

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 2615/2016 & CM APPLs. 11066-11067/2016

UJJWAL JAIN AND ORS

Through

..... Petitioners

Mr. Kirti Uppal, Senior Advocate
with Ms. Aastha Dhawan,
Mr. Sidharth Chopra and Ms.
Wamika Trehan, Advocates

versus

UOI AND ORS

Through

..... Respondents

Mr. Jasmeet Singh, CGSC with
Ms. Pallavi Shali, Advocate for R-1.
Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate for
R-2.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN****ORDER**

%

23.03.2016

Present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to respondent no. 3-Doordarshan to evaluate the pilot projects of the petitioners submitted in pursuance to the Self-Financed Commissioning [for short "SFC"] Scheme dated 11th November, 2014.

It is the case of the petitioners that in November, 2014 respondent no. 3 invited proposals under the SFC Scheme for prime time and mid time slots of Doordarshan National Channel. Respondent no. 3 is stated to have indicated that proposals received prior to 15th April, 2015 shall be evaluated

between 28th April, 2015 and 20th May, 2015. In pursuance thereto, 179 proposals have been evaluated, out of which 30 have been approved.

The controversy in the present petition pertains to remaining 154 proposals which were received by respondent no. 3 after 15th April, 2015 till the closure of the Scheme, i.e., 20th November, 2015.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioners states that no reason has been communicated to the petitioners till date for non-consideration of their proposals.

Though learned counsel for respondent no. 2-Prasar Bharti, who appears on advance notice, has sought to rely upon Clause 47 of the guidelines for SFC programmes, yet this Court is of the view that the reasons for the non-consideration of the petitioners' proposals should be communicated to the petitioners in writing so that the petitioners can challenge the same, if they so desire.

Consequently, present writ petition and applications are disposed of with a direction to respondent no. 2-Prasar Bharti to disclose reasons for non-evaluation of the petitioners' pilot project. The said reasons are directed to be communicated within three weeks. This Court clarifies that it has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the controversy and the rights and contentions of all parties are left open.

MANMOHAN, J

MARCH 23, 2016

rn