

\$~10

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 9562/2016

DHRUV FILMS

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Sumit Chander and Mr Jatin  
Choudhary, Advocates.

versus

DD URDU DOORDARSHAN AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms Arti Bansal, Advocate for R-  
3/UOI.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU**

**ORDER**

% **06.02.2019**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning a letter dated 06.01.2016, whereby the petitioner's proposal for allotment for a programme titled as 'Zamein Dekh Falak Dekh Jahan Dekh' was rejected.
2. It is apparent from the plain reading of the said communication that the petitioner's proposal for commissioning programme was rejected on the ground that his son (Shri Dhruv Sehgal) had also submitted a programme pursuant to the said scheme. According to the respondents, both the petitioner and his son could submit only one proposal, as individuals of family could be granted only one assignment.
3. Mr Sharma, learned counsel who appears for respondent no.1, readily concedes that the said communication is required to be set aside. He states that, thereafter, the proposal of the petitioner's son was rejected.

4. He has also referred to a letter dated 30.05.2016, which indicates that the petitioner's programme is one of the 580 recommended proposals. The petitioner was further informed by the said letter that whenever the said proposal comes up for consideration, the petitioner would require to submit tangible documentary proof to establish the fact that he and his son were separate families. Mr Sharma states that this ground also does not survive.

5. Mr Chander, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has also drawn the attention of this Court to a notice dated 20.02.2010, which provides for following clarification:-

**“Clause N(v) may read as follows:**

An individual producer/production house/members belonging to same family will be granted only one assignment, irrespective of the number of subject categories per round of commissioning. For the purposes of this clause, “Family” all mean:

- (a) Spouse (including judicially/separated spouse).
- (b) Dependent parents
- (c) Dependent brothers/unmarried dependent sisters.
- (d) Dependent sons/dependent unmarried daughter including such step sons/step daughters and adopted sons/adopted daughters).

A family member will be treated as dependent unless he has been an income tax payer during the last three financial years and has attached income tax return in proof of the same and also has been an independent producer in his own rights as per the documentary evidence submitted by him.”

6. He submits that since the petitioner's son was not dependent on him, the question of rejecting the petitioner's proposal does not arise. There does

not seem to be real dispute as to the contentions advanced by the petitioner.

7. Mr Sharma fairly states that the petitioner's name is now listed at Sl. No.118 of the selected programmes in the category of 'Fiction', and allottees upto Sl. No.79 have already been accommodated. He states that the petitioner would also be accommodated in his turn subject to the scheme subsisting.

8. In view of the above, the grievance of the petitioner in the present petition stands redressed. However, Mr Chander submits that the petitioner's proposal has been incorrectly categorized as 'Fiction' and ought to have been considered in the category of 'Quiz' or 'Animation'. This Court is not inclined to entertain this controversy in this petition, as there is no foundation for the same. However, it would be open for the petitioner to make a representation in this regard. It is directed that if such a representation is made to respondent no.1 within a period of two weeks from today, the same would be considered as expeditiously as possible and, in any event, not later than four weeks, thereafter.

9. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

10. Order *dasti*.

**VIBHU BAKHRU, J**

**FEBRUARY 06, 2019**  
**MK**