

September 18, 2019

BSE Limited Corporate Services Department Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers Dalal Street, Mumbai-400 001	The National Stock Exchange of India Limited Corporate Communications Department “Exchange Plaza” Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai-400051
Scrip Code: 532529	Scrip Symbol: NDTV

Sub: Disclosure under Regulation 30 of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015

Dear Sir/ Madam

This is in furtherance to the disclosure submitted by New Delhi Television Ltd. (“NDTV”) on September 12, 2019 regarding the order dated September 5, 2019 (uploaded on September 11, 2019) (“Order”), passed by the Hon’ble Bombay High Court in a defamation suit filed by NDTV in 2013 against Quantum Securities Private Limited and its directors - Mr. Sanjay Dutt, Mr. Om Prakash Arora, Mr. Neeraj Dewan and Mr. Sandeep Dutt.

The copy of the said Order is annexed hereto for reference and records, in conformity with a statement made on September 17, 2019 to the Hon’ble Bombay High Court, by counsel for NDTV.

Thanking you.

Yours faithfully.

For New Delhi Television Limited



Shiv Ram Singh

Company Secretary & Compliance Officer



Encl: Copy of the Order dated September 5, 2019 passed by the Hon’ble Bombay High Court

Ladda.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 488 OF 2014

IN

SUIT No. 284 OF 2014.

New Delhi Television Limited ..Applicant.

In the matter between:-

New Delhi Television Limited ..Plaintiff.

Vs

Quantum Securities Pvt. Ltd. & Ors ..Defendants.

Ms. Feresthe Sethna a/with Mr. Sagar Sarin & Mr. Shreyash Taparia
i/by DMD Advocates for the Applicant/Plaintiff.

Mr. Dinkar Singh & Ms. Jaymala M. Raut for the defendants.

CORAM : B.P. COLABAWALLA, J.

DATED :- 5th SEPTEMBER, 2019.

P.C. :-

1. This Notice of Motion has been filed by the applicant
(original plaintiff) mainly for the following reliefs:-

(a) That pending the hearing and final disposal of the Suit, the Defendants and each of them (by themselves and by / through their servants, employees, affiliates, associates and agents) be restrained, by order and injunction of this

1/6

Hon'ble Court, from in any manner further issuing any defamatory letters, notices, emails, etc., in connection with and/or pertaining to and/or relating to the Plaintiff, its senior officials and promoters;

(aa) That pending the hearing and final disposal of this Suit, the Defendants and each of them (by themselves and/by through their servants, employees, affiliates, associates and agents) be restrained by an order and injunction of this Hon'ble Court, from in any manner further publishing, re-publishing, printing, reprinting, stating, re-stating and/or repeating the allegations made in the various publications brought out in the present Suit or any allegations substantially similar in nature to the allegations made in the various publications brought out in the present Suit against the Plaintiff, its management and/or its Promoters;

2. When this Notice of Motion was pressed at the ad-interim stage, an ex parte ad-interim order was passed on 6th August, 2013. After a detail discussion, in paragraph No. 16, this Court found that the plaintiff had made out a prima facie case in terms of prayer clause (a) of the Notice of Motion. The learned Judge at the ad-interim stage recorded that the balance of convenience and/or irreparable injury are also in favour of the plaintiff for granting of ex parte ad-interim reliefs. Accordingly, ad-interim relief in terms of prayer clause (a) was granted and the matter was stood over to 13th August, 2013.

3. On the next occasion, namely, 13th August, 2013 the

defendants were represented by an Advocate and sought time to file an affidavit-in-reply on behalf of the defendants. Accordingly, the Notice of Motion was placed for hearing and final disposal on 29th August, 2013 and in the meantime the ad-interim order dated 6th August, 2013 was continued. Thereafter, the matter was again on board on 17th October, 2013. On this date, the learned Judge directed both parties to remain present in the Chambers on 13th November, 2013 at 3:00 p.m. to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement. In the meantime, it was clarified that the Regulatory Authority shall be at liberty to proceed with the complaints received by them from the defendants on merits, despite the orders passed by this Court on 6th August, 2013 (wrongly mentioned as 3rd August, 2013) and 13th August, 2013. It was also directed that none of the parties shall circulate or publish this order except forwarding a copy of the same to the Statutory Authority. It is thereafter that this Notice of Motion has come up for hearing and final disposal before me.

4. I have heard Ms. Feresthe Sethna, the learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the applicant/plaintiff as well as Mr. Dinkar Singh, the learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the defendants.

5. Ms Sethna took me through the averments made in the plaint in great detail and sought to establish that the defendants are in the habit of making defamatory statements against the plaintiff as well as its promoters which has a negative impact on the business of the plaintiff and therefore at the ad-interim stage this Court correctly and justifiably granted ad-interim relief in terms of prayer clause (a) of the Notice of Motion. She submitted that looking at the averments made in the plaint and the conduct of the defendants who are clearly continuing with their unjustified and defamatory statements and indulging in a smear campaign against the plaintiff, the ad-interim orders ought to be continued till the disposal of the suit.

6. On the other hand, Mr. Singh, the learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the defendants submitted a note of arguments on behalf of the defendants to justify as to how none of the letters referred to by the learned Judge at the ad-interim stage did not in any way amount to defamation. He submitted that the ad-interim order was passed ex parte and without hearing the defendants. He submitted that if one was to look at these documents

and which have been referred to in great detail in the note of arguments filed on behalf of the defendants, it would be clear that the defendants are not guilty of any defamation. In any event, the learned Advocate for the defendants submitted that without prejudice to their rights and contentions that they are not guilty of any defamation whatsoever, the defendants are willing to make a statement to this Court that they being proud shareholders of the plaintiff Company and formally believing in the credibility of the plaintiff in the electronic news media, the defendants shall not continue to make or publish any defamatory statements against the plaintiff and/or its promoters. Mr. Singh however clarified that this would not mean that the defendants would in any way be hampered or restrained from making any complaints to any statutory or regulatory authorities or from raising any grievances by writing letters or correspondence to the Directors of the plaintiff. Ms Sethna, the learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the plaintiff has fairly stated, on instructions, that she is satisfied with the statement made on behalf of the defendants and this Notice of Motion can be disposed of in terms of the statement made by Mr. Dinkar Singh.

7. In view of this consensus, without prejudice to the rights

and contentions of both parties, as per the statement of Mr. Dinkar Singh made on behalf of the defendants, the defendants shall not make and/or publish any defamatory statements against the plaintiff including in the social media. It is clarified that this restraint order will not preclude the defendants from making any complaints to regulatory and statutory authorities, which, if made, shall be decided by such authorities on its own merits and in accordance with law. Similarly, this restraint order will not preclude the defendants from addressing correspondence to the Directors of the plaintiff Company raising their grievances regarding its management and/or the conduct of the management. The Notice of Motion is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

(B.P. COLABAWALLA, J.)

Digitally signed
by
Radhakrishnan S.
S. Ladda
Date: 2010.06.11
11:43:55
+05'30'