

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.03.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mrs. JUSTICE PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA

W.P. No.33444 of 2013
and M.P.No.1 of 2013

Chennai Metro Cable T.V.Operators
Association, (Regd.270/2011),
Rep by its President,
No.33/8, Srinivasa Iyer Street,
West Mambalam, Chennai 600 033 .. Petitioner

Versus

1. Government of India,
Rep by Secretary,
Ministry of I & B,
New Delhi.
2. Telecom Regulatory Authority of India,
Rep.by its Chairman,
Mahanagar Doorsanchar Bhawan,
(next to Zakir Hussain College)
Jawaharlal Nehru Marg (Old Minto Road)
New Delhi - 110 002 ... Respondents

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Mandamus directing the second respondent to conduct the meetings to discuss the implementation of DAS in Chennai only in Chennai and consequently direct the second respondent to hear the petitioners Association in present and also in all the future meetings / conferences / discussions, relating to the implementation of DAS in Chennai.

For Petitioner : Ms.J.Amirtha Sarayan

For Respondent-1 : Mr.B.Rabu Manohar,
Senior Central Government Panel Counsel

For Respondent-2 : M.Devendran

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the second respondent to conduct the meetings to discuss the implementation of DAS in Chennai, only at Chennai and consequently for a direction to the second respondent to hear petitioner's Association in present and also in all the future meetings/conferences/discussions, relating to the implementation of DAS in Chennai.

2. It is pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner that, though the members of the petitioner association are in Chennai, the meetings are held at Delhi. On 4.12.2013, the second respondent had sent an e-mail, intimating that there was a meeting to be convened on 6.12.2013 to discuss the issues relating to the implementation of the Digital Addressable cable TV Systems in Chennai. However, on the same day, after an hour, another mail was sent to the petitioner postponing the date of meeting to 9.12.2013 and changing the venue of the meeting to Delhi. Aggrieved by the same, the present writ petition has been filed.

3. Upon notice, the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent also states that, after the writ petition, there seems to be no meeting convened in this regard. Learned counsel for the petitioner, impressed upon the court that, already the grievances and also the difficulties of the petitioner association, were addressed to the Chairman of the second respondent and it will be easy for the petitioner, if the meetings are held only in Chennai. Learned counsel for the second respondent also stated that, if any such request is made by the petitioner, it will be appropriately considered.

4. Therefore, without going into the merits of the case, petitioner association is directed to make a request as per the prayer made in the writ petition to the second respondent, within a period of two weeks and on receipt of the same, the second respondent is directed to consider the request and pass appropriate orders, within a period of four weeks, thereafter.

5. With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ASR
To

1. The Secretary,
Government of India,
Ministry of I & B,
New Delhi.
2. The Chairman,
Telecom Regulatory Authority of India,
Mahanagar Doorsanchar Bhawan,
(next to Zakir Hussain College)
Jawaharlal Nehru Marg (Old Minto Road)
New Delhi - 110 002

+1cc to Mr.J.Srinivasa Mohan, Advocate, S.R.No.22497
+1cc to Mr.B.Rabu Manohar, Advocate, S.R.No.21497
+1cc to Mr.Devendran, Advocate S.R.No.21807

W.P.No.33444 of 2013

CO-JP
adl/28.05/2020

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY