

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.2369 OF 2015

Suresh Ramchandra Nadkar

Petitioner

versus

Press Council of India and others

Respondents

Mr.Suresh Nadkar, Petitioner in person, appears.

Mr.vijay Haremath for Respondent no.3.

CORAM : S.C.DHARMADHIKARI AND  
B.P.COLABAWALLA, JJ.

DATE : 2 December 2015

PC :

The Petitioner appears in person.

2. By this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the Petitioner challenges a communication at page 53 of the paper book and equally one at page 73, Annexure-K to the paper book, by which the Press Council of India has informed the Petitioner that no cognizance can be taken of the complaint which has been made by the Petitioner against M/s.Bennett, Coleman Company Limited, owners and proprietors of daily Times of India published from Mumbai. A publication of that proprietor/owner called 'Economic Times' is the news paper in which the alleged offending advertisement was published.

3. The Petitioner does not dispute that this advertisement was published in daily edition of Economic Times dated 12 May 1980. The Press Council of India was approached by the Petitioner after noticing another assertion of Respondent no.3. That assertion was that Bennett Coleman group publishes publications styled as Times of India for past more than 175 years. They, therefore, greeted the readers and assured them all their continued co-operation.

4. We find that Press Council of India was fully justified in rejecting a belated complaint of the Petitioner. Once the offending advertisement is as old as 13 May 1980 and a complaint with regard thereto is moved by the Petitioner in the year 2013, then, the reasons assigned for not taking cognizance of a belated and stale complaint cannot be termed as vitiated by an error apparent on the face of record or perversity. The complaint of the Petitioner that the stand of Press Council of India is unfair cannot be accepted in the face of Petitioner's inaction for all these years. The petition is entirely misconceived and is dismissed.

(S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)

(B.P.COLABAWALLA, J.)