

*(Unofficial-Translation)*¹

Nepa-Telecommunications Authority

Decision made by

1. Chairperson Prof. Dr. Dinesh Kumar Sharma
2. Member Mahesh Prasad Adhikari
3. Member Balaram Pradhanang
4. Member Bheshraj Kanel
5. Member Tulasi Bhatta

Date of petition registration: 2063.12.26 (9 April 2007)

muniepa-C
Petition registration number: 11

Suman Chhetri, authorized on behalf of Web Server Communication
Pvt. Ltd., having its registration office at ~~W~~do

Petition registration number: 16	
----------------------------------	--

Mr. Sudhir Kumar Paudel, authorized on behalf of Vianet Communication Pvt. Ltd., having its registered office at Ward No. 3, Lalitpur Sub-municipal Corporation, Lalitpur Distric--1

Versus	
--------	--

Nepal Doorsanchar Company Limited, Central Office, Kathmandu -1	Respondent
---	------------

Date of petition registration: 2063.12.27 (9 April 2007)	
Petition registration number: 17	

Mr. Mahendra Kumar Subedi, authorized on behalf of Everest Net Pvt. Ltd., having its registered office at Ward No. 4, Lalitpur Sub-

Versus	
Nepal Doorsanchar Company Limited, Central Office, Kathmandu -1	Respondent
Date of petition registration: 2063.12.29 (11 April 2007) Petition registration number: 20	
Mr. Ek Raj Sedhai, authorized on behalf of Radius Communication Pvt. Ltd., having its registered office at Ward No. 31, Kathmandu Municipal Corporation, Kathmandu District-----1	Petitioner
Versus	
Nepal Doorsanchar Company Limited, Central Office, Kathmandu -1	Respondent
Date of petition registration: 2063.12.30 (12 April 2007) Petition registration number: 21	
Mr. Mingmar Tamang, authorized on behalf of Himal Technologies Pvt. Ltd., having its registered office at Ward No. 8, Kathmandu Municipal Corporation, Kathmandu District-----1	Petitioner
Versus	
Nepal Doorsanchar Company Limited, Ce	

Mr. Manish Kumar Singh, authorized on behalf of Himalayan Online Service Pvt. Ltd., having its registered office at Ward No. 29, Kathmandu Municipal Corporation, Kathmandu District-----1	Petitioner
Versus	
Nepal Doorsanchar Company Limited, Central Office, Kathmandu -1	Respondent

Subject: Petition for equal treatment.

The statement of defense in writing submitted by NDCL reads that the petitioner's claim for taking action pursuant to Sections 16 and 47 of the Telecommunications Act, and Rules 22 and 24 of the Telecommunications Rules, 2054(1997) for an act contravening the Telecommunications Act is not a legal provision in relation to the settleme

responding to what had happened in relation to the petitioner's claim and whether the order as sought by the petitioner should be issued or not.

Exchange could be offered to ISPs as every connection occupies a channel and separation of

fees and other terms of the telecommunications se

possible obstruction in competition. The Authority has a duty to ensure that such activities do not

allocation of resources in a non-transparent manner watches such activities and prevent them on occasions, impose fines and various services are operated by the same institution, and issues order to operate separate units if any condition or situation envisaged in Section 42(3) is found.

We concur with the above opinion.

Sd.

Prof. Dr. Dinesh Kumar Sharma

Sd.

Mahesh Prasad Adhikari