



Neutral Citation Number: [2021] EWHC 504 (QB)

Case No: QB-2019-00261

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE**  
**QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION**  
**MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS LIST**

Royal Courts of Justice  
Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 5 March 2021

**Before :**

**MRS JUSTICE STEYN DBE**

-----  
**Between :**

AMRIK SINGH SAHOTA

**Claimant**

**- and -**

- (1) MIDDLESEX BROADCASTING CORPORATION LIMITED
- (2) JASWANT SINGH BHARJ (AKA JASWANT SINGH THEKEDAR)
- (3) PARMINDER SINGH BAL

**Defendants**

-----  
-----  
David Mitchell (instructed by Sydney Mitchell LLP) for the Claimant  
Richard Munden (instructed by CND Parker) for the Defendants

Judgment without a hearing pursuant to CPR 23.8(b)  
-----

**Approved Judgment**

I direct that no official shorthand note shall be taken of this Judgment and that copies of this version as handed down may be treated as authentic.

.....  
THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE STEYN DBE

**Mrs Justice Steyn DBE :**

**A. Introduction**

1. This claim for defamation arises from a broadcast on Midlands Asian Television National (“MATV”) on 29 January 2018 of a programme called “Gurdwara Miri Piri” (“the Programme”). The hour-long Programme was in Punjabi. It took the form, primarily, of a live discussion between the Second and Third Defendants of matters arising from a protest that had taken place in front of the Indian Embassy a few days earlier.
2. According to the Amended Particulars of Claim, the Claimant, Mr Amrik Singh Sahota OBE is a successful businessman, a devout Sikh, and a prominent advocate of the rights of Sikhs in the Punjab to self-determine in an independent state of Khalistan. He has been a Council Member of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce and has served as chair of the Birmingham Asian Business Association and of the Institute of Asian Businesses. He was appointed to the World Sikh Parliament in 2018 and, since 2002, he has served as the President of the Council of Khalistan. It is said that he is well-known in the Sikh community not only in Birmingham where he lives and works, but throughout the United Kingdom and internationally.
3. The First Defendant operates the television channel on which the Programme was broadcast.
4. The Programme was presented by the Second Defendant, Mr Jaswant Singh Bharj (aka Jaswant Singh Thekadar), with the Third Defendant, Mr Parminder Singh Bal, appearing as a guest.
5. The preliminary issues for determination, in accordance with the consent order approved by Master Davison, sealed on 6 November 2020 (“the consent order”), are:
  - “(1) The natural and ordinary meaning of the words complained of:
    - i. Spoken by the Second Defendant;
    - ii. Spoken by the Third Defendant;
    - iii. As a whole;
  - (2) Whether those meanings are defamatory at common law;
  - (3) Which parts of those meanings are statements of fact and which are statements of opinion; and
  - (4) Whether, in respect of those parts which are statements of opinion, the statement indicated, whether in general or specific terms, the basis of the opinion.”
6. In accordance with the terms of the consent order, I have determined the preliminary issues without a hearing, based on written submissions. Save to the extent that this judgment has been handed down in accordance with the Covid-19 Protocol, I have

adopted the procedure described by Nicklin J in *Hewson v Times Newspapers Ltd* [2019] EWHC 650 (QB) at [25].

## **B. The Law**

### *Ascertainment of meaning - general principles*

7. There was no disagreement between the parties as to the applicable principles regarding the determination of the natural and ordinary meaning of the words complained of. The principles are well-established. My attention was drawn to recent summaries of the principles in *Stocker v Stocker* [2019] UKSC 17, [2020] AC 593, per Lord Kerr of Tonaghmore JSC at [34] to [41] and *Koutsogiannis v Random House Group Ltd* [2019] EWHC 48 (QB), [2020] 4 WLR 25, per Nicklin J at [10] to [15].
8. The Court's task is to determine the single natural and ordinary meaning of the words complained of. It is well recognised that there is an artificiality in choosing a single meaning from a series of words that individual readers may understand in different ways, but this approach is well-established and it provides a practicable, workable solution: see *Stocker v Stocker* at [33]-[34].
9. The focus is on what the ordinary reasonable viewer of the Programme would consider the words to mean. That is the touchstone. It is the "court's duty to step aside from a lawyerly analysis": see *Stocker v Stocker* at [37] to [38].
10. The key principles derived from the authorities were helpfully distilled and re-stated by Nicklin J in *Koutsogiannis* at [12] - references to "readers" of an "article" apply equally to "viewers" of a "programme":
  - "i) The governing principle is reasonableness.
  - ii) The intention of the publisher is irrelevant.
  - iii) The hypothetical reasonable reader is not naïve but he is not unduly suspicious. He can read between the lines. He can read in an implication more readily than a lawyer and may indulge in a certain amount of loose thinking but he must be treated as being a man who is not avid for scandal and someone who does not, and should not, select one bad meaning where other non-defamatory meanings are available. A reader who always adopts a bad meaning where a less serious or non-defamatory meaning is available is not reasonable: s/he is avid for scandal. But always to adopt the less derogatory meaning would also be unreasonable: it would be naïve.
  - iv) Over-elaborate analysis should be avoided and the court should certainly not take a too literal approach to the task.
  - v) Consequently, a judge providing written reasons for conclusions on meaning should not fall into the trap of conducting too detailed an analysis of the various passages relied on by the respective parties.

vi) Any meaning that emerges as the produce of some strained, or forced, or utterly unreasonable interpretation should be rejected.

vii) It follows that it is not enough to say that by some person or another the words might be understood in a defamatory sense.

viii) The publication must be read as a whole, and any 'bane and antidote' taken together. Sometimes, the context will clothe the words in a more serious defamatory meaning (for example the classic "rogues' gallery" case). In other cases, the context will weaken (even extinguish altogether) the defamatory meaning that the words would bear if they were read in isolation (e.g. bane and antidote cases).

ix) In order to determine the natural and ordinary meaning of the statement of which the claimant complains, it is necessary to take into account the context in which it appeared and the mode of publication.

x) No evidence, beyond publication complained of, is admissible in determining the natural and ordinary meaning.

xi) The hypothetical reader is taken to be representative of those who would read the publication in question. The court can take judicial notice of facts which are common knowledge, but should beware of reliance on impressionistic assessments of the characteristics of a publication's readership.

xii) Judges should have regard to the impression the article has made upon them themselves in considering what impact it would have made on the hypothetical reasonable reader.

xiii) In determining the single meaning, the court is free to choose the correct meaning; it is not bound by the meanings advanced by the parties (save that it cannot find a meaning that is more injurious than the claimant's pleaded meaning)."

11. I approach the assessment of meaning on the understanding that, in relation to the distinction between the naïve and unduly suspicious reader (principle (iii)), "*modern readers should be treated as having more discriminating judgment than has often been recognised*": *John v Times Newspapers Ltd* [2012] EWHC 2751 (QB), per Tugendhat J at [19]; and *Allen v Times Newspapers Ltd* [2019] EWHC 1235 (QB), per Warby J at [14].
12. I have also borne in mind the observations of Nicklin J in *Tinkler v Ferguson* [2018] EWHC 3563 (QB) at [37] regarding implied or inferred expressions of opinion.

***Guidance in relation to television broadcasts***

13. Specific guidance regarding the ascertainment of the meaning of words spoken in the context of a television programme was given by Sir Thomas Bingham MR in *Skuse v Granada Television Ltd* [1996] EMLR 278 (which concerned Granada's television programme "*World in Action*") at 285:

"(1) The court should give to the material complained of the natural and ordinary meaning which it would have conveyed to the ordinary reasonable viewer watching the programme once in [the year in which it was broadcast].

...

(3) While limiting its attention to what the defendant has actually said or written, the court should be cautious of an over-elaborate analysis of the material in issue. ...

In the present case we must remind ourselves that this was a factual programme, likely to appeal primarily to a seriously minded section of television viewers, but it was a programme which, even if watched continuously, would have been seen only once by viewers many of whom may have switched on for entertainment. Its audience would not have given it the analytical attention of a lawyer to the meaning of a document, an auditor to the interpretation of accounts, or an academic to the content of a learned article. In deciding what impression the material complained of would have been likely to have on the hypothetical reasonable viewer we are entitled (if not bound) to have regard to the impression it made on us."

14. The overall, subjective impression gleaned from a television programme may be relevant to interpretation. As Eady J observed in *Bond v BBC* [2009] EWHC 539 (QB) at [9]:

"It is important to acknowledge that assessing the meaning(s) of an hour long television programme is to a large extent a matter of impression. Yet it is also necessary to remember that the test is objective, so that one must always have in mind how the reasonable viewer would interpret it. Nonetheless it is recognised in the authorities that the judge can take into account his or her own subjective reason as part of the process. Beyond that, one must not be over-analytical, in the sense of subjecting the text to a leisurely or legalistic breakdown: ordinary viewers will not have had that opportunity. The overall flavour of a programme may contribute to an interpretation which would not necessarily be found when subjecting the text to piecemeal analysis. There is a risk that such an exercise will focus on the trees and miss the wood."

***Guidance in relation to foreign language broadcasts***

15. In *Shakil-ur-Rahman v Ary Network Limited* [2015] EWHC 2917 (QB), Haddon-Cave J considered the approach to ascertaining the meaning of 25 television programmes broadcast in Urdu. He said:

“37. The task with which the Court is faced in this case is substantial and unusual and has to be approached with particular care. The Court is asked to determine the meaning of words spoken in the course of 25 TV programmes. However, because the TV programmes were entirely in Urdu, the Court cannot glean the meaning from simply watching recordings of the broadcasts. The Court is necessarily reliant on studying translations of the transcripts of the broadcasts. To this extent, the Court is having to approach the task twice-removed, i.e. through the filter of the transcript and the translation. The Court does not have the benefit of gaining the immediate impression which the words spoken would have had on the hypothetical viewer in the original broadcast. Further, the problem is compounded by the fact that much of the broadcasts amount to a ‘stream of consciousness’ by the presenter, Mr Luqman, in language which is not always syntactically correct or easily comprehensible.

38. In order to address these problems, and guard against literalism and over-reliance on textual analysis at the expense of the immediate impact of the spoken word, the approach I have adopted is as follows:

(1) First, I played the DVD of the broadcasts with the transcripts in hand. I did not, of course, watch all 12 hours, because I do not speak Urdu; but I watched enough of each broadcast to get a flavour of the tone and structure of each programme and the style and approach of the presenter, Mr Luqman, and his various guests.

(2) Second, I read the full English translations of the entire transcripts of each broadcast and formed my own impression of the meaning of the particular words complained of in each broadcast highlighted in yellow.

(3) Third, I considered counsels’ written and oral submissions in relation to each broadcast.

(4) Fourth, I replayed the DVD with the transcript and my notes to hand in order to confirm or adjust the impression I had formed as to meaning in relation to each broadcast.”

16. In *Shah v UP and Coming TV Limited* [2020] EWHC 3472 (QB) Collins Rice J addressed the approach to the ascertainment of the meaning of a four-minute news broadcast in Urdu. Collins Rice J referred to *Shakil-Ur-Rahman* and said:

“10. I saw from his paragraph 38 how Haddon-Cave J dealt with the challenge of viewing foreign-language video. It is a real challenge. On the one hand it is important, as discussed below, not to over-labour what is essentially an impressionistic exercise. On the other hand, there is an irreducible minimum of effort involved in the basic task of accessing content. Unlike Haddon-Cave J, I was considering a few minutes’ footage only, so I adopted a variant of his technique. I watched the item once through, to get an impression of genre and tone, and a clear view of the video images. With that in mind, I next read the transcript and translations. I then watched the video again, along with the English texts, to get an overall impression of meaning. I formed and noted some provisional views.

11. I then read the preliminary issues trial bundle and the skeleton arguments lodged for both parties. I heard oral submissions at trial and reserved judgment. Finally, I replayed the item with the transcript and my notes to hand to confirm or adjust the impression I had formed as to meaning.”

### ***Fact or opinion***

17. There is no dispute as to the applicable principles when determining whether the words complained of contain allegations of fact or opinion:
- i) First, the statement must be recognisable as opinion, as distinct from an imputation of fact.
  - ii) Secondly, opinion is something which is or can reasonably be inferred to be a deduction, inference, conclusion, criticism, remark, observation etc.
  - iii) Thirdly, the test is an objective one and the ultimate determinant is how the words would strike the ordinary reasonable reader.
  - iv) Fourthly, the subject-matter of words and their context may be important indicators of whether they are fact or opinion.
  - v) Fifthly, not every inference counts as an opinion: context is all. The bare statement of an inference, without reference to the facts on which it is based, may well appear as a statement of fact. Whereas the more clearly a statement indicates that it is based on some extraneous material, the more likely it is to strike the reader or viewer as an expression of opinion.

See *Koutsogiannis* per Nicklin J at [16] and *Triplark Limited v Northwood Hall (Freehold) Limited* [2019] EWHC 3494 (QB) per Warby J at [15]-[17].

### ***Defamatory at common law***

18. The relevant common law test for whether a meaning is defamatory is uncontroversial. As recently summarised by Warby J in *Ameyaw v McGoldrick* [2020] EWHC 3035 (QB) at [48(4)]:

“At common law,

“A meaning or imputation, whether it be one of fact or opinion, is defamatory only if it would tend to have a substantially adverse effect on the way that right-thinking members of society generally would treat the claimant”

*Swan v Associated Newspapers Ltd* [2020] EWHC 1312 (QB) [20(3)] and cases there cited. This formulation encapsulates the common law threshold of seriousness identified in *Thornton v Telegraph Media Group* [2010] EWHC 1414 (QB) [2011] 1 WLR 1985 [94] (Tugendhat J) and what I have called “the consensus requirement”. These are objective tests that turn on the inherent tendency of the words. See also *Monroe v Hopkins* [2017] EWHC 433 (QB) [2017] 4 WLR 68 [23(1)-(2)] and *Lachaux [v Independent Print Ltd* [2020 AC 612] (SC) [6] (Lord Sumption, with whom the other Justices agreed).”

### **C. The Programme**

#### ***My approach to viewing***

19. I adopted the standard preparatory approach to the determination of meaning in a defamation claim of viewing/reading the material complained of, and forming a provisional view about its meaning, before considering the parties’ pleaded cases and arguments about meaning.
20. As in *Shakil-Ur-Rahman* and *Shah*, the task of forming an initial impression was made more challenging by the fact that it was a foreign-language broadcast. Here, the words complained of were in Punjabi. The parties have agreed a transcript of the words spoken, and an English translation of the transcript (“the translation”).
21. In this case, I watched the Programme once through, with the translation to hand. As I do not speak Punjabi, from this viewing I was able to gain an impression of the genre and tone of the Programme, and to ascertain the extent to which any images were shown, but not to ascertain the meaning. I then read the full translation of the Programme and made a note of my provisional view of the meaning of what was said. Having done so, I turned to read and consider the parties’ skeleton arguments and the preliminary issues trial bundle before finally re-reading the translation, and re-playing parts of the Programme, to confirm or adjust the impression I had formed as to meaning.
22. I have sought to avoid an over-literal approach but, as Haddon-Cave J observed in *Shakil-Ur-Rahman*, I have necessarily had to approach the task of ascertaining the meaning of the Programme through the filters of, first, a transcript of what was said orally, and secondly, a translation of that transcript. I did not have the benefit of gaining the immediate impression which the words spoken would have had on the hypothetical viewer of the Programme, who would have understood Punjabi.

#### ***General impression of the Programme***



23. The Programme lasted just under an hour. It took the form, primarily, of a live discussion between the Second Defendant and the Third Defendant of matters arising from a protest that had taken place in front of the Indian Embassy a few days earlier. A “live call” number was on the screen throughout the Programme and at one stage a viewer called into the Programme and joined the discussion for several minutes.
24. The visual format remained largely the same throughout, namely, a view from a side angle of the Second and Third Defendants at a table having a discussion (against a background image of open windows overlooking a river and bridge). At the beginning, and occasionally thereafter, the Second Defendant spoke directly to the camera, or the angle changed to focus on the Third Defendant. There were no other images shown throughout the Programme.
25. The general impression was that this was a serious discussion programme about topical political and religious matters relating to Sikhism. Parts of the discussion were not easy to follow, and I have particularly borne in mind that viewers would have seen and heard the Programme only once.
26. The primary focus of the Second and Third Defendants’ criticisms was Nazir Ahmed, Lord Ahmed, who is not a party to this claim. However, criticisms were also directed at the small group of pro-Khalistan protesters, including one who was described at the outset as Lord Ahmed’s “partner”. The pro-Khalistan protesters were forcefully and repeatedly reproached for carrying flags (supplied by Lord Ahmed) which were said to have misrepresented the Nishan Sahib (the Sikh flag) by being the wrong colour (yellow instead of saffron) and the wrong shape (square instead of triangular), but that criticism is not the subject of complaint.

### ***Reference***

27. The Third Defendant referred to “*Sahota Sahib*” twice (about 12 and 13 minutes into the Programme) and to “*Sahota Jee*” once (about 18 minutes into the Programme). The consent order provides that for the purposes of the trial of preliminary issues, without prejudice to the Defendants’ case on reference at any subsequent trial, “*the references in the words complained of to ‘Sahota’ shall be taken to refer to the Claimant*”.
28. The consent order does not expressly address the approach to be taken to references to the person described as the “*partner*” of Nazir Ahmed, and (amongst other identifying details) as someone who used to run a Birmingham TV station (“*the partner*”). It is apparent at a number of points in the Programme that the discussion is about the partner but, for a viewer without extrinsic knowledge, the partner is not identified as “*Sahota*”. For the purposes of the trial of the preliminary issues, and without prejudice to the Defendants’ case on reference, I have taken references to the person identified as the partner as referring to the Claimant.

### **D. The words complained of**

29. I have set out the agreed translation of the transcript of the Programme, with paragraph numbers added for ease of reference, in tabular form, as an appendix to this judgment (save that I have not set out in full the words of the various advertisements played during two commercial breaks).

30. The words selected for complaint by the Claimant are those in §§ 2-41, 55-56, 86-100 and 143-171.

**E. The parties' meanings and submissions**

31. The parties have each put forward five meanings. The Claimant contends that each of his meanings is defamatory at common law and that the statements are presented to the viewer as bald imputations of fact during a polemical, unashamedly partisan programme which lacked balance or objectivity. He has not made submissions on whether the meanings proposed by the Defendants, if accepted, are defamatory or constituted statements of fact or opinion.
32. I have indicated below the meanings which the Defendants contend constitute statements of opinion, rather than fact. The Defendants contend that the meanings are not defamatory only to this extent. First, if the Court accepts the Defendants' meaning (a), then the meaning that protesters (unintentionally) misled others as to whether they were representative of the wider community was a non-defamatory opinion. Secondly, the Defendants' meaning (b) regarding the Nishan Sahib is not defamatory. Thirdly, with respect to the Defendants' meaning (c), right-thinking members of society would not think substantially less of the Claimant for not promoting the cause previously but later supporting it, with financial support. Fourthly, even if the Court accepts the Claimant's meaning (e), the Defendants contend it is not defamatory, without more, to suggest an individual's business is in selling holy books.

***Meaning (a)***

33. The Claimant's first meaning is that the Claimant "*misled and deceived the Sikh community*".
34. Adopting the Claimant's structure, the Defendants' first meaning is that the Claimant had:

"as one of only a very small number of Sikhs visibly and loudly protesting for Khalistani independence in front of the Indian Embassy, *given the misleading impression that he was representing the views of the British Sikh community generally*".

(The italicised words are those the Defendants contend are a statement of opinion.)

35. In support of his meaning, the Claimant relies on the Second Defendant's words in §§ 19, 20, 95, and 153; and the Third Defendant's words in §§ 24, 86, 88, 89 and 90.
36. The Defendants contend that there are limited references to misleading and deceiving, all of them tied to the number attending the protest (§§20, 24, 28-29, 40 and 89). While accepting that the meaning is not entirely clear, the Defendants contend that the suggestion was that it was misleading for the small group of five to seven people to have taken up the issue on their own and joined the protest as if they were representing the larger community of British Sikhs more generally. It was not suggested that the protesters were intentionally misleading.

**Meaning (b)**

37. The Claimant's second meaning is that the Claimant:

“b) was venal, mercenary and a hypocrite. Whilst purporting to support Khalistan independence in reality he was an agent in the pay of Lord Nazir Ahmed promoting the interests of Pakistan against India where previously he had been in the pay of Indian nationalists.”

38. The Defendants' second meaning is that the Claimant:

“by displaying square yellow flags supplied by Lord Nazir Ahmed (a Muslim) in place of the Nishan Sahib (the Sikh holy flag), [D2] *created a new separation between Sikhs, greatly disrespected the Sikh religion, acted in a manner that was very wrong and the most religiously wrong thing he had done; and as such did not deserve to be called a Sikh; [D3] had thereby brought disrespect upon Sikhs and acted shamefully*”.

(The italicised words immediately following “[D2]” are those the Defendants contend are a statement of opinion by the Second Defendant and the italicised words following “[D3]” are those they contend are a statement of opinion by the Third Defendant.)

39. The Claimant contends that the themes of his alleged venality and hypocrisy, being in the pay of Lord Ahmed and serving as an agent for Pakistan where previously he had aligned himself with Indian nationalists, run throughout the broadcast. The Claimant particularly emphasises the statements by the Second Defendant at §§11, 17, 18, 30, 152, 155 and 164; and by the Third Defendant at §§41, 100, 144, 168 and 171.

40. The Defendants contend the Claimant's meaning is unclear, unrealistic and not reasonably borne by the words. They point out that the adjectives used in the Claimant's first sentence do not appear in the Programme and nor was it suggested the Claimant was “*promoting the interests of Pakistan against India*”. The Defendants acknowledge that the words referred to the Khalistani protesters being funded or hired by Lord Ahmed and a contrast was drawn between the support for the Khalistani cause given by the partner when funded by Lord Ahmed compared to his lack of support for that cause when he ran a television station.

**Meaning (c)**

41. The Claimant's third meaning is that the Claimant:

“fomented division, hatred and violence between Sikhs and Indians, and between Indians and Pakistanis.”

42. The Defendants' third meaning is that the Claimant:

“protested for Khalistani independence when financially assisted in doing so by Lord Nazir Ahmed, yet had not

promoted the Khalistani cause when he had previously operated a television station, *and therefore his position on Khalistan independence appeared to depend upon financial support from others*".

(The italicised words are those the Defendants contend are statements of opinion.)

43. The Claimant contends that the theme of the Claimant's divisiveness is an extension of meaning (a), but the Defendants go further and blame the Claimant for instigating actual violence between Sikhs and Indians, and between Indians and Pakistanis. For this meaning, the Claimant relies on the same statements referred to in respect of meanings (b) and (d).
44. The Defendants submit that the Claimant has not identified any particular extracts that support his pleaded meaning (c), and none of the passages referred to in respect of meanings (a), (b) or (d) support or explain the basis for this asserted meaning. The word "foment" was not used. The Defendants contend that the statements at §§14-18 are a far cry from an allegation that the Claimant is fomenting division, hatred and violence. Rather, the statements warn against the division that could arise within the Sikh community if the Claimant were to support independence for Kashmir. The references to hatred, and to dividing communities, were directed only at Lord Ahmed.

#### ***Meaning (d)***

45. The Claimant's fourth meaning is that the Claimant "*promoted terrorism*".
46. The Defendants' fourth meaning is that the Claimant:

"by promoting this [Khalistani independence] cause and protesting in this manner against the Indian government, at the same event as much larger groups of rival protestors (including Pakistani and Indian Kashmiri protestors, Kashmir having been the subject of numerous terrorist attacks driving huge numbers of people from their homes), *risked, if he did not stop, dividing the Sikh community and involving Sikhs in violence, hatred and terrorism*".

(The italicised words are those the Defendants contend are statements of opinion.)

47. The Claimant alleges that throughout the Programme he is accused of promoting terrorism in league with Lord Ahmed. He relies on the Second Defendant's statements in §§19, 36 and 37, and on the Third Defendant's statements in §§25, 26, 89 and 146.
48. The Defendants' contends that, whereas allegations were directed against the Kashmiris and Lord Ahmed, the Khalistani protesters (including the Claimant) were never accused of promoting terrorism. The word "promote" was not used. At most, they were said to have appeared at the protest along with Kashmiri terrorists, and a warning is given as to their future direction. Strong criticism was directed at the Khalistani protesters for carrying an improper flag.

**Meaning (e)**

49. The Claimant's fifth and final meaning is that the Claimant "*exploited the sacred Guru Granth Sahib Ji for financial gain*".
50. The Defendants' final meaning is that the Claimant:
- "was a member of a family which had been ordering the Guru Granth Sahib from India through their business."
51. These meanings are based on the Second Defendant's statement at §20. The Claimant relies on the fact that this statement was prefaced with the charge that the Claimant had been deceiving people and had spread lies. So the reasonable viewer would have understood that, according to the Second Defendant, the Claimant would (and did, as a matter of fact) exploit sacred scriptures for financial gain.
52. The Defendants' submits there is no reference to any "exploitation" by the Claimant or any financial gain by him, as opposed to being a member of a family who ordered the Guru Granth Sahib from India through their business. Nor is there any explanation of what the Guru Granth Sahib is, whether in the Programme or in any innuendo pleading.

**F. Decision**

53. In my judgment, the meanings of the words complained of are:
- i) By his protest, the Claimant deceived and misled people.
  - ii) *The Claimant is not a true supporter of the independence of Khalistan, as he purports to be: he is a hireling whose allegiance can and has been bought. When he ran a television station, he failed to support the Khalistani cause but now he does so because he is in the pay of Lord Ahmed.*
  - iii) *Nor is he a true Sikh: no true Sikh would show such disrespect for the Sikh religion, as the Claimant did by changing the colour and shape of the Nishan Sahib from saffron and triangular to a yellow square.*
  - iv) *The Claimant, by standing with Kashmiri terrorists in London, showed his ignorance of history and the rights of Sikhs, and risked, if he did not stop, dividing the Sikh community and involving Sikhs in violence, hatred and terrorism.*
  - v) The Claimant and his family commercialised the sale of the sacred Guru Granth Sahib.
54. These meanings essentially reflect the provisional view I formed on first reading the translation. I have italicised those parts of the meanings that are statements of opinion.

**Meaning (i)**

55. In the first ten minutes of the Programme both the Second and Third Defendants conveyed the impression that, by his protest, the Claimant had deceived and misled

people. I reject the Claimant's submission that the meaning is that he deceived and misled *the Sikh community*. In support of that aspect of the meaning the Claimant relies on quite distinct statements, regarding the creation of a "*separation*" between or "*feud*" within the Sikh community. It was far from clear which people or community was alleged to be the object of the deception. In addition, I have not based my decision regarding meaning (a) on what the Third Defendant said immediately following the viewer's call, as the impression given was that he was speaking generally, until he resumed speaking about the small group of protesters (in §89).

56. However, I also do not accept the Defendants' submission that the meaning is tied to the small number of protesters in attendance or that the meaning was that the deception was unintentional. It would not have been clear to a reasonable viewer watching the Programme what the basis was for the accusations of deception and spreading lies, save that it related to the protest.
57. In my judgment, this was expressed as a bald statement of fact rather than opinion. Beyond the fact that the Second and Third Defendants were commenting on the Claimant's involvement in the protest, it would not have been apparent to a reasonable viewer what extraneous facts were relied on to support the statement that the Claimant was misleading or deceiving people. The meaning is clearly defamatory at common law.

***Meaning (ii)***

58. Both the Second and Third Defendants conveyed meaning (ii). The meaning I have found is substantially the same as the Claimant's meaning (b), save for three points. First, in my view, the word "*hireling*" conveys more closely than "*mercenary*" the impression given by references to the Claimant being "*like a pony that can be hired*" and to "*lift[ing] their bags*", taken together with the references to him being hired. Secondly, while a viewer may judge that a person whose allegiance to such a cause can be bought is "*a hypocrite*" or that he is "*venal*", I agree with the Defendants that these are inferred opinions rather than meanings conveyed by the words spoken. Thirdly, I also agree with the Defendants that the Programme would not convey to a reasonable viewer, watching it once, the meaning that the Claimant promoted the interests of Pakistan against India.
59. The statements that the Claimant purports to support the Khalistani cause, that when he ran a television station he failed to support that cause, that he is in the pay of Lord Ahmed, and that his allegiance can be, and has been, bought would all strike the reasonable viewer as statements of fact. Whereas, the statement that the Claimant is not a true supporter of the independence of Khalistan is, in my view, an expression of opinion based upon those facts.
60. The Defendants' submission that the meaning is not defamatory was based on it being a statement, in effect, that previously the Claimant did not support the Khalistani cause whereas he does now (and receives financial support). Whereas the meaning I have found - in effect, accusing him of falsely professing to support a cause for financial gain - is obviously defamatory at common law.

***Meaning (iii)***

61. Both the Second and Third Defendants clearly convey meaning (iii) in the words complained of. The statement that the Claimant changed the colour and shape of the Sikh flag is one of fact, but the rest of this statement is an expression of opinion based on that fact.
62. This is not a meaning of which the Claimant makes complaint. In my judgment, neither the accusation of fact regarding the incorrect colour and shape of the flag, nor the Second and Third Defendants' opinion about that matter, would substantially affect the Claimant's reputation in the eyes of right-thinking members of society generally, and so it was not defamatory.

***Meaning (iv)***

63. Meaning (iv) was conveyed by both the Second and Third Defendants. The meaning I have found is much closer to that proposed by the Defendants than by the Claimant. I reject the Claimant's contention that a reasonable viewer would have understood the Defendants to be accusing the Claimant of promoting terrorism or of fomenting division, hatred and violence. The impression given to a reasonable viewer was that very serious allegations along these lines were made against Lord Ahmed, but not against the Claimant. The Claimant was accused of acting, through ignorance, in a way which carried serious risks for the Sikh community if he continued down that path, but not of promoting terrorism or fomenting hatred.
64. The statement that he stood with Kashmiri terrorists in London was a statement of fact, but the rest of meaning (iv) was clearly an expression of opinion. In my judgment, the meaning that I have found, although not as serious as that for which the Claimant contended, is clearly defamatory at common law.

***Meaning (v)***

65. Meaning (v) was conveyed only by the Second Defendant, not the Third. The immediate impression given by the Second Defendant's statement was that the Claimant and his family had commercialised the sale of Sikh scripture. This was given as an example of the types of things the Claimant has done, and so the impression was conveyed that the Claimant was party to this business. Although no explanation was given as to what the Guru Granth Sahib is, a reasonable viewer of the Programme would know that it is sacred. The repeated use of the word "*business*" gave the impression of commercialisation. This was a statement of fact, not opinion.
66. I agree with the Defendants that this statement is not defamatory. The view of the Claimant taken by right-thinking members of society generally would not be adversely affected by the statement that he was involved in the commercial sale of copies of religious books.

**G. Conclusions**

67. My conclusions are as follows:
  - i) The natural and ordinary meanings of the words complained of:

- a) Spoken by the Second Defendant are the meanings (i) to (v) set out in §53 above;
  - b) Spoken by the Third Defendant are the meanings (i) to (iv) set out in §53 above; and
  - c) As a whole are the meanings (i) to (v) set out in §53 above.
- ii) Meanings (i), (ii) and (iv) are defamatory at common law; meanings (iii) and (v) are not defamatory.
  - iii) The parts of meanings (ii), (iii) and (iv) shown in italics in §53 above are statements of opinion. The meanings are otherwise statements of fact.
  - iv) Each of the statements of opinion indicated, at least in general terms, the basis of the opinion.



**Appendix: English translation of the transcript of the Programme**

D2 = Second Defendant; D3 = Third Defendant

Time Code	Speaker	Para	English translation from Indian Punjabi transcription of the Programme
00:00	Song	1	Starts with the Song of prayer – This service is accepted (by god)
00:09	D2	2	Wahe Guru jee ka Khalsa, Wahe guru jee ki fateh (religious greeting).
		3	Respected Sikh people, we always present ourselves here in Gurudwara Sahib MiriPiri in front of you with this programme. You are watching this program on MATV 793, UK Europe and Delp Smagam [00.30 SL].
		4	You can always watch, record this programme or have discussions twice a week and also can make your calls on the number which is showing on the TV screen. MATV has always been working towards the well-being of the Sikh community.
		5	Whatever happens in relation to the Sikhism or in relation to Punjab we try our best to have discussions on these with you. It is about what happened last week, a protest took place in front of the Indian Embassy on 26th of January, there were some people who called themselves Khalistanis , they did not appear there but the two small groups came, out of them, one was the group who wanted to set the school on fire and they have accepted ransom to do so and the other group of partial Khalistani got there with some ten to twelve people, so it looked like that out of the four vans that Lord Nazir Ahmed had formed at his own cost, the van with the name of Khalistan was one of them.
		6	Even the flags that we call Nishan Sahib, or call Nishans, to this day, whenever these protests have happened they always happened under the guidance of Kesari Nishan, but, as these flags were also made by the same firm, the firm has no knowledge that these flags should not be of yellow colour, but they should be of Kesari (saffron) colour. The Kesari Flag is usually made in a triangular shape, not square, not chorus (square). Their flags were of square shape and on them Khalsa was written and they were of yellow colour.
		7	Now, let us look at their background a little bit. The person who is Lord Nazir’s partner nowadays, when he started his Birmingham TV station he should have called all the Khalistanis there if he was a Khalistani himself.
		8	In those days the Khalistani were in full power. But he did not invite any Khalistani. The people he invited were all from Bande Matram (non-Sikh). People told him too many times that you should have invited at least four to

			five Sikh people there. In those days on the two TV stations from Punjabis, one in Hays and another in Birmingham, there has never been any discussion on Sikhism on his TV station.
05:00		9	Khalistanis never talked about their feud related struggle on his TV. He never allowed them to settle down there. But the situation changed, Dr Jagjit Singh died and slowly- slowly people from a neighbouring country, needed a person there, and his TV station failed, and his money ran out.
		10	The member of parliament who came to his area was their person and he made him to change his mind and join the section of Lord Nazir Ahmed.
		11	Therefore, for them, if they receive money then it is Khalistan and if they do not receive money then it is Hindustan.
		12	His travelling to Hindustan (India) is frequent but no one has checked his visa. That is why we would like to ask him what right he has to change Nishan (Flag) of the Sikh religion? What right he has to make yellow flags instead of Kesari?
		13	The way in which the twenty people from India and some one hundred and fifty people from the other side, on that day, in front of them, were saying to protect India, or were saying to end terrorism in our country. They were saying these slogans, face to face, if circumstances like these keep arising then there may be a great chance for a big fight one day.
		14	Lord Nazir Ahmed never came to these rallies before and he will never take part in them in future either. But he has left a spark there. And you see, what he is saying about Kashmir. Did Pakistan give Kashmir independence? Did Kashmir become an independent country? Why is it called Azad Kashmir? Which part of it is free? Which boundary of it is free? We cannot see their freedom. This state is the same as is the case with other states of Pakistan. There is no freedom.
		15	If you look at the background, the Kashmir can be said of the Kashmiris, because Kashmiris live there just like Punjab belongs to Punjabis. In the same way Kashmir was a State of the Sikh Raj (state). When British Empire took over the Sikh kingdom by deception, 'as a Trustee', he never conquered it, never thought that he had conquered the Sikhs. He took over the Sikh kingdom as a trustee. It was said to emperor Maharaj Daleep Singh that when he becomes an adult we will hand over the royalty to him and we will stay away from it. After that they deceived once again and Kashmir was given to Dogras as a prize.
		16	And we still claim it today. Kashmir is a Sikh state, a

			part of the Sikh state and it can never go to another country.
09:58		17	Suppose if these Sikhs ask to liberate Kashmir and they do not assert their right which is rightfully a right of the Sikhs, then from it you should understand that these types of Sikhs can be an agent for someone, after accepting money they can say Khalistan but genuinely they cannot be Khalistani or Sikh nationalists, nor do they know the history or have knowledge of Sikh Raj.
		18	The poor person has been brought up here, started a business, now the running of his business also depends on them. Therefore we would request of him that we have been here for 36, 37 years, we know, how great a Khalistani you are, close the business you are running with the people of these neighbouring countries. Nishan (flag) of Sikhism is of Saffron colour and let it stay that way.
		19	If you did not stop and tried to divide the Sikh community, the Sikhs will recognize you, and the new battle that you are about to embark on, in conjunction with Lord Nazir Ahmed, and trying to create a different terrorism front, it is neither good for the wellbeing of Sikhs and nor for other communities.
		20	So today we will discuss about the way by which these people have been deceiving people by taking ten to fifteen people with them. The first time, the number of people who protested was one hundred and fifty. And one hundred and fifty people all were from the neighbour country and among them you were only ten to twelve people. Your number should have been much higher. In a van, your ten people came from Birmingham and started protesting only to spread lies. Bal Sahib, we remember in the way this person has done these types of things. His family had been ordering the Guru Granth Sahib from India on the name of the business, in the form of a business.
10:52	D3	21	See, these people are business type, when he opened his TV station, this guy was against the Bande Matram party, and now he is standing there holding a yellow flag from Lahor or Nazir Ahmed. He doesn't even know that colour of Nishan is saffron (Kesrai). The whole Bande Mataram Party is his TV party.
		22	At that time, he never had any discussion on Sikh issues on his TV. His TV station failed, but as a Sikh he never called the Sikhs there.
11:17	D2	23	No.
11:19	D3	24	But, the most unfortunate thing is, they mislead people, and even betray on the basis of communities, they are five to seven people, and they have taken up the issue on their own and now stand among them by entering

			between them quietly. And these people are appearing in the form of shadows among those Kashmiri terrorists of London, who made many Lakh Kashmiri Pundits – call them pundits or call them Hindustani – to leave Kashmir due to the fear of terrorism in Kashmir.
		25	Do not forget that those who were on the other side of the Indian people, according to my count, they were about two hundred to two hundred and fifty people. They did not come out simply to join the 26th January programme or eat in their party, but they were there to challenge the Kashmiri formally that they have thrown them out of Kashmir and they have no identity here too, it's a new kind of scene, a new kind of terrorism, on the street of London.
		26	Nazir Ahmed has presented it and Nazir Ahmed has master minded it. And Sahota Sahib, Ranjit and Nazir Ahmed ..... [ <i>Incomplete sentence</i> ]. See the van which was parked there; from appearance of Nazir Ahmed's face and the attitude in which he was speaking; the way he spoke; I felt that this guy is from Pakistani Kashmiri origin, in the way he is referring to the Khalistani van, even at the time when no one had arrived there. He was saying that all the vans will stay in Westminster all day. It seemed as if he was about to launch a new Khalistan on the map of Lahore because our history is shared on both sides. But to Ranjit said, he was invited and was told that there was a present for him.
13:05	D2	27	They offered a van they had made.
	D3	28	They do not know that the Sikhs' colour is Kesari (saffron), they made and offered yellow flags to them. See there is a population of fifteen Lakh (million) Sikhs in the UK. Four to five people have accepted those flags. And the most alarming thing is that they were five to seven people, or say, ten, or say seven people; they were from two organizations, four from each group, and bearing turbans they were standing in the middle of the two groups.
		29	If there has been any kind of disturbance, then it is the Sikh person who loses his turban or who becomes victim of the disturbance, then they put blame on the Sikh for it. But these are the people who are responsible for the blame.
		30	When Sahota Sahib wishes he becomes a Bande Matram, whenever he wishes he is a complete Congresssee (a follower of a pro India political party), when he wishes he becomes a friend of Nazir Ahmed. But the most noticeable thing is that London's Mayor Sadiq Khan has not thought about it seriously yet. But when these groups of two, two hundred, two hundred and fifty and two hundred and fifty people came here

			and stood on both sides, a picture of it shows that there were two policemen there.
14:10	D2	31	Hum...
14:11	D3	32	Right, the groups of two, two hundred, two hundred and fifty and two hundred and fifty, if there is a fight between them, they may have equal game. But our brothers five, four in number are standing there in the delusion that they have agreed to offer them cars. But the organisations that were taking place before, they may have seen the intention of Nazir Ahmed, therefore another three to four organizations did not participate in it. Neither the Asian's organization has come nor the other ..... [ <i>cross talking, Indiscernible, 14.35</i> ]
14:36	D2	33	Other organizations also did not come.
14:38	D3	34	In my view these organizations didn't get involved in it in any way, as they knew about his mischief, but the game of five, foursome, they've rallied on the street many times. Many times they've displayed a sign board, it looks nice. During the era of '84, all four were beaten up by opponent party people in Southall on Broadway, and entire Sikh community .... [ <i>Indiscernible, 14.49</i> ].
15:00		35	When such a procession happens – up to now we have seen all such processions. There was also a time when we took part in them by staying in the front. There were such times. In the processions, thousands of people got involved and there were five people here today, five people in a crowd, they were standing in such a circle that they could go down and get included in any side. Naturally, it got avoided. Later, when the case became serious, then the number of policemen increased and the police took both parties ..... [15.29 did not complete the sentence].
		36	Over the years these protests in London have grown so serious that it is now totally terrorism. When there is a protest; you put your demand in the protest; you chant slogans; you march and get out. We have seen this happening for the last fifty years. We took part in every protest in the early years. Now only a few processions take place, one of white people and the one is of the defence league and some others also take place.
		37	There was a time when you saw there were protests in the South Africa; among the South African protests there was one that was Liberation Forces. The other South African procession was Liberation Front, Mugabe and Nelson Mandela organized the procession. There has never been a procession against them. Only one party used to organize processions. But it is customary here now that they all are of equally large sizes. Because Nazir Ahmed has started this new trend, and by it this man can create any type of terrorism in London.

		38	<p>It is the duty of British security to keep an eye on the man. See, our Pakistan and India are two countries, conflict between both of them increases and decreases; they keep killing each other. Kashmir is on both sides. India has Kashmir and Pakistan has Kashmir too. You are right in saying that this is always the case that Kashmiri people always talk about the Kashmir which is in India. People of Nazir Ahmed never presented a picture from there in front of the people, to say about how much freedom they have. In Islamism how they make an Assembly after selecting a governor, they moan about their part. They don't tell him about it.</p>
		39	<p>All the energy you are spending on this side, we wish you would make developments there first. At least make some changes to your circumstances. You have a big job to complete there. Then come here to bloom. In London our communities that live together, I come to the same point that our community, Muslim community, Sikh community, Hindu community, other communities, and Farsi communities, communities of Asians, they all live together in West London. If such a person gets up and creates problems among the communities, makes them fight, then it becomes the responsibility of London's mayor to see it as well because he had won with the joint votes from all the communities.</p>
		40	<p>Therefore they have done this very bad thing that the two of our brothers who have become like 'Dons', have been standing there to say, come on Ranjeet we will show you the van, come on Sahota Jee, sit in it and have a ride. Shame on fifteen Lakh Sikhs where four people out of fifteen million people come and do such activities. They should sit down with the Sikh community and think, come to Gurdwara and have meetings and have conferences, gather information from there, discuss their issues by being there. But they have no right to be such jokers.</p>
		41	<p>If they create too much trouble on the basis of the Sikh community, people will not consider them as good people. The people will say they are the people who are bought by an agency of a country. These people lift their bags and go to the place wherever they see they fit in the trade. Their trade today is similar to that of Nazir Ahmed. By giving and taking from him, they have created a source to provide them with food. All this is happening but the Sikh community cannot see this thing which can be in loss any time. If they ever had any difficulty, they would go to the Sikh Community and would complain that we have been treated in such a way. So this issue can also go beyond these limits.</p>
18:57	D2	42	<p>We will be back after a short break.</p>

19:00	Song	43	Song – Accepted, accepted, this service is accepted (by God).
19:09	Advert 1	44	[ <i>Lyca Mobile advertisement (in English) omitted.</i> ]
19:39	Advert 2	45-46	[ <i>Air India advertisement (in English) omitted.</i> ]
20:08	Advert 3	47	[ <i>Heston Hyde hotel advertisement (in Hindi and English) omitted.</i> ]
20:43	Advert 4	48-49	[ <i>Akshaya Patra (charity) advertisement (in Hindi) omitted.</i> ]
21:22	Advert 5	50	[ <i>Confused.com advertisement (in English) omitted.</i> ]
21:42	Advert 6 (Hindi and English)	51	Thousands of people watch MATV sometimes from morning to night.
		52	They might be your future customers. But you have to tell them about your products and services. Let us grow your business with MATV. Advertise, promote and market your products and services on MATV. Call MATV cell - 07970 337036 or 0208 795 0026.
22:14	Advert 7 (Hindi and English)	53	Hinduism is the great religion of the world. Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh, creator, preserver and destroyer. The world needs to know about Hinduism because it is not a religion; it is a way of life. Watch this on – Let us talk Hinduism, on MATV every Sunday 8.30.
22:40	Song	54	Song – Accepted, accepted, this service is accepted (by God).
22:48	D2	55	Wahe Guru jee ka Khalsa, Wahe guru jee ki fateh (religious greeting).
		56	What we are talking about is that neighbour nation agent unfortunately died. They were looking for someone to take his place. They asked many people; please come, please come. We will offer you the same benefits that we offered the previous person. And they found this person to fill the place. He was partially retired and his work was not doing so well. Therefore they thought the man would have some income from this job.
		57	Call is coming, OK.
23:40	Caller	58	Hello Sir, Satsri-Akal
	D2	59	Hello, Satsri-Akal brother. How are you?
	Caller	60	I am fine, yes.
		61	People make us fools with four things: Khalistan, Unity, Service and part of verses.
	D2	62	You can put them anywhere you wish.
	Caller	63	At the moment, name of Khalistan should be stopped altogether. Our condition is that no one has yet come forward. What you are saying about Khalistan, it should only be possible if it comes out from the heart of everyone whether we need Khalistan or what we really need. First of all, we don't have a clue in order to inform our children about how we will manage it. That is why

			the name has to be stopped.
		64	Second thing is the service. Any person who says I want to serve; I want to serve the people who are in the prisons. People should say to them that you should serve them and when you have spent everything in serving them then you can sell your house. When everything is finished we will take care of you and help you.
		65	Third one is unity; whichever leader comes in power he wants unity. There are great saints who are visited by twenty thousand people to offer them food and they say we want unity. Take the twenty thousand people sitting in front of you and have the unity you did not have from this amount of people.
25:13	D3	66	Very well Said.
	Caller	67	What else did I say? The part of the verses.
		68	When a discussion is going on, some people, purposely, do not listen to the full explanation and add their own line of the verse in it. Other listeners think, oh brother, he knows the verse (Bany). He has spoken about the verse, and they are fooled by the person in this way. No matter where you have the verse from these people will add their line of verse wherever they wish to add it. For example, our ten older people together say to donate 10% of what you earn. For your own selfish purpose stop adding a line of verse; for your own selfish purpose stop asking for money; for your own selfish purpose stop saying Khalistan. There is not a single person here in England who is sincerely asking for Khalistan, I am talking about those groups who want Khalistan in India and not inviting these people as they know that they are not capable yet for Khalistan.
	D3	69	That is right.
	Caller	70	Capable to run Khalistan. We are not even able to ask for Khalistan; we do not have any plans; there is no system in place.
		71	All the things that provide services they are robbing us and making our minds poisonous. The opportunity to provide service ourselves is taken away from us. Until some older person makes us realise what type of nice feeling we get by providing selfless service, we would not have that feeling. They should allow us to have the feeling. As long as you do not offer your full-service whole heartedly you do not get that feeling.
	D3	72	That is right.
	Caller	73	If you believe me, provide your service whole heartedly and see. You will be intoxicated with the good feeling and it will make you provide your selfless services again and again.
	D3	74	That is right.
	Caller	75	If you provide your service whole heartedly.



	D3	76	Yes, sir.
	Caller	77	It is not just to say, a person can do it and experience it himself.
	D2	78	Only that person can serve others who has compassion.
	Caller	79	It will not be less than any sight. The people, who are looking for things and ask, Baba (saint) to give, Baba, give us this and Baba, give us that. The one who had this good feeling, he finds everything in this world.
	D3	80	Yes, sir.
	Caller	81	You do it and see. First make them feel that they need to provide their service. When they will get this good feeling, then they will offer their services and after that they will have something to feel good about. We do not serve. Brother goes against his brother, how are you asking for a trade?
	D3	82	Everything is said very well. Many thanks.
	Caller	83	Who are you asking for unity from? Brother separates from brother at the age of 18 years old, 19 years old and they do not live together whereas we used to spend our whole lives together. We used to have separate kitchens in the house but no one was told about it. People used to know thirty years later that their kitchens were separated in the house. Now, people already know that the family is going to be divided as soon as they see that boy is grown up, has left college and has come home now. People say these things beforehand. These things of the Hindustan must be stopped in England.
	D3	84	OK, Jarnail Sahib.
	D2	85	Wahe Guru jee ka Khalsa, Wahe guru jee ki fateh (religious greeting).
	D3	86	See, he has talked about four things. Even Khalsa has become a deceitful diet nowadays. How well he said that a gathering of 25 thousand people takes place and he (saint) says that we need unity. Which other food does he need instead of what these 25 thousand and 30 thousand people have to offered him? It is getting something big. They are also deceitful towards the verses. Where they want to deceive or mislead the people, they take support of the Bany.
		87	The thing is, as long as you have the interest, or the power, unless you stay put on your own issue, the rest of it he said very beautifully that people fabricate deceit. They degrade themselves.
30:00		88	I read a book of history in which a Sikh was making a show of his sword skills in the Jacaria Khan's Palace. He shows force of the sword and he wins the field, wins the prize, and is offered diamonds on a plate by Jacaria Khan in his court. The Sikh turned the plate ( <i>thali</i> ) down with the tip of the sword. He said that when I needed these diamonds I would take them at the tip of the

			sword. I did not come to win the prize. What he said about that there is deceit in Sikhism now, he was right to say this.
		89	People increase their trading skills by bringing deceptions in everything. This is also a deception of the people. Do you not feel that four people, six people or eight people come and represent fifteen Lakh Sikh people? Are you helping those people on the brink of terrorism who made nine to twelve Lakh Kashmiri or Hindustani people leave Kashmir by force and by fear of bullets and pushed them into cities of Hindustan as destitute?
		90	When we talk about our community we should also keep balance of others. There are large communities living here, processions take place, conferences take place, everything happens, these communities have their area, for the area there is a leader, there is a religious leader as well. They have their own thought process. Every programme is thought about very carefully by the community before it is put into action. It is not like four people get up without an aim and decide what to do. This has happened many times in the UK. A group of four people started a fight in Nottingham, but when they injured each other's party members then they came back moaning about it. Even on South Broadway, they asked for trouble mischievously. See, it is not the job of a single person. Today's fight has started and this fight of both the countries has become of its own type.
	D2	91	Listen, the protest, they will do it on their own as we used to do it before.
	D3	92	Yes, as Sikh used to do it before.
	D2	93	Number two, this person does not know about history or knows about Bany (verses). This person was thrown out of the Gurdwara.
	D3	94	He has started to give commission.
	D2	95	See, he has changed Nishan Sahib to yellow and made it square shaped. He has created a new separation between Sikhs.
	D3	96	See, the already existing thing which was offered to him free of charge and he took advantage of it. The person in front of you telling you that I have made it ready for you. Has the thought process of the Sikhs remained so limited, that anyone who wishes to make a van ready for them and they will climb in and sit in it?
	D2	97	Then he also said this by calling him by name that the van was prepared for Ranjit.
	D3	98	After listening to such a big accusation people bearing turbans are still walking around in the market.
	D2	99	Don't Sikhs have money?
	D3	100	Is the count of the Sikh population less? These useless

			people have put their services for sale. These guys have put themselves up for a kind of auction. The price for that auction is right. They need an agent. These men are in more hurry than each other to become an agent. Then they do not know the history. These men and Nazir Ahmed's people of front should come here on the panel and talk to us and have a debate on accounts based on history and how these accounts are created.
	D2	101	Bal Sahib, it is a big thing that today they have made it (flag) square instead of a triangular shape, tomorrow they will make it with six corners, or round. What right do they have to do this? Who are they?
	D3	102	No, no, this is the case, that it is their right that they have [No sound from 32.58 - 33.02] .....
	D2	103	..... the community here in London was united.
	D3	104	Yes, it was united.
	D2	105	And as you said, the Mayor of London is of Muslim Religion. Nobody has any objection that he is a Muslim. He is common to all communities.
	D3	106	Yes, he has been there. After arriving here he went to the Harmandir Sahib first, bowed down there and then went to Jallianwala Bagh and then went to Pakistan.
	D2	107	But Bal Sahib, they should also stop this ..... ...[cross talking]
	D3	108	..... That is why rather than us talking about it here, it becomes a much more important issue for Sadiq Hussain (Khan) because this is the first time all communities have a common Mayor. Therefore staying in the position in the future; keeping the communities as they are; if tomorrow he loses his position or gets re-elected again; all this is more important in a historical series. Yesterday, we were sitting in the Ealing Borough Council. The team which was with him were from all the communities. There were mixed (communities) people in a mixed committee. They are all happy that they are all together around the places near the Mayor.
	D2	109	Bal Sahib, the matter is that the Lord is from British Government. Lord Nazir Ahmed has a responsibility to keep all the communities united in the UK. He is saying I am from Pakistani origin; I am from Kashmiri origin. If he has to fulfil duty of Kashmiri origin, he should resign.
	D3	110	After leaving Lordship, he can make his own military force in Kashmir, improve conditions there, try to bring happiness among people there, Do some sort of work for the people of Kashmir.
	D2	111	Why does he have two faces?
	D3	112	He has two faces in the way that he has taken a position of Lord here. It is a very serious matter that after being a British Lord he talks in this way and that is how he divides communities. A lord of an Asian community

			should be common to all communities.
35:14		113	There is a Sikh lord as well. They cannot speak the language he does, the way in which he is stepping on. If he is so interested in it, his lordship should be taken away from him, the British Government should take it away from him, the House of Lords should take it away from him. Let him go, send him to Pakistani Occupied Kashmir.
	D2	114	The second thing is Bal Sahib, the money he has spent, it may have been more than fifteen thousand to twenty thousand...
	D3	115	Maybe even more.
	D2	116	Where has this money come from? Did Pakistan give it to him? Or Kashmiri people gave it to him? Or he spent it from own his pocket? You should ask him to give an account of it.
	D3	117	See, whatever he has done it comes under Unit Section of London Mayor. He can make inquiries or investigations according to his interest, according to interest of his position. He should investigate what is this, which is being created on the street of London. Sikhs have been doing processions until this day. In the olden days Palestinians used to do processions.
		118	Strong protests took place here when an emergency was imposed in India. Processions have also taken place before as well. However, the person has opened a new door on the street of London for this kind of hatred between the two communities in London. If tomorrow there is any kind of harm; it doesn't matter which party gets hurt as there are people living on both sides; two types of nations on both sides; neighbours on both sides; but if any one got harmed tomorrow, or if someone has touched a Sikh's turban (insulted), then this person will be responsible for the action which has created a new tradition in London. To this day, the English Defence League has staged demonstrations but this kind of atmosphere was not created by them.
	D2	119	The worst thing is that if they were to set fire to the Indian flag, they would have set fire to the flag themselves. It was done by the hands of a poor girl ..... <i>[interrupted by D3]</i>
	D3	120	The girl interviewed. She says that they have committed violence. And his finger was directly pointed to the Lord that on his order the tricolour flag was set on fire.
	D2	121	Then See, Bal Sahib, he created the fight himself by snatching the flag from the hand of a female.
	D3	122	How much self-respect the person has for himself.
	D2	123	They do not have any self-respect.
	D3	124	They encourage all communities. What they are appealing for, we do not want to give them the same

			response. But enough is enough if he passed the limits then it is felt that these people are not fit. This man is ruining his responsibilities as well as his position given to him by the House of Lords. The House of Lords or the system here should investigate all these things. If they do not investigate then protests will take place from all communities including the Sikh community.
	D2	125	See, he has planted seeds of a greater hatred in the communities, therefore people should demand to know within which capacity the man has been made a Lord.
38:40		126	Will be back after a small break.
	Song		Song – Accepted, accepted, this service is accepted (by God).
	Advert 1	127	[ <i>Lyca Mobile advertisement (in English) omitted.</i> ]
	Advert 2	128-129	[ <i>Air India advertisement (in English) omitted.</i> ]
	Advert 3	130-131	[ <i>Heston Hyde hotel advertisement (in Hindi and English) omitted.</i> ]
	Advert 4	132-133	Hinduism is the great religion of the world. Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh, creator, preserver and destroyer. The world needs to know about Hinduism because it is not a religion; it is a way of life. Watch this on – Let us talk Hinduism, on MATV every Sunday 8.30.
40:46	Advert 5 English	134-137	[ <i>Pure Heaven advertisement omitted.</i> ]
41:07	Song	138	Song – Accepted, accepted, this service is accepted (by God).
41:14	D2	139	Wahe Guru jee ka Khalsa, Wahe guru jee ki fateh (religious greeting).
		140	Yes, Bal Sahib.
	D3	141	Look, in London, the government has imposed cuts to ambulances, cuts to the police service, cuts to other local services, cuts to bus services and this person is spending money openly on vans. He has not bought just one van. He bought many vans and was saying ‘see all the vans are parked here, they will all stay here for the whole 24 hours.’ This person also put drivers in the vans. It may be this person has been given plenty of money from an external agency, as money is offered for paid informants/agents. Or he has collected money from the addresses of the House of Lords, from all the money we pay in Council Tax by cheating people. He takes no responsibility. But who gets all the blame for it? It is the British Parliament system who gets all the blame for it. Our Mayor of London is blamed for it.
		142	But what right does this man have to bring all the authorities together? It is like if a man in the army does something wrong, all his badges are taken off of his uniform with a knife. This guy's Lordship should be seized from him. He is not fit for the job at all.

	D2	143	First of all, Bal Sahib, tell me the total cost of his spend. First the flags were made; the people who carried them they may have been paid for it as well.
	D3	144	He hired them all. There is one of our sardar (Sikh person) who used to sing Bande Matram (national song of India) 25 years ago, he was hired to come. One or two also came as hired people. We have seen one or two of them before.
	D2	145	It is in a story that the person who spreads a net for pigeons he includes his own one or two already trained pigeons in them, who bring back other pigeons with them. Similarly this person brought ten pigeons (people) with him.
	D3	146	I think the local tax which goes into the London Government's treasury, this man has spent that money to spread dirt of terrorism on the streets of London. He should be sacked from the House of Lords, as, for the last 52 years I have seen people coming to House of Lords and retiring as well, but I have not seen a person who uses the British Parliament System in this type of wrong way. There is a racism law and which a fit law of this country, under this law this can be investigated that the person has spread this type of hatred. Last year in Thames, a van was made to mount the side of the Parliament house.
	D2	147	Yes, sir.
	D3	148	He is openly offering vans to people. It is like come and get it and do what you like. It means that he can offer a good amount of money to someone to have something done. The things London is afraid of, he brings them there and says to people, 'these things are for people to use and to have fun'.
		149	Therefore this person is facing serious issues as on the thread of hatred or under the racism Act he has started to assess people.
45:06		150	Do not forget that this person is a man of Asian origin and when his parents and our parents came to this country; these acts were created for our right; to fight for the rights; so that we would not be hated socially. But by leaving these acts behind, these people are spreading across London, across the UK a new type of hatred. That is why they should be legally banned.
		151	In this case, London's Mayor, Sadiq Khan has greater responsibility for it, because I was surprised that so many people were standing on both sides. Two policemen were standing there first, and when needed, the number of policemen was increased. Any serious dispute would have happened before the number of policemen was increased as they had snatched the flag from the girl and burned it. They have created a matter

			<p>of strong violence and they have no right to snatch the flag. Because of this, what they did, it can make things worse. But, if these things have a chance of growing in the future, then the mayor's team should stop it or the law should stop it, or the parliamentary system should monitor them. But this has been observed, when our elderly community says that sometimes people are targeted by the media. We are very unhappy about these things. No community should be targeted. It is like, if a filthy fish is born in our community, the community should also find a solution to get rid of it.</p>
	D2	152	<p>See, we demand that this Lord Nazir should be questioned about; the total money he has spent on this day; where the money came from; and in what way; how many people he bought with the money? On the other hand, this proverbial Sikh, I will call him proverbial Sikh as I know him not from today but for the last 35-36 years. You are not Punthak (of Sikh religion); nor are you a Khalistani; and this man has no stand. When he goes to Khalistan on the next day he is in Pakistan. He gossips there and comes back.</p>
		153	<p>He has lots of friends that he made with the power of money. Now his business has gone down. This person has created feud in the Gurdwara. Now he wants to create feud in the community. The most religiously wrong thing that man has done is, he disrespected the Nishan Sahib (religious symbol of Sikh). He has no right to be called a Sikh. Because someone, who changes our Nishan Sahib, changes its colour, how could he be a Sikh?</p>
		154	<p>His blood is dirty in the way he supplied ready-made flags by the neighbouring country which he calls Khalistani. He became a Khalistani later; we were Khalistanis twenty years ago; before he was born. We have never seen a Khalistani who makes such flags and brings them in market and disrespects the Sikh religion. What he has done, it is very wrong he has not seen that the two or four followers of Sikh religion who came in his van, stayed behind. They did not come to the front when they saw this type of his misdeed, they stayed behind in the vans because they came in their vans and they had to return in their vans as well. Because of that, these men stayed behind.</p>
		155	<p>We will certainly appeal to the Sikh community not to confront such a person, as he is like a pony that can be hired. Because he belongs to the side who offers him money. If tomorrow he gets money from India he will stay in India (Hindustan). The neighbouring country lost their agent. That agent used to take five pounds to say every slogan. And if he has said five slogans at one time</p>

			he used to get half a day's earnings. By taking another five, seven, he used to make fifty pounds a day. The poor man died, and they are trying to replace him with this man. See whether he can replace him.
		156	But the Sikhs knew from the first day, even before he took the agent's place, that he is anti-Sikh, anti-Panthic and anti-Khalistani, so they should stay away from such a person.
	D3	157	See the readymade vans, readymade flags that were brought, they ignore colour of the flags. That showed them as beggars there. They ruined respect of Sikhs.
	D2	158	But Bal Sahib, we are more unhappy about the Kesari (saffron) Nishan.
	D3	159	That is why we make our Nishan ourselves with our own hands and then erect it.
	D2	160	You see, one Misl (a Sikh confederacy from the 18th century period) was to carry Nishan and when Sikhs saw that the Nishan Sahib kept falling off and this is disrespect to the Nishan, Guru Sahib said I will put a Nishan on every Sikh's head. Therefore the Pharla (piece of cloth hanging out of the turban at the back) is Nishan for Sikhs.
	D3	161	A Sikh never accepts money to buy a piece of cloth to put it on his turban.
50:02		162	For this show, these people have turned themselves into beggars. Because there is certified proof that this man has presented things to these people as gifts. Shame on these people for accepting those gifts: in the way they accepted them and became a subject of entertainment.
		163	We will appeal to those few partners that he has with him to come to their senses. They should go back to their communities; comply with Gurdwara's teaching; walk with Sikh people. In my view, if these things keep carrying on in this way, then people will start standing with their own parties and then no one can be blamed for it, then they will say that they are people who are pretending. If they do not stop becoming part of other countries politics then for our right we ..... <i>[interrupted by D2, 50.46]</i>
	D2	164	Bal Sahib, Sikh has a right to protest where they become subject of violence. We will protest; we will protest in future too. But we should do these processions by standing on our own feet, not by being hired by someone; accepting money from someone; by becoming slaves of someone, this is ..... <i>[interrupted by D3, 51.07]</i>
	D3	165	There was a time when there were old associations,
		166	Punjabi and Sikhs were such a great combination that any procession in the world, such as processions of Asians and Farsi people, then they had the biggest lead,



			and they were the largest in numbers. Now new types of beggars are born who go on their knees to buy flags. I have mentioned this that when there were demonstrations during the time of emergency; the biggest demonstration - demonstration of Pugri (Turban) - at the time of emergency, in South Africa and Asia against Smith, which is between South Africa and Asia, all these demonstrations were organised by Punjabis, and Sikhs used to organise these by staying in the forefront.
		167	Even today, some of our elder people of the Sikh community are still alive who used to organize these demonstrations. These people are not aware of what our history is like. Investigate your generation to know what type of history we have.
		168	What difference they have made, they have put price on themselves as if they were going to be sold there; they should take side of the matter by being straight, not by taking vans from Nazir Ahmed and should say it in a clear way that, brother, by making offers to Pakistan we want to make Kashmir prosperous. He can also go there himself to work there. Who is stopping him from working there?
	D2	169	Kashmiri's..... [52.20 <i>indiscernible</i> ]
	D3	170	He can take refuge there by going there. In my view there are Acres of land attached to Gurdwara. In the past four hundred years one or two families till the land. They are offered a contract of two and half thousand. To this day, they do not give up the land or increase the contract. Therefore he can go there and earn his simple living, no one is stopping him.
		171	At least we will see whether he enjoys Lahore; enjoys agencies there; or fulfils friendship of Nazir Ahmed. The main thing that has become an issue for Nazir Ahmed is his Lordship, and we have feelings that he is not fit to be called a Lord. Legally their system .....[ <i>Interrupted by D2, 53.10</i> ]
	D2	172	See, he has been made a Lord somehow now, it is like please come and be a Lord. But if you see he has a brain of Lords, of pro thinking.
	D3	173	Look, Theke Dar Sahib (contractor), it happens in this way that where minority communities exist; such as our Sikh community; Muslim community; Hindu community; and others. All communities are asked for presentation. It may be in the way our Sikh Lord has been made; similarly he has been selected as a Lord from the Muslim community. But if he turned his back on his community and did not fulfil his duties then this Lordship should be taken away ..... [ <i>Interrupted by D2, 53.43</i> ]

	D2	174	Bal Sahib, he has not turned his back on his community; he is a leader to his community; if we say he has let his community down but his community thinks whatever he is doing is right as a Lord.
	D3	175	I think, he got this place of Lord as he is from Pakistani origin. If as a Kashmiri he fights for their rights then it is an open area for him. He can go and sit there. He does not need to lead as a Lord there, as there is the Government of Pakistan on the one side, who keeps running its own operations and on the other side there is the Government of India. Kashmir is divided on both sides. We do not believe that he has received the Lordship due to his reputation. We just do not want to make a show of this thing. He got the Lordship on behalf of Pakistanis. Therefore, he should not let the Pakistani community down, in that way.
		176	This is important because as a community there are also conditions for Lordship. We also have two Sardar Lords; on their own accord as they go through the community; no one has any objections to it; neither does the Lord take sides of any community. They do their duties in the places where they are given these duties for.
55:01	D2	177	Whichever duties they are offered they should perform them. They should put their participation in the British Government. If we forget this and keep our background in front of us; it is like having food from British government and serving Pakistan; this is not right.
	D3	178	See, we have Sikh Lords, Muslim's Lord. But with the media, we have objection that the media should not be so much hard-hitting. There are several associations that keep speaking without any purpose. We Sikhs have issues; similarly the Hindus have their own issues and other communities as well, such as our Asian community, the Farsi community. All these communities have their own issues. Sikhs have their own issues related to Turbans and religious issues. Our Lord takes up these issues when matters of issues come to the forefront but they do not take them to any other direction; in the direction of politics. It is like we have a contract to spread any type of filth (to create problems) that we wish on the streets of London freely. This will not be allowed by the people. Because we are the same type of taxpayers as any other communities, especially Sikhs have much more ... [ <i>interrupted 56.13</i> ]
	D2	179	The money comes from the taxes paid by all the communities. He receives money from the British Government and he does Pakistani work. I would not even say that he does Pakistani work, but the thing is, he works to split the communities. It is fine if he works for any country. But a system of disintegration of the Asian

			communities has begun in here if he is not stopped in time. Whether the British Government, or the local community, they should advise him to stop doing such things, if he does not stop there are more chances of creating separation between the communities.
	D3	180	See this separation between the communities, although, there has been disputes between Pakistanis and Hindustanis countries for many years in the past, but communities stayed together up to now.
	D2	181	Yes, communities stayed together up to now.
	D3	182	Yes, the communities have been together. Communities will stay together in the future too. But the type of situation that has passed we do not want these types of situations to take place in the foreseeable future again. After consuming our tax money this person should not take it as worthless earning from any point. After consuming our tax; consuming our salt; getting paid from the local taxpayers' money; taking addresses out of it; you should not become disloyal; this person should provide answers to all the questions. And this person can create a big accident with the type of signs he is showing.
	D2	183	When the community got together second time, he got up and ran away. It would have been fun if he had stayed right up to the end.
	D3	184	See, there is a proverb that - went to see a show but the show did not happen. The type of show the Lord would have liked to see he was unable to see it at the moment. There may be something quite bad going on in his mind and we should save ourselves from it.
	D2	185	Our time is now almost up. We will see you on Friday from half past eight to half past nine. You can watch our program twice a week. On Mondays from quarter to nine to quarter to ten and on Fridays from half past eight to half past nine.
		186	We finish the program here. Vahiguru ji ka Khalsa Vahiguru ji Fateh.
58:57		187	Finished