

OF 1986.

In the matter of Article 14,
19 (1) (A) and 19(1)(C) of the
Constitution of India;

Versus.

1. Union of India,
Through Secretary,
Ministry for Information and
Broadcasting :

2. The State of Maharashtra
Through;

Respondents.

To,

The Honourable the Chief Justice and other Honourable Puisne Judges of the High Court of Judicature at Bombay.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THE
PETITIONERS ABOVENAMED:

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

1. The Petitioners are Citizens of India and are permanent Indian inhabitants. The first Petitioner is an outstanding public figure, an active participant in the freedom movement, a member of both the Constituent Assembly and the Lok Sabha, General Secretary and later President of the Swatantra Party and above all a zealous advocate of individual freedom.

The second Petitioner is former Director - General of All India Radio. He thus has first-hand knowledge of the technical intricacies of radio Communication. He is thus eminantly qualified to speak with authority on the contents and quality of radio and T.V broadcasting.

2. The Petitioners state and submit that they wish to set up independent broadcasting

stations for radio and television respectively, to function alongside. All India Radio and Doordarshan. The petitioners further state that they wish to establish a public limited company for the aforesaid purpose and the proposed Board of Directors for this enterprise will comprise patriotic men and women of standing and integrity.

3. The petitioners further state and submit that initially the Headquarters of the proposed broadcasting stations will be in Bombay. The petitioners will use transmitters of medium power.

4. The petitioners made an application to the Minister for Information and Broadcasting on 11th September, 1986 requesting him to grant the petitioners, a valid licence to establish independent broadcasting stations for radio and television to be run alongside AIR and Doordarshan. The said letter is annexed herewith and marked as Exhibit 'A' to the petition.

Ex. A.

The said letter, inter alia, placed the proposal of the petitioners for the establishment of independent broadcasting stations before the Minister with all the necessary information regarding the setting up of such broadcasting stations and also showed willingness to be subjected to reasonable control and supervision by the Government of India in respect of frequencies to be used, and further to any such rules and regulations as may be laid down by a statutory authority of a quasi-judicial

5. The petitioners state that in reply to their first communication dated 11th September 1986 marked Exhibit 'A', Respondent No.1 by their

EX.A.

letter no.L.14027/171/86-LR dated 17.10.1986 chose to misunderstand the request made by the petitioners and arranges for the Ministry of Communications to send the wrong forms which are intended for a mere issue of a licence for a wireless transmitter. A copy of this ~~form~~ ^{letter} is

EX.B.

attached hereto as Exhibit B. On 23rd December 1986 the petitioners again wrote to the New Minister for Information and Broadcasting,

EX.C.

(letter marked Exhibit C) Mr. Ajit Panja pointing out that the reply received from Government to the petitioners' request was irrelevant and unsatisfactory and requesting him to give a considered reply in principle to the petitioners' request. When no reply was received from the Minister, a reminder was sent to him on 24th

EX.D.

January 1987, (letter marked Exhibit D) No reply was received to either letters. The petitioners hold that the failure to reply amounts to a rejection of their repeated requests.

nature to be established by Parliament for that purpose.

Ex. B.

5. [The application made by the petitioners was rejected by Respondent No. 1 by his letter dated _____ annexed hereto and marked as Exhibit 'B'. The said letter at Ex. B is under challenge in this petition.]

6. The petitioners submit that the Constitution of the Republic India seeks to create for her its citizens an atmosphere of healthy and unhindered freedom in which there is a free exchange of thought, ideas and opinions to enable the people to make their decisions be it social political or cultural with greater facility and intrammelled by constraints that restrict the people's right to know and be informed.

7. It is submitted that it is against this background that the rights of the petitioners and their anxiety to establish independent broadcasting stations should be viewed.

8. The petitioners submit that Article 14 of the Constitution of India guarantees equal rights to all citizens and associations. The rejection of the request of the petitioners at Ex. A by Respondent No. 1, is highly discriminatory to the petitioners. The state monopoly of radio and television constitute an unreasonable restriction on the exercise of equal rights by the petitioners. The impugned letter at Ex. A is therefore, violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India as it seeks to perpetuate

state monopoly in matters of radio and television and seeks to exclude the petitioners from those fields on grounds that are unreasonable and arbitrary.

9. The petitioners further submit that Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India, guarantees freedom of Speech and expression to the Citizens. It is further submitted that the right to expression includes all those forms of expression which are necessary for communication and propagation. The petitioners submit that radio and television are in terms of communication, propagation of different points of view are as vital a media as newspapers. Being audio and visual radio and television infact reach a much larger section of our population considering that even after 37 years of freedom as much _____ % of the people of India cannot read or write. Thus the action of the government of India in denying the petitioners access to such media is not only discriminatory and therefore, violative of Article 14, but is also violative of Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India inasmuch as it puts unreasonable restraints on the freedom of expression of the petitioners and also on their rights to choose the media of expression. The petitioners further submit that if no restrictions are placed on the medium of the written word e.g. in the form of news papers to place a restriction and totally prohibit the use of radio and television by individual citizens is irrational, arbitrary and discriminatory and is violative of Article 14 and 1

and 19(1) (A) of the Constitution of India.

✓
Government's
refusal to respond
to the petitioners'
request,

10. The petitioners further submit that the ~~impugned letter~~ is also violative of Article 19 1(G) of the Constitution of India. Article 19 1(G) guarantees freedom of occupation, business and trade. The impugned letter prevents the petitioners from exercising this right. Such prevention is without reasonable cause or justification. It also puts the petitioners to a disadvantage and detrimental to their interests and rights. The petitioners who wish to engage themselves in the business of radio and television broadcasting are prevented by the impugned letter from engaging themselves in the said business and ~~impugned letter of rejection~~ is therefore violative of Article 19(1) (G) of the Constitution of India.

✓

11. The petitioners further submit that

'Communication' is listed in the Union List in Schedule VII at Entry No. 31 which reads as follows "Posts and Telegraphs, Telephones, Wireless, Broadcasting and other like forms of communication"

Under the Constitution therefore the Union alone ^{in that behalf} is competent to pass legislation ^{The only Union legislation} which is in effect at present is the (Indian) Wireless Telegraphy Act 1933 with its amendments. The said Act up dated to 31.5.1986 defines wireless communication in S.2 as under:-

"In this Act, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context;

(1) Wireless communication means any transmission, omission or reception of signs, signals, writing, images and sounds or intelligence of any nature by means of electricity, magnetism, or Radio waves or Hertzian Waves without the use of wires or other continuous electrical conductors between the transmitting and receiving apparatus.

Explanation: RadionWaves on Hertzian Waves means electromagnetic waves of frequency lower than 3000 gigacycles per Second propagated in space without artificial guide.

Section 3 of the said Act Lays down the necessity of obtaining a licence for wireless communication and S. 5 lays down the necessity of a licence to be issued by an Authority under the Indian Telegraph Act 1985.

Thus, so far the Union has legislated in the matter of Wireless Communication only in the aforesaid manner.

As the petitioners understand, All India Radio and Doordarshan are only Departments of the Ministry

for Information and Broadcasting and hence, function under the central and supervision of the Ministry for Information and Broadcasting as any other department under its control.

There is no particular legislation therefore in respect of radio and television which can preclude an individual from engaging himself in the business of broadcasting on radio and television.

In any event, the petitioners submit that under entry 31 in the Schedule, the Union can at best legislate in matters of communication but cannot exclude individual citizens and thus conferring monopoly rights and privileges on Government agencies.

12. The petitioners further submit that under the Allocation of Business Rules 1961 as corrected upto 1st March, 1982, the Union can legislate in respect of the following:

I - Radio:

All business connected with AIR embracing news, services in the home programmed, programmes for countries and Indian overseas radio journals, researches in the field of broadcast engineering, monitoring of foreign broadcasts, programme exchange and transcription services, television, supply of community, ^{Sets to state government under the} functioning scheme etc. ^{community,}

II Films:- Legislation under entry 60 of the Union List viz: Sanctioning of Cinematograph Films for exhibition.

III - Advertising and Visual Publicity:

IV - Press:

V - Publications:

VI - Research & Reference:

2
[The Government ~~is~~
declining to issue
a

13. As will be evident from the above, the Union has so far legislated in the matters above mentioned or has put into operation some set of rules and regulations. However, no such legislation, neither the sets of rules in the matters aforesaid either by definite intent or implication exclude the operation of broadcasting and television stations by individual citizens other than the Government of India. / ~~The impugned letter therefore, which rejects the~~ license for the setting up of broadcasting stations is against the authority of law and is therefore bad in law.

14. The petitioners further state that the Government of India is engaged in the business of broadcasting on radio and television for profit. The advertisements published on Radio and Television, the conditions of payment to programme contributors on radio and television will stand testimony to this fact. In the circumstances, therefore it is unreasonable to preclude the petitioners from carrying on the business of broadcasting for profit.

15. The petitioners further state and submit that the petitioners have expressly stated their willingness in their letter of request at Ex. A to function under reasonable control and supervision of any statutory quasi-judicial authority. The petitioners state that the Government of India will always have the field of legislation open to them in the matters of broadcasting and it can always make rules which can create checks and balances to avoid broadcasting and transmission

of unwanted and harmful material.

/the Government's
attitude in
declining to issue
a licence

16. In the aforesaid circumstances, the petitioners challenge the ~~impugned letter at Ex. B~~ on the following grounds amongst others and which are without prejudice to one another:-

GROUND:

- A) That the ~~letter at Ex. B~~, dated 1-1-1962 *Ground's refusal of the* which ~~rejects~~ the request of the petitioners for a valid license for setting up broadcasting stations for radio and Television is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, inasmuch as it is discriminatory. This discrimination is further hostile inasmuch as there is no law for the time being in force which confers monopoly rights and privileges on the Government agencies in matters of ~~bx~~ broadcasting and excludes individual citizens in that behalf.
- B) The ~~impugned letter~~ *The ground's refusal* is violative of Article 19(1)(A) of the Constitution of India inasmuch as it prevents the petitioners from exercising their right to freedom of expression as guaranteed under that articles.
- C) The petitioners submit that the fundamental rights guaranteed under 19(1)(A) not only acknowledge freedom of expression and propogation, but also include in its ambit the right to choose the medium of expression. *Ground's refusal* The ~~impugned letter~~ is therefore, violative of Article 19(1)(A) of the Constitution of India inasmuch as it deprives the petitioners

exercising their right to exercise an option of two media of expression.

- 7A
- D) The ~~impugned letter~~ ^{impugned letter} at Ex. B is violative of Article 19(1)(G) of the Constitution of India as being discriminatory, arbitrary, unreasonable as as being without the authority of law.

17. The petitioners have not filed any other petition of similar nature either in this Honourable Court or in the Supreme Court of India.

18. This Honourable Court has the jurisdiction to hear and dispose of ~~this~~ Petition since the cause of action arisen within the limits of Greater Bombay.

19. The petitioners, therefore, pray:-

- (a) That by an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus Respondent No. 1 be directed to grant the Petitioners a valid licence for setting up broadcasting stations for radio and television on conditions as may be deemed fit by this Honourable Court.

(24)

That by an appropriate writ, order or direction, it be declared that Government monopoly in matters of broadcasting on radio and television be declared illegal and without the authority of law.

- c) That, as a consequence, by an appropriate writ, order or direction, ~~the letter of Respondent No.1 dated _____ at Exhibit 'D'~~ be declared Violative of Article 14, 19(1)(A) and 19(1)(G) of the Constitution of India; and thus illegal.

After failure of the Government to respond to the Petitioner's request

- d) That by an appropriate writ, order or direction, Respondent No.1 be directed to set up an authority at least of quasi-judicial nature to exercise uniform control over all those who shall be engaged in the business of broadcasting or radio and television.

- f) Any other reliefs as deemed fit and proper in the interests of justice and in the circumstances of this petition be passed. And for this act of kindness and justice, Your Lordship's petitioners shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Petition drawn by;

Usha Purohit, Advocate

High Court.

)

))

)

)

....)

Petitioners.

Advocate for the petitioners.

WRIT PETITION NO. OF 1986.

And

And

1. Shri Minoo R. Masani,
Indian Inhabitant, Residing
at _____

2. Shri P. C. Chatterjee,
Indian Inhabitant, Ex-Director
Residing at _____

Versus.

1. Union of India,
Through Secretary,
Ministry for Information and
Broadcasting ;

2. The State of Maharashtra
Through:

Respondents.

To,

The Honourable the Chief Justice and other Honourable Puisne Judges of the High Court of Judicature at Bombay.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THE
PETITIONERS ABOVE NAMED:

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

1. That the petitioners are Citizens of India and are permanent Indian Inhabitants. Petitioner No.1 has always been closely associated with the social and Political life, of the Indian People. Petitioner No.1 has been the President of the Swatantra Party and has always shown deep concern for political , social and cultural values and has been a zealous supporter of individual freedoms.

Petitioner No.2 is the ex-director of _____ ; As such, he has a first hand knowledge about the technical intricacies of media of communication such as Radio and Television. He is well versed with the Techniques of media productions and is alive to the necessary quality of media productions in terms of their informative, educative, creative and entertaining potentials.

2. The petitioners state and submit that they are desirous of (starting) setting up independent broad-casting stations, one for radio and the other for television to function alongside All India Radio and Door Darshan. The petitioners further state that they shall establish a public limited company for the aforesaid purpose and the proposed Board of Directors for this enterprise shall comprise men and women of standing and integrity with a strong sense of patriotism. The petitioners

may mention the following persons who support the
Petitioners in their endeavour . These are ;

Mr. Ramkrishna Hegde, Mr. Rajendra Sachar,

Professor Shri Nissim Ezekiel , Mr. Manohar

Malgaonkar, and Mr. M.P. Chitnis.

3. Thepetitioners further state and submit that
initially , the Headquarters of the proposed ex
broadcasting stations will be in Bombay. The petitioners
shall use transmitters of medium power.

4. The petitioners state that the
petitioners in fact, made an application to the
Minister for Information and Broadcasting , dated

_____ requesting him to grant the petitioners,

a valid licence to establish independent broadcasting stations
for radio and television to be run along with AIR
and Doodhast Doordarshan. The said letter is annexed
herewith and marked as Exhibit 'A' to the petition.

Ex. A.

The said letter interalia placed the proposal of the
petitioners for the establishment of independent
broadcasting stations before the Minister with all the

the necessary information regarding the setting up of such broadcasting stations and also showed willingness to be subjected to reasonable control and supervision by the Government of India in respect of frequencies to be used, and further to any such rules and regulations as may be laid down by a statutory authority of quasi-judicial nature to be established for that purpose.

5. The petitioners state that the application made by the petitioners in the aforesaid matter was rejected by Respondent No.1 by his letter dated _____

Ex. B.

annexed hereto and marked as Exhibit ' B ' .

The said letter at Ex. B is under challenge in this petition.

6. The petitioners, submit that India has come a long way from the days of bondage under the British Imperial Rule. Monopoly

of all available media of expression and near total prohibition on individual, independent media of expression were instruments of politics of constrain and suppression for the British Imperialists. All the freedom loving Indians had to act in defiance of the British Policies to assert their individual rights and freedoms. In free India, however, the political and social structures have naturally changed and as India has emerged as a free

Republic, her constitution now stands a guarantee for the individual freedoms having acknowledged their status as fundamental rights of the Citizens of Free India.

7. It is further the submission of the Petitioners, that the perspective of the checks, controls and supervisions as existed during foreign rule over India has undergone substantial changes and the nature and necessity of checks, controls and

supervisions over contents and forms of expression will now have to be viewed in a different perspective.

8. The petitioners submit that in sharp contrast with the pre-independence India, the Constitution of free India, strives to create for her Citizens an atmosphere of healthy, unhindered freedom so that the Indian Society- politic blossoms into a socially culturally and politically sturdy, mature and enlightened democracy. It is expected in such a democracy that there is an exchange of thoughts, ideas and opinions . The people then can make their decisions in social , political and cultural fields with far greater facility and more openness and with lesser constrain.

9. It is submitted that it is ^{against} ~~on~~ this background that the rights of the petitioners and their anxiety to establish independent

broadcasting stations must be viewed.

10. The petitioners submit that Article 14 of the Constitution of India guarantees equal rights to all Citizens and associations. The rejection of the request letter of the petitioners at Ex. A by Respondent No.1, is highly discriminatory as against the petitioners. The state monopoly in matters of radio and television is further an unreasonable restriction on the exercise of equal rights by the petitioners. The impugned letter at Ex. A is therefore, violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India in as much as it seeks to ^{perpetuate} ~~perpetuate~~ the Govt. monopoly in matters of radio and television and seeks to exclude the petitioners from those fields on grounds that are unreasonable and arbitrary.

11. The petitioners further submit that Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India, guarantees freedom of speech and expression to the Citizens. It is further submitted that the right to expression includes all those forms of expression which are necessary for communication

and propagation . The petitioners submit that radio and television are as much the media of such communication and propagation as are the newspapers. It is further submitted that the basic quality and form of expression is not very much different in respect of radio and television as it is in respect of newspapers. However, radio and television being audio-visual media of communication they can be and are more direct and effective media. The action of the Govt. in shutting out the petitioners from such media is not only discriminatory and therefore, violative of Article 14, but is also violative of Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India inasmuch as it puts unreasonable restraint on the freedom of expression of the petitioners and also on their rights to choose the media for expression. The petitioners further submit that if no restrictions are placed on the medium of written letter e.g. in the forms of

news papers to place a restriction and total prohibition on the use of radio and television *by individual citizens* is irrational, arbitrary and discriminatory and is violative of Articles 14 and 19(1)(A) of the Constitution of India.

12. The petitioners further submit that the impugned letter is also violative of Article 19 1(G) of the Constitution of India. Article 19 1(G) guarantees freedom of occupation, business and trade. The impugned letter prevents the petitioners from exercising this right. Such prevention is without a reasonable cause or ~~any~~ justification. It also puts the petitioners to a disadvantage and creates a detriment, adverse, to their interests and rights. The petitioners who wish to engage themselves in the business of radio and television broadcasting are prevented by the impugned letter from engaging themselves in the said business and the impugned letter of rejection is therefore, violative of Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India.

13. The petitioners further submit that 'Communication' is listed in the Union List in Schedule VII at Entry No. 31 which reads as follows " Posts and Telegraphs , Telephones, Wireless, Broadcasting and other like forms of communications "

Under the Constitution therefore, the Union alone is competent to pass any legislation in that behalf .The only Union legislation which is in effect at present is the (in Indian) Wireless Telegraphy Act 1933- with its amendments . The said Act updated to 31 . 5. 1986 ~~in s. 2~~

defines wireless communication ^{in s. 2} as under :-
^

" In this Act, unless there is anything ^{repugnant} ~~repugnant~~ in the subject or context;

(1) Wireless communication means any transmission, omission or reception of signs, signals, writing, images and sounds or intelligence of any nature by means of

electricity, magnetism, or Radio waves or
Hertzian Waves without the use of wires or other
continuous electrical conductors between the
transmitting and receiving apparatus.

Explanation: Radio Waves on Hertzian
Waves means electromagnetic waves of a frequency
lower than 3000 gigacycles per Second propagated in
space without artificial guide. "

Section 3 of the said Act: Lays down the
necessity of obtaining a licence for wireless
communication and S. 5 lays down the necessity of a licence
to be issued by an Authority under the Indian Telegraph
Act 1885.

Thus, so far, the Union has legislated in the
matter of Wireless Communication only in the aforesaid
manner.

As the petitioners understand, All India Radio
and Doordarshan are only the Departmental limbs of the

Ministry for Information and ~~Box~~ Broadcasting
and hence, function under the Central and
Supervision of the Ministry for ~~R~~ Information
and Broadcasting as any other departmentsix
under its control.

There is no particular legislation
therefore, in respect of radio and television
which can preclude an individual from engaging
himself inthe business of broadcasting on radio
and television.

Inany event, the petitioners submit
that under the entry 31 in the Schedule,
the Union can at best legislate in the matters
of communication but cannot exclude the individual
citizens conferring monopoly rights and
privileges on the Government agencies.

14. The petitioners further submit that under the Allocation of Business Rules 1961 as corrected upto 1 March 1982, the Union can legislate in respect of the following :

I- Radio;

All business connected with AIR embracing news ,services in the home programmes, programmes for countries and Indian overseas, radio journals, researches in the field of broadcast engineering maintaining of foreign broadcasts, programme ~~xx~~ exchange and transcription services, television ~~xx~~ supply of community receiving sets to State Governments, under the community , functioningg ~~scek~~ scheme etc.

II: Films:- Legislation under entry 60 of the

Union List viz; Sanctioning of Cinematograph Films for exhibition .

III- Advertising and Visual Publicity :

IV- Press;

V- Publications;

VI: Research & Reference:-

As will be evident from the above, the Union has ~~not~~ so far legislated in the matters abovementioned or has put into operation some set of rules and regulations. However, none of such legislations, neither the sets of rules in the matters aforesaid either by definite intent or implication exclude the operations of broadcasting stations by individual citizens other than the Govt. of India. The impugned letter therefore, which rejects the license for the setting up of broadcasting stations is against the authority, of law and is therefore, bad in law.

16). The petitioners further state that the Govt. of India is engaged in the business of broadcast

broadcasting on radio and television for profit.

The advertisements published on Radio and Television, the conditions of payment to programme contributors on radio and television will stand a testimony to this fact.

In th circumstances, therefore, it is unreasonable to preclude the petitioners from carrying on the business of broadcasting for profit.

16-A) . The petitioners further state and submit that the petitioners have expressly stated their willingness in their letter of request at Ex. A to function under reasonable control and supervision of any statutory quasi-judicial authority . The petitioners state that the Govt. of India will always have the field of legislation open to them in the matters of broadcasting and it can always make rules which can prevent unhealthy competitions, create checks and balances to avoid

17.

broadcasting and transmission of unwanted
and harmful material and create a quasi
judicial authority, to which all those engaged
in broadcasting, including the Government
agencies, will be subjected . All the
proprietors of broadcasting stations will *then*
be bound by the set of rules and regulations, even in respect
of service conditions of employees and
payments to contributors.

17. In the aforesaid circumstances,
the petitioners challenge the impugned
letter at Ex.B on the following grounds
amongst others and which are without prejudice
to one another :-

 GROUND

- A). That the letter at Ex.B , dated
_____ which rejects the request

of the petitioners for a valid
 licence for setting up broadcasting
 stations for radio and Television is
 violative of Article 14 of the Constitution
 of India, in as much as it discriminates the
 petitioners as against the Govt. agencies
 who are at present engaged in Broadcasting
 on A.I.R. and Doordarshan, ^{The} discrimination
 is further hostile in as much as there is no law
 for the time being in force which confers
 monopoly rights ^{and} privileges on the Govt.
 agencies in matters of broadcasting and
 excludes individual citizens in that behalf.

- B) The impugned letter is violative of
 Article 19(1)(A) of the Constitution of
 India inasmuch as it prevents the petitioners

from exercising these right to
freedom of expression as guaranteed
under that articles

C) The petitioners submit that the
fundamental rights guaranteed under
19(1)(A) not only acknowledge freedom
of expression and ^{propagation} ~~propagation~~ but also
include in its ambit the right to choose
the medium of expression. The impugned
letter is therefore, violative of Article
19(1)(A) of the Constitution of India
in as much as it deprives the petitioners
from exercising his right to ^{exercise} ~~make~~ an
option of the medium of expression.

D) The impugned letter at Ex.B is violative
of Article 19(1)(G) of the Constitution

of India as being discriminatory arbitrary,
unreasonable and as being without the
authority of law.

17. The petitioners have not filed any
other petition of similar nature either in this
Honourable Court or in the Supreme Court of India.

18. This Honourable Court has the jurisdiction
to hear and dispose of this petition since the cause
of action arisen within the limits of Greater Bombay.

19. The petitioners, therefore, pray;-

- a). That by an appropriate writ, order
or direction in the nature of mandamus
Respondent No.1 be directed to grant
the Petitioners a valid licence for setting
up broadcasting stations for radio and
television on conditions as may be deemed
fit by this Honourable Court.

b). That by an appropriate writ,
order or direction, it be declared
that the Govt. monopoly in matters
of broadcasting on radio and television
is illegal and without the
authority of law.

c) That by an appropriate writ, order
or direction it be declared that
the letter of Respondent No.1 dated
_____ at Exhibit 'B' is illegal
as being without the authority of law.

d) That it be further declared that
the impugned letter at Exhibit 'B'
is violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(A)
and 19(1)(G) of the Constitution of India;
India;

d e) That by an appropriate writ, order

or direction, Respondent No.1

be directed to set up an authority

at least of quasi-judicial nature

to exercise a uniform control over all

those who shall be engaged in the business of

broadcasting on radio and television.

f) Any other reliefs as deemed fit and

proper in the interest of justice ^{and} in the

circumstances of this petition be passed.

And for this act of kindness and justice,

Your Lordships' petitioners shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Petition drawn by;

Usha Purohit, Advocate

High Court.

}
}
...)

Petitioners .

Advocate for the petitioners.