

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 22 October, 2019

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

Sony Pictures Network India Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Moon IT Services Pvt. Ltd	... Respondent

BEFORE :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVA KIRTI SINGH, CHAIRPERSON

Appellant	: Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Advocate
Respondent	: None

JUDGMENT

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner. Nobody appears for the respondent.

The records show that since the very beginning, inspite of service of notice, the respondent has chosen not to appear and has never filed any reply to contest the claim of the petitioner. Hence, there is already an order for ex-parte hearing of the petition.

The petitioner is a private limited company. At the relevant time its predecessor, MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.(the original petitioner), which was authorized agent of Sony Pictures Network India Pvt. Ltd. (earlier known as Multi Screen Media Pvt. Ltd., now "SPN") and also TV Today Network Ltd. "TVT" to distribute their respective channels.

Petitioner has claimed that it has been validly assigned the right to recover the dues of the broadcaster SPN and TVT even for the period prior to 1.4.2015 and as such it has right to

file the present petition for recovering the subscription fees and the outstanding dues on that account even for period prior to 1.4.2015. In the present case the term of the agreement has been shown to be from 1.1.2015 to 31.12.2015, although the agreement was actually executed by the respondent on or about 15.10.2015. The affiliation agreements have been annexed as Annexure P-I (Colly). These show that the respondent has agreed and was required to pay a sum of Rs. 79,838/- per month for SPN channels and Rs. 1629/- per month for TVT channels. Taxes had to be paid additionally.

It has been disclosed in the petition that DAS phase – III was introduced in the concerned area where the respondent was operating, after 31.12.2015 and therefore on expiry of the term of the agreement the supply of signals as per old regime was discontinued. It is the case of the petitioner which is also supported by the statement of account available as annexure P-3 (colly) that the dues claimed by the petitioner are covered by the term of the agreement and the demand is in accordance with the rates disclosed in the agreement. The payments made by the respondent have also been reflected in the statement of account and given due credit. But thereafter also an amount of Rs. 4,67,288/- remained due and payable as appearing in the statement of account. The petitioner has claimed the aforesaid amount alongwith interest at the rate 18% per annum till the dues are realized from the respondent.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has explained that invoices for larger part of the agreement period could not be raised because the agreement was actually signed sometime in October 2015 and therefore the amount as per agreement was shown as payable on the basis of debit note, soon after the expiry of the agreement and within a month thereof.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the facts of the case the parties were aware of the monthly liability and this is evident from two payments made by the respondent on 31.12.2015. In respect of SPN both the payments are of Rs. 98,000/- each whereas in the case of TVT both the payments are of Rs. 2000/- each. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner the bonafide conduct of the petitioner is evident from the fact that on 28.1.2016 a credit note has been issued and entered in the accounts to the benefit of the respondent. That entry in respect of SPN channels is for Rs. 3,41,072/- and for TVT the amount is Rs. 11,006/-. These amounts were earlier lying to the credit of the entity whose name was changed and that fact of change of name through acquisition is mentioned in a document placed with the agreement.

In the aforesaid facts, the petitioner claims that inspite of several reminders etc. the respondent failed to clear the outstanding dues and that forced the petitioner to move this Tribunal through present petition filed on 5.5.2016, well within the period of limitation.

Having considered the claims of the petitioner and the supporting documents available on record as annexures, there appears no good reason not to accept the case of the petitioner when the respondent has chosen, even after notice, not to appear and contest the claims.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed and as prayed, a decree for Rs. 4,67,288/- (Rupees four lakhs sixty seven thousand two hundred and eighty eight) only in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent is passed alongwith interest, but only at the rate of 8% per annum which has been allowed in large number of similar cases. The interest shall be payable on the aforesaid rate from May 2016 till the date of realization.

Since the respondent has chosen not to contest the claim there shall be no order as to cost. The respondent is directed to pay the decretal amount as per this order within six weeks failing which the petitioner will be entitled to realize the entire amount through execution application.

The Registry is directed to prepare a decree on the basis of this judgment and order at an early date, preferably within six weeks.

.....
(S. K. Singh, J)
Chairperson

/NC/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 29th November, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Love Cable Network	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd	... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. PulkitAggarwal, Advocate

For Respondent : None

ORDER

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that the matters are listed for evidence before Ms. Disha Sachdeva, Learned Advocate Commissioner on 5th December, 2016.

List on 8th December, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 9th July, 2019

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Love Cable Network	... Respondent

BEFORE :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVA KIRTI SINGH, CHAIRPERSON

Appellant	: Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Advocate
Respondent	: None

ORDER

It appears that the name of petitioner needs to be substituted by another entity which is taken over the petitioner's interest. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for, and is permitted to file a substitution application by 11.7.2019.

The matter may be heard on merits as well on the next date.

Post the matter under the same head on 12.7.2019 for considering the said application.

.....
(S. K. Singh, J)
Chairperson

/dbc/

291 of 2016

It appears that the name of petitioner needs to be substituted by another entity which is taken over the petitioner's interest. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for, and is permitted to file a substitution application by 11.7.2019.

The matter may be heard on merits as well on the next date.

Post the matter under the same head on 12.7.2019 for considering the said application.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner. Nobody appears for the respondent. It is recorded that at an early stage, on instructions, one counsel had taken time on behalf of the respondent for filing Vakalatnama and reply but ultimately the respondent did not give any further instructions and hence the counsel wrote to the respondent and as per order passed on 19.12.2016 it was recorded that the counsel had prayed for discharge and the matter was ordered to be heard *ex parte*. Since then the respondent has not appeared and no reply has been filed on its behalf.

At the relevant time petitioner's predecessor was a private limited company and as an authorised agent of Sony Pictures Networks India Pvt. Ltd. (SPN) and TV Today (TVT) it had entered into an agreement with the respondent MSO for distribution of signals of some television channels belonging to the petitioner broadcaster.

It has been shown that the agreement was for the period 1.4.2014 to 31.12.2014 with monthly subscription fee of Rs.8,63,493/- plus taxes for the SPN channels and Rs.17,778/- plus taxes for the TVT channels. A copy of the affiliate agreements are Annexure P-1 (Colly). Copies of the invoices for both sets of channels are on record as Annexure P-2(Colly). Petitioner has also annexed relevant extract of statement of accounts in respect of both agreements to substantiate its case that after making regular payments for few months began to both the in regular payment for the month of September 2014 onwards. As per statement of accounts for both sets of channels, the outstanding dues till the date of disconnection i.e. 16.2.2015 comes to Rs.71,22,383/- as claimed in this petition as the dues recoverable from the respondent. Petitioner had served disconnection notices dated 14.1.2015 and these have been annexed as Annexure P-3 (Colly). Subsequent legal notices dated 13.4.2016 has been annexed as Annexure P-4 (wrongly described as 'Colly') This also supports the total outstanding amount claimed through this petition.

On behalf of the petitioner Mr. Rohan Kunal appeared as PW-1. He described himself as Area Sales Manager and conversant with the facts of the case. He had supported the

case of the petitioner fully and has not been cross examined because nobody appeared for the respondent in spite of notice.

In the aforesaid circumstances, ordinarily, the entire claim of the petitioner for Rs. 71,22,383.00 should have been allowed but it is noticed that the agreement between the parties was valid till 31.12.2014 whereas petitioner has raised invoices and charged the respondent for the period till 16.2.2015. On a careful perusal of the pleadings and the correspondences, it is found that no case has been made out that after the expiry of the agreements, efforts were being made for renewal of the agreement or for a fresh agreement between the parties. Since such a case has not been made out by the petitioner as per law settled by the judgement of this Tribunal in case of UCN cable Vs, the petitioner's claim must be confined to the period covered by the affiliation agreement. Learned counsel for the petitioner has shown that the outstanding amount till end of December 2014 and covered by the agreements comes to only Rs. 60,30,081.00. Accordingly, we allow the petitioner's petition only for the aforesaid amount of Rs. 60,30,081.00.

Although petitioner has claimed interest on the sum due @ 18% p.a., we are inclined to follow our recent orders and accordingly, we allow interest in favour of the petitioner over the aforesaid due amount only @ 9% p.a. The interest shall be payable from May'2016, when the petition was filed till date of realisation. Since the respondent has not appeared and contested the claim, petitioner is directed to bear its own costs. The petition is allowed to the aforesaid extent. The respondent is directed to pay the decretal amount within two months failing which the petitioner will be entitled to realise the same by preferring execution application. The

office is directed to prepare a formal decree on the basis of this judgement at the earliest, preferably within four weeks. The petition is allowed to the aforesaid extent.

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 19thDecember, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.

... Petitioner

Vs.

Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd

... Respondent

BEFORE:**HON'BLE MR. BIPIN BIHARI SRIVASTAVA, MEMBER****HON'BLE MR. A.K. BHARGAVA, MEMBER**

For Petitioner : Mr. PulkitAggarwal, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. NavinChawla, Advocate

ORDER

Mr. NavinChawla, learned counsel appears and submits that despite his efforts no instructions are coming from the respondent and he, therefore, seeks discharge. He is discharged. Mr. PulkitAggarwal appears on behalf of the petitioner and submits that in view of the non-appearance of the respondent, the matter may proceed *ex-parte*.

It is permitted accordingly. The petitioner is directed to file its evidence on affidavit within two weeks from today and produce its witness for examination on a date fixed by Registry.

.....
(B.B. Srivastava)
Member

.....
(A.K. Bhargava)
Member

/NS/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 8th December, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
Vs.
Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. PulkitAggarwal, Advocate

For Respondent : None

ORDER

Examination-in-chief of Petitioners witness is complete before
Ms. Disha Sachdeva, Learned Advocate Commissioner.

List these ex-parte matters on board for hearing.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 29th November, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Love Cable Network	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd	... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. PulkitAggarwal, Advocate

For Respondent : None

ORDER

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that the matters are listed for evidence before Ms. Disha Sachdeva, Learned Advocate Commissioner on 5th December, 2016.

List on 8th December, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
 NEW DELHI**

Dated 24th November, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner

Vs.

Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. ShashankShekher, Advocate
 Mr. PulkitAggarwal, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. AnurupNarula, Advocate

ORDER

Reply has not yet been filed. Mr. Anurup Narula, Advocate for the Respondent submits that he has not received any instruction from his client and therefore would take appropriate action seeking discharge from this matter. He may do so as per prescribed procedure. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner opposes grant of any further time to file reply.

Respondent is directed to file its reply before next date, failing which suitable action will be taken. The Registry is directed to send a certified copy of this order at Respondents address as given in Memo of Parties. **Order dasti as well.** Mr. Narula also undertakes to inform the Respondent of this order.

List on 14th December, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
 NEW DELHI**

Dated 10th November, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Love Cable Network	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd	... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. ShashankShekher, Advocate

For Respondent : None

ORDER

Affidavit in evidence in these two ex-parte matters has been filed by the Petitioner. Ms. Disha Sachdeva, Advocate has already been appointed Advocate Commissioner vide order dated 23rd September, 2016 to record examination-in-chief of Petitioners witness in this Petitions.

List on 29th November, 2016 for directions. The Petitioner is directed and Learned Advocate Commissioner is requested to complete Petitioners evidence before said date.

.....
(Sanjeev Pandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
 NEW DELHI**

Dated 10th November, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner

Vs.

Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. Shashank Shekher, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. AnurupNarula, for Mr.
NavinChawla, Advocate

ORDER

Reply has not yet been filed. Learned Counsel for the Respondent seeks further time of one week stating that reply is still awaited from the client. Learned Counsel for the other side opposes grant of any further time. On the last date two weeks time, by way of last indulgence, was given to Respondent to file reply. Another opportunity of one week is given to Respondent to file reply.

List on 24th November, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 25th October, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.

... Petitioner

Vs.
Love Cable Network ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner

Vs.
Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. PulkitAggarwal, Advocate

For Respondent : None

ORDER

Ms. DishaSachdeva, Advocate was appointed Advocate Commissioner vide order dated 23rd September, 2016 to record examination-in-chief of Petitioners witness in Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner prays for appointment of same Advocate Commissioner to record examination-in-chief in Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016 as well. Ordered accordingly.

List both the Petitions for directions on 10th November, 2016.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 23rd September, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Love Cable Network	... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner	:	Mr. ShashankShekher, Advocate
For Respondent	:	None

ORDER

Upon being mentioned this matter is taken on board.

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks permission to file Affidavit in evidence in this ex-parte matter during the course of the day. He may do so. He also prays for appointment of Advocate Commissioner to record examination-in-chief of his witness at an early date at his cost.

Ms. DishaSachdeva, Advocate who is present in the Court is appointed as Advocate Commissioner to record examination-in-chief of

Petitioners witness. She would be paid fee of Rs.5000/- for the same to be borne by the Petitioner.

List on 19th October, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
 NEW DELHI**

Dated 19th October, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner

Vs.

Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. PulkitAggarwal, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. AnurupNarula, for Mr.
 NavinChawla, Advocate

ORDER

Reply has not yet been filed. Mr. AnurupNarula, Advocate for the Respondent seeks further time of two weeks stating that they could not

contact the client. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner opposes grant of any further time. By way of last indulgence time as prayed for is given.

List on 10th November, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 23rd September, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner

Vs.

Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. ShashankShekher, Advocate

For Respondent : None

ORDER

No one appears for the Respondent. Reply has not yet been filed.

List on 29th September, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

Mr. AnurupNarula, Learned Counsel for the Respondent appears at this stage and seeks further time of two weeks for filing reply. Time given.

List on 19th October, 2016 for directions. Matter need not be listed on 29th September, 2016 as indicate above.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 7th September, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
Vs.
Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. PulkitAggarwal, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. AnurupNarula, Advocate

ORDER

As prayed for two weeks further time is given to Respondent to file reply.

List on 23rd September, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 2nd September, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
Vs.
Ove Cable Network ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
Vs.
Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

HON'BLE MR. B.B. SRIVASTAVA, MEMBER

For Petitioner : Mr. ShashankShekhar, Advocate for
Mr.KunalTandon,Advocate
For Respondent : None

ORDER

Mr. ShashankShekhar, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Affidavit of Service of notice has been filed and there is no appearance on behalf of the respondent. Today also there is no appearance on behalf of the respondent. He prays for proceeding these matter *sex parte*. It is ordered accordingly.

The petitioner is directed to file its evidence on affidavit within four weeks from today and produce the deponent before the Deputy Registrar for his examination on the date fixed by the Registry.

.....
(B.B. Srivastava)
Member

/NC/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 24th August, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.289 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Surma Valley Cable Network	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Love Cable Network	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.293 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Super Channels India Pvt.Ltd	... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner	:	Ms. SugandhaSharan, Advocate for Mr. KunalTandon, Advocate
----------------	---	---

For Respondent In Petition No.289, 291,292 &	:	None
---	---	------

293 of 2016

ORDER

Broadcasting Petition No.291& 292 of 2016

No one appears for Respondents. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that she has filed Affidavit of Service of Notices and prays to proceed ex-parte.

List before Hon'ble Tribunal for directions on 31st August, 2016.

Broadcasting Petition No.289& 293 of 2016

No one appears for the Respondents. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner prays for issuance of fresh notice. ***Issue fresh notice, dastias well.*** Respondent is directed to file its reply in three weeks time.

List on 23rd September, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 16thAugust, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.294 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.

... Petitioner

Vs.

Meenu Cable

... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner

:

Mr. ShashankShekhar, Advocate

For Respondent(s)

:

Mr. Ratnesh Kumar, Advocate
Proxy

ORDER

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that notices have been duly served upon the Respondents. He prays to proceed ex-parte. Respondents are directed to file their reply in three weeks time.

List on 7th September, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 16th August, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner

Vs.

Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. ShashankShekhar, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. AnurupNarula, Advocate

ORDER

Mr. AnurupNarula, Advocate appears for the Respondent and seeks time to file Vakalatnama and reply. Three weeks time is given.

List on 7th September, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
 NEW DELHI**

Dated 12th August, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.289 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Surma Valley Cable Network	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Love Cable Network	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.293 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Super Channels India Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. PulkitAggarwal, Advocate

For Respondent
 In Petition No.289,291,292 : None
 &293 of 2016

ORDER

No one appears for the Respondents.

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks 10 days time for filing Affidavit of Service. He may do so.

List on 24th August, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 1st August, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.289 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Surma Valley Cable Network ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Love Cable Network ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.293 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Super Channels India Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

BEFORE:**MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

For Petitioner : Ms. SugandhaSharan, Advocate

For Respondent
 In Petition No.289,291,292 &
 293 of 2016 : None

ORDER

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks one week time to file Affidavit of Service. She may do so.

List on 10th August, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 20th July, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.289 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Surma Valley Cable Network	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Ove Cable Network	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.293 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Super Channels India Pvt.Ltd	... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.294 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.	... Petitioner
Vs.	

Meenu Cable

... Respondent

BEFORE:

MR. SANJEEV PANDEY, DEPUTY REGISTRAR

For Petitioner : Mr. ShashankShekhar, Advocate
for Mr.KunalTandon,Advocate

For Respondent

In Petition

No.289,290,291,292 & 293 of : None
2016

In Petition No.294 of 2016

Mr. PiyushMathur, Advocate
Proxy for Mr. Ajay Mandyal,
Advocate

ORDER

Broadcasting Petition No.294 of 2016

Mr. PiyushMathur, Advocate appears as Proxy Counsel for Mr. Ajay Mandyal, Advocate and seeks time to file Vakalatnama and time to file reply. Learned Counsel for the Respondent is directed to file its Vakalatnama in one week time and reply in three weeks time.

List on 16th August, 2016 for directions.

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

Noone appears for the Respondent.

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner prays for issuance of fresh notice. Ordered accordingly.Dasti as well.

Respondent is directed to file its reply in three weeks time.

List on 16th August, 2016 for directions.

Broadcasting Petition No.289,291,292& 293 of 2016

No one appears for the Respondent.

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks one week time to file Affidavit of Service. He may do so.

List on 29th July, 2016 for directions.

.....
(SanjeevPandey)
Deputy Registrar

/KP/

**TELECOM DISPUTES SETTLEMENT & APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

Dated 9th May, 2016

Broadcasting Petition No.289 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd.

... Petitioner

Vs.

Surma Valley Cable Network

... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.290 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Trustline Broadband Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.291 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Ove Cable Network ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.292 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Moon IT Services Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.293 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Super Channels India Pvt.Ltd ... Respondent

Broadcasting Petition No.294 of 2016

MSM Media Distribution Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
 Vs.
 Meenu Cable ... Respondent

BEFORE:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AFTAB ALAM, CHAIRPERSON****HON'BLE MR. B.B. SRIVASTAVA, MEMBER**

For Petitioner : Mr. ShashankShekhar, Advocate for
 Mr.KunalTandon,Advocate
 For Respondent : None

ORDER

Admit

Issue notice; *dasti*, in addition.

Reply may be filed within three weeks from the date of service of the notice; rejoinder, if any, may be filed within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the reply.

Put up before the Registrar's Court on 20.07.2016 for getting the pleadings completed, framing of issues and taking evidences.

.....
(AftabAlam)
Chairperson

.....
(B.B. Srivastava)
Member

/NC/

