



**IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS  
FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**

**CAUSE NO. FSD 113 OF 2024 (DDJ)**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES ACT (AS REVISED)  
AND IN THE MATTER OF BAOSHENG MEDIA GROUP HOLDINGS LIMITED**

**Before:** The Hon. Justice David Doyle

**Heard:** On the papers

**Draft judgment circulated:** 25 November 2024

**Judgment delivered:** 28 November 2024

*Determination of application for costs – importance of strictly complying with court orders*

**JUDGMENT**

**Introduction**

1. On 6 November 2024, for the reasons stated in a judgment delivered on 30 October 2024 (the “Judgment”) I made an order (the “Order”) that:

*241128 Baosheng Media Group Holdings Limited – FSD 113 of 2024 (DDJ) - Judgment*

- (1) the summons of Baosheng Media Group Holdings Limited (the “Company”) dated 10 July 2024 (the “Summons”) seeking to strike out a winding up petition (the “Petition”) presented by Orient Plus International Limited (the “Petitioner”) on 9 April 2024 is dismissed;
  - (2) the parties shall file written submissions of no more than 3 pages on the issue of costs of the Summons on or before 20 November 2024.
2. Unhelpfully, a copy of the Judgment and the Order were not included in the two bundles provided to the court by the parties.

### **Documents considered**

3. I have considered:
- (1) the Judgment and the Order;
  - (2) the first 3 pages of the 4 pages of written submissions of the Petitioner dated 20 November 2024; and
  - (3) the first 3 pages of the 4 pages of written submissions of the Company dated 20 November.
4. As I have previously indicated when a court makes an order limiting the number of pages of written submissions the parties and their attorneys should comply with such an order. In the future if such orders are not complied with costs orders and other adverse consequences may follow. This court does not expect its orders to be ignored.

### **The position of the Petitioner**

5. The Petitioner’s position is that, as it is the successful party, it should have its costs of and incidental to the Summons on the standard basis to be taxed if not agreed unless it appears to the court that, in the circumstances of the case, some other order should be made.

**The position of the Company**

6. The Company's position is that the costs on the Summons should be costs in the cause or alternatively costs to be reserved until the determination of the Petition.

**Determination**

7. In my judgment, in the particular circumstances of this case, the appropriate order for costs in respect of the Summons is for costs in the cause. It would be unjust to make any other order especially in circumstances where the court has made critical comments in respect of the Petition and where the possibility of the Petitioner failing at trial is a very live possibility.
8. The attorneys should provide the court for my approval a draft order agreed as to content and form within 7 days of the delivery of the judgment.

David Doyle

---

**THE HON. JUSTICE DAVID DOYLE  
JUDGE OF THE GRAND COURT**