the specific information rather mentioning that the SLR was unverifiable.

7. Therefore, I direct that, pending disposal of this Petition, the notice under regulation 4.1 and 4.3 will not be given effect to. I further direct the parties to have a meeting within a week to negotiate to settle their disputes and difference for the purpose of renewal of agreement.

.....  
(P.K. Rastogi)  
Member

K.D.