



2026:DHC:5967



\$~J-

*** IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI***Judgment delivered on: 27.07.2026*

+ CS(COMM) 740/2026

HOME BOX OFFICE INC & ORS.

.....Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Saikrishna Rajagopal with Ms. Suhasini Raina, Mr. Raghav Goyal, Mr. Aditya Sing Thakur, Mr. Affan Moin, Advocates.

versus

STREAMZY.TO & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Ms. Kruttika Vijay with Ms. Harshitha Rathod, Ms. Suvarna Singh, Advocates for D-31.
Ms. Shweta Sahu and Ms. Deeksha Pokhriyal, Advocates for D-39.
Ms. Manisha Agrawal Narain, CGSC with Mr. Nipun Jain, GP for D-60 and 61.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI**J U D G M E N T****ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J.****I.A. 18203/2026**

By way of the present application filed under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 read with section 151 of the CPC, the plaintiffs seek the following reliefs :

“i. Pass an order of temporary injunction restraining the Defendant Nos. 1-30 (and any such other mirror/redirect/alphanumeric website which appears to be associated with any of the Defendant Websites either based on its name, branding, the identity of its operator, or source of the content or discovered to provide additional means of accessing, the



Defendant Websites and other domains/domain along with their subdomains and subdirectories, owners / website operators / entities which are discovered during the course of the proceedings to have been engaged in infringing the Plaintiffs' exclusive rights and copyrights in the Titles and / or Upcoming Titles), its owners, partners, proprietors, officers, servants, employees, and all others in capacity of principal or agent acting for and on their behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under it, from, in any manner hosting, streaming, reproducing, distributing, making available to the public and / or communicating to the public, or facilitating the same, on their websites, through the internet in any manner whatsoever, Titles and / or Upcoming Titles in which Plaintiffs have copyright and/or any other right;

iii. *Pass an order directing the Defendant Nos. 51-59 (ISPs), their directors, partners, proprietors, officers, affiliates, servants, employees, and all others in capacity of principal or agent acting for and on their behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under it, to block access to the Defendant Nos. 1-30 websites identified by Plaintiffs in the instant suit (and such other websites which are discovered during the course of the proceedings and notified on Affidavit by the Plaintiffs to have been infringing the Plaintiffs' exclusive rights, copyrights in the Titles and / or Upcoming Titles);*

iv. *Pass an order directing the Defendant Nos. 60-61 (DoT and MEITY), to issue a notification calling upon the various Internet Service Providers registered under it to block access to the various websites identified by the Plaintiffs in the instant suit and such other websites which are discovered during the course of the proceedings and notified on Affidavit by the Plaintiffs to have been infringing the Plaintiffs exclusive rights and copyrights in the Titles and / or Upcoming Titles.*

v. *Pass an ex-parte ad-interim order in terms of the prayer clauses (i) to (iv) hereinabove;*

vi. *Pass any other Order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the Plaintiffs."*



2. Mr. Saikrishna Rajagopal, learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff submits, that defendants Nos.1-30 are ‘rogue websites’ that are carrying motion pictures produced by the plaintiffs without any license or other authority to do so.
3. Mr. Rajagopal submits, that defendants Nos.31 to 50 are the domain name registrars (‘DNR’) who have registered the websites set-out as defendants Nos.1-30; defendants Nos.51-59 are the internet service providers (‘ISP’); and defendants Nos.60 and 61 are the Department of Telecommunications (DoT) and Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MEITY) of the Government of India respectively. The particulars of defendants Nos.1-30 and defendants Nos.51-59 are appended in the Schedules appearing herein-below.
4. Mr. Rajagopal submits, that defendants Nos.1-30 are carrying/broadcasting/webcasting/streaming movies sometimes immediately upon release and sometimes even before release, in flagrant violation of the copyright of the production house, namely the plaintiffs.
5. Explaining what the court has considered to be ‘rogue websites’ and how they are to be dealt with in law, Mr. Rajagopal draws attention to the view taken by a Co-ordinate Bench of this court in ***UTV Software Communication Ltd. & Ors. v. 1337X.To & Ors.***¹ and connected matters to submit that the court has held as follows :

“WHETHER AN INFRINGER OF COPYRIGHT ON THE
INTERNET IS TO BE TREATED DIFFERENTLY FROM AN
INFRINGER IN THE PHYSICAL WORLD?”

*“50. However, many believe that Internet is a unique highway
or a separate space (i.e. Cyberspace) to be left totally free i.e.*

¹ 2019 SCC OnLine Del 8002



unrestricted. They believe that this space should be left free to be used by an infringer or by a law abiding individual simultaneously. Internet exceptionalists, such as the Electronic Frontier Foundation, are defined by the belief that because the Internet is exceptional, most rules that apply offline should not apply online. Followers of this school of thought believe that the Internet is first and foremost about individual freedom, not about collective responsibility. Their view is that the Internet's chief function is to liberate individuals from control by, or dependence on Government and Corporations. They believe in the maturity of the public. The followers of this school of thought acknowledge that online piracy comes at the cost of legal sales, but they rationalize this loss by saying that it only hurts the profits of content firms, implying that if the choice is between infringement that rewards consumers with free content legality that helps corporations, then the former is to be preferred.

“51. However, this Court finds that the majority of piracy websites are in it not for any ideological reason but for one reason: to make money. Modern digital piracy is a multibillion-dollar international business. (Only a small fraction of sites are supported by ideologies which believe that piracy is a social good.) For example, the owners of The Pirate Bay were earning \$3 million a year, according to Swedish prosecutors. More recently, U.S. law enforcement stated that one of the world's most popular piracy sites—KickassTorrents—was making \$16 million annually in advertising.

“52. Business models differ, but the majority of piracy sites make money via advertising, or to a lesser degree, through subscriptions that provide premium access to content without advertising. The Digital Citizens Alliance's Good Money Still Going Bad : Digital Thieves and the Hijacking of the Online Ad Business report showed that 589 of the largest piracy sites generated more than \$200 million in advertising-driven revenues in 2014. Another report showed that 80 percent of the top piracy websites (550 of 622) in Europe carried advertising, showing how easy it is for piracy sites to profit from online advertising and how profit-driven these sites are. Piracy sites take advantage of the fact that the online economy has become more complex and easier to exploit. There are many intermediaries that aggregate ad space—known as an ad exchange—



from a range of websites (both legitimate and illegitimate) for advertisers to use. **This makes it easy for websites hosting illegal content to gain advertising revenue, including from legitimate brands and businesses, which may be several steps and organizations removed from the host site.**

“53. Also should an infringer of the copyright on the Internet be treated differently from an infringer in the physical world? If the view of the aforesaid Internet exceptionalists school of thought is accepted, then all infringers would shift to the e-world and claim immunity!

“54. A world without law is a lawless world. In fact, this Court is of the view that there is no logical reason why a crime in the physical world is not a crime in the digital world especially when the Copyright Act does not make any such distinction.

WHETHER SEEKING BLOCKING OF A WEBSITE DEDICATED TO PIRACY MAKES ONE AN OPPONENT OF A FREE AND OPEN INTERNET?

“55. If the views of Internet exceptionalists were to be accepted, then a boon like Cyberspace would turn into a disaster. Further, just as supporting bans on the import of ivory or cross-border human trafficking does not make one a protectionist, supporting website blocking for sites dedicated to piracy does not make one an opponent of a free and open Internet. Consequently, this Court is of the opinion that advocating limits on accessing illegal content online does not violate open Internet principles.

“56. The key issue about Internet freedom, therefore, is not whether the Internet is and should be completely free or whether Governments should have unlimited censorship authority, but rather where the appropriate lines should be drawn, how they are drawn and how they are implemented.

WHAT IS A ‘ROGUE WEBSITE’?

“57. One of the key issues around digital piracy is the importance of distinguishing between accidental and intentional piracy. Some experts are apprehensive that anti-piracy orders can go too far, sweeping in the former when they should be more focused on



the latter. There are risks that cleverly drafted complaints could intentionally harm sites that are largely focused on legal material and that diligently work to limit infringing material. But one also knows that doing nothing contributes to further piracy. In the opinion of this Court, finding this balance does not mean abandoning efforts to go after international piracy.

“58. Music and film piracy are primarily facilitated on the net by FIOs or Rogue Websites. They are those websites which primarily and predominantly share infringing/pirated content or illegal work (See : Para 2 of Order dated 29.07.2016 in DEITY v. Star India Pvt. Ltd., FAO (OS) 57/2015). Either these websites, themselves allow streaming of content or provide a searchable database with links to third-party FIOs. The Registrant details of these websites are unknown and any or all contact information is masked/blocked. Even the Ad Networks employed on these websites are not run-of-the-mill popular networks, but obscure Ad Networks, with equally anonymized credentials. **These websites invite consumers for watching free movies/contents. Although, some of these websites feebly claim to only provide links to third-party websites and not host content on their servers, yet their entire module/interface is premised on allowing users to watch pirated releases/movies by way of links, and which account for all the content available on their sites.**

“59. In the opinion of this Court, **some of the factors to be considered for determining whether the website complained of is a FIO/Rogue Website are:—**

- a. whether the **primary purpose** of the website is to commit or facilitate copyright **infringement**;
- b. the **flagrancy** of the infringement, or the flagrancy of the facilitation of the infringement;
- c. Whether the detail of the registrant is masked and no personal or traceable detail is available either of the Registrant or of the user.
- d. Whether there is silence or inaction by such website after receipt of take down notices pertaining to copyright infringement.



e. Whether the online location makes available or contains directories, indexes or categories of the means to infringe, or facilitate an infringement of, copyright;

f. Whether the owner or operator of the online location demonstrates a disregard for copyright generally;

g. Whether access to the online location has been disabled by orders from any court of another country or territory on the ground of or related to copyright infringement;

h. whether the website contains guides or instructions to circumvent measures, or any order of any court, that disables access to the website on the ground of or related to copyright infringement; and

i. the volume of traffic at or frequency of access to the website;

j. Any other relevant matter.”

(emphasis supplied)

6. It is the plaintiffs' case that while the identities of the DNRs are known, the registrants themselves *i.e.*, the actual owners/operators of the defendant websites, remain masked behind privacy-protection policies, rendering it impossible for the plaintiffs to identify or proceed against the true operators directly.
7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the present case, this court finds that defendants Nos.1 to 30 bear the hallmarks of flagrantly infringing online locations ('FIOL') as set-out in the above-cited decision. It is stated by the plaintiffs that the registrant details of the said defendant websites are masked, no traceable contact information is available, and the content hosted or made accessible by them is, on a *prima facie* view, overwhelmingly unlicensed cinematographic work of the plaintiffs. This is, therefore, not a case of incidental infringement, but one where the primary purpose of the websites appears to be to facilitate infringement of the plaintiffs' copyright.



8. Counsel submits, that unless orders in the terms prayed-for in para 11 (i), (ii), (iii) of the present application are not passed, the rogue websites will succeed in blatantly infringing the copyright of the plaintiffs in their cinematographic films and shows.
9. Issue notice.
10. Learned counsel, as above, appear on behalf of the defendants accept notice; and seeks time to file reply.
11. Upon the plaintiffs taking steps within 10 days, let notice be sent to the unserved defendant by all permissible modes, returnable for the next date before the learned Joint Registrar.
12. Let reply to the application be filed within 30 days of service; rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within 30 days thereafter; with copies to the opposing counsel.
13. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of defendants Nos.31 and 39 submit that they have no hesitation in blocking the rogue websites as referred-to in the plaint. However, it is pointed-out that in para 11(ii) of the present application, the plaintiffs are also seeking a blanket interim injunction order, whereby they are praying that if, during the course of the present proceedings, any other websites are discovered to be infringing the plaintiffs' copyright, such websites must also be blocked by the concerned ISPs/DNRs merely on being notified by the plaintiffs on affidavit in that behalf. Learned counsel submits however, that this would place the ISPs and DNRs in a peculiar position, inasmuch as being



mere intermediaries, the ISPs/DNRs would be required to exercise powers of blocking websites without any administrative or judicial order.

14. On the other hand, the concern raised by Mr. Rajagopal is indeed a practical issue that the plaintiffs would most likely face, since there is every chance that the rogue websites that are being enjoined in the interim by the present order, would try to circumvent the injunction by redirecting their content onto mirror/alphanumeric/re-direct websites, or other similar websites, so as to frustrate the plaintiff's copyright and evade the effect of the injunction order. This would make the plaintiff chase a moving target, and would frustrate the injunction orders that the court may have passed.
15. The difficulty expressed on behalf of the plaintiffs is therefore genuine; and clearly, it would be futile for the court to pass injunction orders against the defendant rogue websites only to find those orders being frustrated with ease, by the infringing content showing-up on mirror/alphanumeric/re-direct websites. At the same time, the court would also be loath to grant either to the plaintiffs or to the ISPs or the DNRs a *carté blanche* to block any and every website by themselves extending the interim injunction issued by this court to other websites without any judicial screening or scrutiny.
16. In matters of this nature, this court and Co-ordinate Benches have granted varying kinds of relief depending on the facts shown before them. The relevant extracts from such orders are set out below:



16.1. **Universal City Studios Productions LLLP & Ors. vs. Movies123.LA & Ors.**²

“... .. e. To keep up with the hydra-headed nature of the infringement actions of such infringing domains/websites, this Court finds it fit to grant a ‘Dynamic+ injunction’ to protect copyrighted works as soon as they are created, to ensure that no irreparable loss is caused to the owners of copyrighted works, as there is an imminent possibility of works being uploaded on infringing websites or their newer versions immediately thereafter. Plaintiffs are permitted to implead any mirror/redirect/alphanumeric variations of the websites identified in the suit as defendants nos. 1 to 26, including those websites which are associated with them, either based on the name, branding, identity or even source of content, by filing an application for impleadment under Order I Rule 10, CPC in the event such websites merely provide new means of accessing the same primary infringing websites that have been enjoined.

“f. Plaintiffs will be at liberty to also file such an appropriate application seeking protection qua their copyrighted works, including future works, if the need so arises. Upon filing such applications along with an affidavit with sufficient supporting evidence seeking extension of the injunction to such websites, which be listed before the Joint Registrar, the injunction shall become operational against the said websites and qua such works. If there is any work in respect of which there is any dispute as to ownership of copyright, an application may be moved by the affected party before the Court, to seek clarification regarding the same.”

(emphasis supplied)

16.2. **Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. vs. Terrimeridooriyan.com & Ors.**³

“... .. f. It is further directed that if any other mirror websites/ alphanumeric websites/ similar websites are found

² 2024 SCC OnLine Del 3852

³ Order dt. 23.02.2024 in CS(COMM) 163/2024



to be directly or indirectly infringing the plaintiffs' rights, the plaintiffs will be at liberty to communicate in writing/email to the DNRs, ISPs, DoT, MEITY. The said defendants shall ensure that the directions given above shall be extended to those websites as well. If any of these defendants have a reservation, they will be at liberty to address a written communication/email to the plaintiffs stating the reasons for the same. The plaintiffs are at liberty to approach this Court for any relief they may seek pursuant to the same. Plaintiffs shall also file within 24 hours of sending any such communication, an affidavit before this Court giving the list of the websites they have communicated to the said defendants, as well as supporting documentation in relation to the same. The plaintiffs shall be held to their affidavit and in the event any assertion by the plaintiff, of a website being a rogue website, is found to be incorrect or false, it may necessitate strictures/directions from this Court.

(emphasis supplied)

16.3. *Home Box Office Inc vs. Moviebox.ph & Ors.*⁴

“... iv. If any further websites are discovered during the course of the proceedings, which are found to be unauthorizedly streaming, communicating, hosting or making available content over which the plaintiff has exclusive copyright in respect of the Series – Euphoria: Season 1, Euphoria: Season 2 and/or the upcoming season of the same – Euphoria: Season 3, the plaintiff is at liberty to communicate the details of such websites, domain names, URLs to defendant nos.21 to 31/DNRs and defendant nos.32 to 40/Internet Service Providers (ISPs). Upon receiving such intimation from the plaintiff alongwith supporting evidence, defendant nos.21 to 31/DNRs are directed to forthwith lock or suspend the domain name registrations of such newly discovered infringing websites and defendant nos.32 to 40/ISPs are directed to immediately block access to the said websites;

⁴ Order dt. 06.04.2026 in CS(COMM) 358/2026



“ v. Defendant no.41/DoT and defendant no.42/MEITY are directed to issue a notification calling upon the various ISPs registered under it to block access to the various infringing websites identified by the plaintiff in the instant suit, as well as any additional infringing websites discovered during the course of the release of the Series and the Show – Euphoria, and notified by the plaintiff on real time basis;

“28. For any further infringing websites discovered by the plaintiff, which are found to be offering or dealing in the plaintiff’s copyright content in the Series and the Show, the plaintiff shall be at liberty to approach the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) by filing an appropriate application under Order I Rule 10, CPC for impleadment of such infringers.

“29. For extension of the present ex-parte ad-interim injunction against such newly discovered infringers, the plaintiff shall also be at liberty to approach this Court in accordance with law.

“30. The plaintiff shall continue to file affidavits providing details of the newly discovered websites, their domain names and the URLs, which are communicated and blocked to ensure that this Court is fully informed of the websites in respect of which blocking orders are sought.

“31. If any website, which is not primarily an infringing website, is blocked in pursuance of this Order, it is permitted to approach the Court by giving an undertaking that it does not intend to do any illegal dissemination of the content over which the plaintiff has copyright and the Court would consider modifying the injunction if the facts and circumstances so warrant.”

(emphasis supplied)

16.4. *Universal City Studios & Ors. vs. Mixdrop Co. & Ors.*⁵

“40. Piracy through Cyberlockers is swift and dealing with that is challenging. As per Plaintiffs’ contentions, it is

⁵ 2023 SCC OnLine Del 3395



anticipated that Defendants No. 1 to 13 will re-emerge with mirror websites, redirect pages, or websites featuring variations using alphanumeric characters. **This is not a hypothetical proposition, but a hard reality. Once a film is uploaded to a Cyberlocker website, it can be shared and downloaded by numerous users in a matter of minutes or hours, leading to widespread infringement before effective countermeasures can be implemented. To avoid burdening the Court with the constant monitoring of such websites, Plaintiffs are permitted to implead mirror/redirect/alphanumeric variation websites which provide access to the same websites/services of Defendants Nos. 1 to 13 that have been enjoined, by filing an appropriate application under Order I Rule 10 of the CPC, supported by affidavits and evidence, in terms of the decision of this Court in UTV Software Communication Ltd. v. 1337x.to Such application shall be listed before the Joint Registrar, who on being satisfied with the material placed on record, shall issue directions to disable access to such mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites in India.**

(emphasis supplied)

16.5. Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc vs. <http://www2.series9.io> & ors⁶

“25. In the present case, applying the test as laid down in UTV Software (supra), and considering the documents filed and the averments made in the plaint, which remained uncontroverted, it has to be held that the defendant no. 1 and 51 are ‘rogue websites’, with their primary purpose being to commit and facilitate infringement of the copyright of the plaintiff. The plaintiff is therefore, held entitled to a decree in terms of prayers made in paragraph no. 52(i), (ii) and (iii) of the plaint.

26. In UTV Software (supra), the Court also examined the issue of grant of dynamic injunctions and permitted subsequent impleadment of

⁶ Order dt. 10.10.2022 in CS(COMM) 400/2019



mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites which provide access to the rogue websites, by filing an application under Order I Rule 10 of the CPC before the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) along with an affidavit with supporting evidence, confirming that the proposed website is mirror/redirect/alphanumeric website of the injuncted defendant websites. At the request of the counsel for the plaintiff, the same directions are liable to be made in this case also.

“27. Accordingly, I.A. No. 13800 of 2022 under Order XIII-A of the CPC, as applicable to commercial disputes, seeking a Summary Judgment is allowed. All the pending applications are also disposed of. 28. The suit is decreed in terms of prayers given in paragraph no. 52(i), (ii) and (iii) of the plaint. Pursuant to the deletion of the defendant no. 12, the prayer (iii) of the plaint is being decreed in favour of the plaintiff and against only the defendant no. 11. *The plaintiff is also permitted to implead any mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites which provide access to the defendants nos. 1 and 51's websites by filing an appropriate application under Order I Rule 10 of the CPC, supported by affidavits and evidence as directed in UTV Software (supra). Any website impleaded as a result of such application will be subject to the same decree.*”

(emphasis supplied)

17. On a perusal of the aforesaid extracts, it appears that this court has, over time, moulded the relief to address the intractable malaise of infringing, rogue websites that would resurface in different online locations and iterations.
18. In some of these orders, the plaintiffs have been required to first move the learned Joint Registrar under Order I Rule 10 CPC, with a supporting affidavit, before the extended blocking direction takes effect. In others, the DNRs and ISPs have been directed to act directly upon intimation by



the plaintiffs, with the plaintiffs' obligation being only to place the fact of such intimation before this court by way of an affidavit within 24 hours, and with the DNR/ISP retaining liberty to object. In yet others, the DNRs and ISPs have been directed to act forthwith upon the plaintiffs' intimation, without any corresponding requirement of a prior application or affidavit before the court in respect of that particular category of website, though liberty is preserved separately for any website considering itself unlawfully blocked to approach the court.

19. At the same time, this court is conscious, that in fashioning relief to address the very real menace of online piracy, care must be taken not to confer upon ISPs, DNRs, or the plaintiffs, powers that they do not otherwise possess in law. An ISP or DNR is, in the ordinary course, a neutral intermediary. It is not the function of such intermediary to determine whether any particular website is a 'rogue website'. Equally, under the guise of a blocking direction, the plaintiffs cannot be permitted to assume unto themselves the authority to identify and disable websites.
20. Any mechanism that requires an ISP or DNR to satisfy itself, upon its own assessment, that a subsequently identified website is a 'rogue website' engaged in infringement of the plaintiffs' rights, would effectively cast upon such intermediary an adjudicatory responsibility that it is neither equipped nor authorised in law to discharge. Therefore, the appropriate balance lies in ensuring that while the plaintiffs are not required to approach this court afresh each time a rogue website comes into existence, the ultimate determination of whether such website is liable to be blocked must continue to rest with the court. Such decision



cannot be left either to the unilateral assessment of the plaintiffs or to the sole satisfaction of an intermediary.

21. In the circumstances obtaining in the present case, in the opinion of this court, the correct balance between the genuine apprehension expressed by the plaintiffs and the necessity to refrain from passing an over-broad *ad-interim* injunction that may affect non-rogue websites, would be achieved by passing the following directions:

21.1. An *ad-interim* order of injunction is issued in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendants *in terms of para 11 (i), (ii) and (iii)*, as extracted above, till the next date of hearing, which will be *subject to* the other directions that follow.

21.2. In the event the plaintiffs discover that mirror/alphanumeric/re-direct websites of the identified defendant websites are, directly or indirectly, infringing the plaintiffs' copyright in their cinematographic films/shows or other content that is subject matter of the present suit, the plaintiffs would be at liberty to furnish to the concerned ISP and/or DNR on affidavit the particulars of such other websites along with supporting documentation evidencing that the mirror/alphanumeric/re-direct websites are *prima facie* infringing the plaintiff's rights to their content. Thereupon, the concerned ISP or DNR shall technically verify if the website(s) in question is/are *in fact mirror/alphanumeric/re-direct websites of the defendant websites*, and if so, they would enforce the injunction order granted by this court against such website(s) as well, as a *pro-tem* measure.

21.3. Simultaneously with filing an affidavit with the concerned ISP and/or DNR, the plaintiffs shall file an application seeking to



- implead the mirror/alphanumeric/re-direct websites in the present proceedings and such application shall be considered by the court.
- 21.4. It is clarified that if any assertion made by the plaintiffs in any affidavit filed before the ISP and/or DNR and/or in any application filed by them before the court is found to be baseless or false or not *bona-fidé*, that would invite appropriate orders from the court.
22. This court is conscious of the fact that, under the law, for an intermediary such as an ISP or a DNR to enjoy 'safe harbour' protection under section 79 of the Information Technology Act 2000, they must operate in a strictly neutral manner; and an intermediary cannot be conferred with any discretion to block websites merely on the asking of a party, like the plaintiffs in this case⁷. However, in the present case, what the court is delegating is *not the discretion* for an ISP or a DNR to decide whether or not to block a website; but only the *task of technically verifying* if a given website, that is claimed by the plaintiffs to be rogue, is indeed a mirror/alphanumeric/re-direct website of the defendant websites. The role of the ISP or the DNR is only to the extent of the technical verification. If at the plaintiffs' request a website is technically found to be a mirror/alphanumeric/re-direct website of the defendant websites, the concerned ISP and/or DNR is required *to enforce* the *ad-interim* injunction granted by the present order. Furthermore, it is counterintuitive that the plaintiffs would seek blocking of a website to which they have granted an appropriate license; and therefore, this court

⁷ Shreya Singhal vs. Union of India (2015) 5 SCC 1, paras 121, 122



2026:DHC:5967



does not discern any risk that the plaintiffs would misuse the direction granted.

23. It is made clear that in a given case an ISP/DNR would also have the liberty to approach this court for not blocking a website despite a request received from the plaintiffs.
24. It is further clarified that blocking of any such website(s) by an ISP/DNR shall purely be a *pro-tem* measure and shall be subject to further directions of this court.
25. Plaintiffs are directed to comply with the provision of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC within 10 days.
26. List before the learned Joint Registrar for completion of pleadings in this application on 28th October 2026.
27. The date before court of 31st July 2026 shall remain as-is.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

JULY 27, 2026

hb/ds

SCHEDULE-A

Sr. No.	Defendant Domain	Domain URL	IP Address
Defendant No. 1			
1.	streamzy.to	https://streamzy.to	172.67.201.65 104.21.76.215
Defendant No. 2			
2.	mp4moviez.dad	https://www.mp4moviez.dad/	172.67.213.56 104.21.23.198
3.	www.mp4moviez.fast	https://www.mp4moviez.fast	172.67.163.163 104.21.65.136
4.	mp4moviez.fast	https://mp4moviez.fast	104.21.65.136 172.67.163.163
5.	mp4moviez.care	https://mp4moviez.care	172.67.218.156 104.21.78.82
6.	mp4moviez.webcam	https://www.mp4moviez.webcam/	104.21.38.211 172.67.168.124
7.	mp4moviez.latino	https://www.mp4moviez.latino	172.67.163.104 104.21.74.215
8.	mp4ys.com	https://mp4ys.com	172.67.190.206 104.21.20.15
9.	mp4car.com	https://mp4car.com	172.67.172.170 104.21.47.209
10.	mp4pk.com	https://mp4pk.com	172.67.167.233 104.21.13.91
11.	mp4hdmobilemovies.com	https://mp4hdmobilemovies.com	172.67.136.47 104.21.62.136
12.	mp4cafe.com	https://mp4cafe.com	172.67.130.49 104.21.7.112
13.	mp4movie.club	https://mp4movie.club	104.21.79.223 172.67.171.147
14.	mp4today.com	https://mp4today.com	104.21.93.217 172.67.215.80
15.	mp4cast.com	https://mp4cast.com	104.21.68.202 172.67.198.114
16.	mp4hits.com	https://mp4hits.com	104.21.11.55 172.67.191.67
17.	mp4wapi.com	https://mp4wapi.com	172.67.199.89 104.21.21.159
18.	mp4res.com		104.21.26.56

Signature Not Verified

Signed By: VIKAS

RAWAT

Signing

Date: 27.07.2026 14:51

		https://mp4res.com	172.67.135.143
19.	mp4izle.com	https://mp4izle.com	104.21.61.89
			172.67.207.251
20.	mp4bao.com	https://mp4bao.com	172.67.168.46
21.	mp4men.com	https://mp4men.com	104.21.96.2
			172.67.150.71
22.	mp4abc.com	https://mp4abc.com	104.21.11.221
			172.67.150.105
23.	mp4sky.net	https://mp4sky.net	104.21.22.85
			172.67.203.191
24.	mp4some.com	https://mp4some.com	104.21.84.74
25.	mp4villa.com	https://mp4villa.com	104.21.51.52
			172.67.221.107
26.	mp4movie.me	https://mp4movie.me	172.67.180.100
			104.21.18.48
Defendant No. 3			
27.	watchseriestv.net	https://watchseriestv.net	172.67.202.232
			104.21.14.113
Defendant No. 4			
28.	kisskh.cam	https://kisskh.cam	172.67.130.4
			104.21.7.92
30.	www.kisskh.ch	https://www.kisskh.ch	104.21.77.61
			172.67.204.219
31.	kisskh.buzz	https://kisskh.buzz	104.21.3.187
			172.67.131.25
32.	kisskh.ch	https://kisskh.ch	104.21.77.61
			172.67.204.219
Defendant No. 5			
33.	www.1shows.org	https://www.1shows.org	172.67.187.201
			104.21.84.68
34.	1shows.org	https://1shows.org	172.67.187.201
			104.21.84.68
Defendant No. 6			
35.	www.cineplay.to	https://www.cineplay.to	95.129.237.253
36.	cineplay.to	https://cineplay.to	95.129.237.253
37.	www.bitcine.tv	https://www.bitcine.tv	104.21.12.54
			172.67.193.175
38.	bitcine.tv	https://bitcine.tv	172.67.193.175
			104.21.12.54
Defendant No. 7			

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:VIKAS

RAWAT

Signing

Date:27.07.2026 14:51

39.	f-moviesz.to	https://f-moviesz.to	104.21.32.36
			172.67.182.155
40.	fmovie.sx	https://fmovie.sx	172.67.190.239
			104.21.76.66
41.	www.fmovies.pw	https://www.fmovies.pw	172.67.140.38
			104.21.70.224
42.	fmovies.pw	https://fmovies.pw	172.67.140.38
			104.21.70.224
43.	ww3-fmovies.com	https://ww3-fmovies.com	104.21.89.242
			172.67.192.27
44.	ww2-fmovies.com	https://ww2-fmovies.com	104.21.53.234
			172.67.219.235
45.	fmoviess.org	https://fmoviess.org	104.21.7.180
			172.67.137.38
Defendant No. 8			
46.	lordflix.org	https://lordflix.org	104.21.90.64
			172.67.153.166
Defendant No. 9			
47.	en.yts.lu	https://en.yts.lu	104.21.54.94
			172.67.137.186
48.	yts.lu	https://yts.lu	172.67.137.186
			104.21.54.94
49.	yts.si	https://yts.si	104.21.67.10
			172.67.167.112
Defendant No. 10			
50.	cineb.sx	https://cineb.sx	104.21.78.158
			172.67.223.188
51.	cineby.vg	https://cineby.vg	172.67.168.27
			104.21.54.60
52.	cineby.at	https://cineby.at	95.129.236.149
53.	cineby.cc	https://cineby.cc	104.21.51.247
			172.67.192.66
Defendant No. 11			
54.	cinespot.to	https://cinespot.to	104.21.18.226
			172.67.183.219
Defendant No. 12			
55.	cinehd.app	https://cinehd.app/	104.21.91.162
			172.67.175.135
56.	cinehd.xyz	https://cinehd.xyz	104.21.73.238
			172.67.193.114

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:VIKAS

RAWAT

Signing

Date:27.07.2026 14:51

Defendant No. 13			
57.	moviesmod.at	https://moviesmod.at	172.67.134.12 104.21.5.244
58.	moviesmod.farm	https://moviesmod.farm	104.21.35.85 172.67.216.55
59.	moviesmod.cards	https://moviesmod.cards	172.67.179.200 104.21.72.95
Defendant No. 14			
60.	vegamovie.ss	https://vegamovie.ss/	104.21.10.201 172.67.190.212
61.	vegamovie.sn	https://vegamovie.sn	172.67.133.32 104.21.13.213
62.	vegamovie.co.in	https://vegamovie.co.in	104.21.83.144 172.67.177.112
63.	vegamovie.sl	https://vegamovie.sl	172.67.213.221 104.21.42.246
64.	vegamovies.condos	https://vegamovies.condos	172.67.168.14 104.21.66.69
65.	vegamovies.diamonds	https://vegamovies.diamonds	172.67.168.165 104.21.94.198
66.	vegamovies.nf	https://vegamovies.nf	104.21.5.40 172.67.132.240
67.	vegamovies.navy	https://vegamovies.navy	104.21.63.40 172.67.169.117
68.	vegamovies.hot	https://vegamovies.hot	104.21.73.172 172.67.164.77
69.	vegamovies.market	https://vegamovies.market	104.21.32.29 172.67.182.91
Defendant No. 15			
70.	9xflix.gdn	https://9xflix.gdn	104.21.34.147 172.67.162.17
71.	9xflix.eu	https://9xflix.eu	104.21.15.181 172.67.163.191
72.	9xflix.kim	https://9xflix.kim	104.21.5.84 172.67.133.54
73.	9xflix.cymru	https://9xflix.cymru	104.21.46.51 172.67.223.223
Defendant No. 16			
74.	bollyflix.at	https://bollyflix.at/	172.67.193.18 104.21.73.233
75.	new.bollyflix.med		104.21.26.50

		https://new.bollyflix.med/	172.67.135.101
76.	new.bollyflix.to	https://new.bollyflix.to	172.67.177.211
			104.21.91.185
77.	bollyflix.moda	https://bollyflix.moda	172.67.203.86
			104.21.22.72
Defendant No. 17			
78.	new2.hdhub4u.cl	https://new2.hdhub4u.cl/	172.67.189.12
			104.21.33.54
79.	hdhub4u.med	https://hdhub4u.med	172.67.205.205
			104.21.69.60
80.	hdhub4u.glass	https://hdhub4u.glass	104.21.64.213
			172.67.136.174
Defendant No. 18			
81.	isaidub.ceo	https://isaidub.ceo	172.67.148.223
			104.21.47.157
82.	isaidub.guru	https://isaidub.guru	172.67.136.125
			104.21.7.151
Defendant No. 19			
83.	movies4u.mw	https://movies4u.mw/	104.21.81.115
			172.67.189.80
84.	movies4u.pn	https://movies4u.pn	172.67.130.127
			104.21.3.83
85.	movies4u.ee	https://movies4u.ee	104.21.95.108
			172.67.144.162
86.	movies4u.as	https://movies4u.as	104.21.89.52
			172.67.188.33
87.	movies4.gr	https://movies4u.gr/	104.21.31.223
88.	movies4u.gl	https://movies4u.gl	88.222.243.170
			91.108.106.191
89.	new3.movies4u.finance	https://new3.movies4u.finance/	104.21.72.56
			172.67.175.169
90.	movies4u.review	https://movies4u.review	104.21.47.42
			172.67.144.113
91.	movies4u.promo	https://movies4u.promo	104.21.74.19
			172.67.167.142
92.	movies4u.ist	https://movies4u.ist	104.21.20.225
			172.67.194.183
93.	movies4u.gift	https://movies4u.gift	104.21.42.196
			172.67.165.142
Defendant No. 20			
Signature Not Verified	www.moviezwap.llc		104.21.23.231

		https://www.moviezwap.llc	172.67.214.33
95.	moviezwap.llc	https://moviezwap.llc	104.21.23.231
			172.67.214.33
96.	moviezwap.love	https://moviezwap.love	104.21.48.83
			172.67.182.166
Defendant No. 21			
97.	multimovies.watch	https://multimovies.watch	104.21.86.110
			172.67.218.145
98.	multimovies.makeup	https://multimovies.makeup	49.44.79.236
99.	multimovies.homes	https://multimovies.homes	49.44.79.236
Defendant No. 22			
100.	myflixerfree.org	https://myflixerfree.org	172.67.144.125
			104.21.71.111
101.	myflixerfree.com	https://myflixerfree.com	104.21.58.168
			172.67.205.163
Defendant No. 23			
102.	vidbox.dev	https://vidbox.dev	172.67.69.137
			104.26.6.124
103.	vidbox.xyz	https://vidbox.xyz	172.67.142.219
			104.21.54.219
Defendant No. 24			
104.	yomovies.foundation	https://yomovies.foundation	104.21.14.12
			172.67.133.188
105.	yomovies.courses	https://yomovies.courses	49.44.79.236
Defendant No. 25			
106.	hicine.app	https://hicine.app	172.67.169.89
			104.21.79.77
107.	www.hicine.info	https://www.hicine.info	104.21.23.7
			172.67.208.65
108.	hicine.info	https://hicine.info	172.67.208.65
			104.21.23.7
Defendant No. 26			
109.	seriesonline.stream	https://seriesonline.stream	172.67.146.108
			104.21.39.152
Defendant No. 27			
110.	5movierulz.limited	https://www.5movierulz.limited	104.21.20.10
			172.67.190.195
111.	5movierulz.house	https://5movierulz.house	172.67.157.83
			104.21.13.200

Signature Not Verified

Signed By: VIKAS

RAWAT

Signing

Date: 27.07.2026 14:51

112.	5movierulz.forsale	https://5movierulz.forsale	104.21.26.205 172.67.168.137
113.	5movierulz.camera	https://5movierulz.camera	172.67.167.141 104.21.74.18
114.	5movierulz.capital	https://5movierulz.capital	104.21.41.160 172.67.148.56
115.	5movierulz.markets	https://5movierulz.markets	104.21.35.46 172.67.213.158
Defendant No. 28			
122.	www.filmyzilla45.com	https://www.filmyzilla45.com	104.21.40.229 172.67.157.145
123.	filmyzilla45.com	https://filmyzilla45.com	172.67.157.145 104.21.40.229
124.	filmyzilla43.com	https://filmyzilla43.com	172.67.191.44 104.21.49.152
125.	filmyzilla40.com	https://filmyzilla40.com	104.21.61.171 172.67.212.97
126.	filmyzilla39.com	https://filmyzilla39.com	172.67.215.28 104.21.78.26
127.	filmyzilla38.com	https://filmyzilla38.com	172.67.138.113 104.21.56.241
128.	filmyzilla37.com	https://filmyzilla37.com	172.67.206.93 104.21.22.179
129.	filmyzilla36.com	https://filmyzilla36.com	104.21.38.14 172.67.217.11
Defendant No. 29			
130.	uhdmovies.casa	https://uhdmovies.casa	104.21.75.203 172.67.181.86
131.	uhdmovies.pink	https://uhdmovies.pink	172.67.141.130 104.21.87.49
132.	uhdmovies.food	https://uhdmovies.food	49.44.79.236
133.	uhdmovies.rodeo	https://uhdmovies.rodeo	104.21.92.225 172.67.199.42
Defendant No. 30			
134.	filmyfly.luxe	https://filmyfly.luxe	172.67.129.54 104.21.1.122
135.	filmyfly.cafe	https://filmyfly.cafe	172.67.167.44 104.21.35.12
136.	filmyfly.host	https://filmyfly.host	172.67.221.93 104.21.67.104
	filmdar.com	https://filmdar.com/	104.21.7.253

			172.67.156.145
138.	filmleo.com	https://filmleo.com	172.67.195.170
			104.21.21.12
139.	uncfilm.com	https://uncfilm.com	104.21.33.212
			172.67.166.219

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:VIKAS
RAWAT
Signing

Date:27.07-2026 14:51

SCHEDULE-B

Defendant No.	DNR	Domain Names
31.	Porkbun LLC	cineby.cc
32.	Tucows Domains Inc.	www.1shows.org 1shows.org fmoviess.org cinehd.app moviesmod.farm moviesmod.cards vegamovies.navy vegamovies.market 9xflix.kim 9xflix.cymru bollyflix.moda hdhub4u.glass vidbox.dev uhdmovies.pink uhdmovies.rodeo bollyflix.moda hdhub4u.glass movies4u.review movies4u.promo movies4u.ist movies4u.gift
33.	NameSilo, LLC	seriesonline.stream filmyfly.host
34.	Tonic Registry	Streamzy.to bollyflix.to cinespot.to
35.	Spaceship, Inc.	ww2-fmovies.com myflixfree.org movies4u.finance
36.	Immaterialism Limited	www.bitcine.tv bitcine.tv 9xflix.eu movies4u.gl
37.	Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu	cineby.at multimovies.watch multimovies.makeup hicine.app

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:VIKAS

RAWAT

Signing

Date:27.07-2026 14:51

		www.hicine.info hicine.info
38.	Dynadot Inc	mp4ys.com mp4car.com mp4pk.com mp4hdmobilemovies.com mp4cafe.com mp4movie.club mp4today.com mp4cast.com mp4hits.com mp4wapi.com mp4res.com mp4izle.com mp4bao.com mp4men.com mp4abc.com mp4sky.net mp4some.com mp4villa.com mp4movie.me www.fmovies.pw fmovies.pw moviesmod.at vegamovie.co.in vegamovies.condos vegamovies.diamonds bollyflix.at bollyflix.med new2.hdhub4u.cl hdhub4u.med isaidub.ceo isaidub.guru movies4u.mw movies4u.as 5moverulz.limited 5moverulz.house 5moverulz.markets filmyzilla45.in uhdmovies.casa uhdmovies.food

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:VIKAS
RAWAT
Signing

Date:27.07-2026 14:51

		filmdar.com filmleo.com uncfilm.com
39.	NameCheap, Inc.	kisskh.cam kisskh.buzz mp4moviez.dad mp4moviez.care mp4moviez.webcam mp4moviez.latino f-moviesz.to lordflix.org cinehd.xyz www.moviezwap.llc moviezwap.llc moviezwap.love multimovies.homes vidbox.xyz yomovies.foundation yomovies.courses
40.	NETIM	vegamovie.sn vegamovie.sl
41.	Key-Systems GmbH	www.kisskh.ch kisskh.ch fmovie.sx en.yts.lu yts.lu cineb.sx vegamovies.nf 9xflix.gdn
42.	Internet Domain Service BS Corp	ww3-fmovies.com www.filmyzilla45.com filmyzilla45.com filmyzilla43.com filmyzilla40.com filmyzilla39.com filmyzilla38.com filmyzilla37.com filmyzilla36.com
43.	Atak Domain Bilgi Teknolojileri A.S.	filmyzilla41.com www.filmyzilla41.com

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:VIKAS

RAWAT

Signing

Date:27.07-2026 14:51



44.	Nicenic International Group Co., Limited	www.cineplay.to cineplay.to cineby.vg filmyfly.cafe
45.	NicNames, Inc.	5movierulz.forsale 5movierulz.camera 5movierulz.capital
46.	Ultahost, Inc.	watchseriestv.net
47.	SafeBrands (now Brandshelter)	yts.si
48.	Afriregister South Sudan	vegamovie.ss
49.	Alfanet OÜ	movies4u.ee
50.	IONOS SE	myflixerfree.com

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:VIKAS
RAWAT
Signing

Date:27.07-2026 14:51