



2025:AHC-LKO:52265-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD  
LUCKNOW**

**WRIT - C No. - 8488 of 2025**

Jay Vardhan Shukla And Another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Of India Thru. Secy. Ministry Of  
Information And Broadcasting New Delhi And 6  
Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

|                           |   |                  |
|---------------------------|---|------------------|
| Counsel for Petitioner(s) | : | Anadi Chitranshi |
| Counsel for Respondent(s) | : | A.S.G.I.         |

---

**Court No. - 2**

**HON'BLE MRS. SANGEETA CHANDRA, J.  
HON'BLE BRIJ RAJ SINGH, J.**

1. Heard S/Sri Rishab Khare and Anadi Chitranshi, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri S.B. Pandey, learned Senior Advocate and Deputy Solicitor General of India assisted by Sri Varun Pandey appearing for opposite parties no.1 and 2.

2. This writ petition has been filed praying for the following reliefs:

*"1. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus restraining Respondents No. 3 from releasing, exhibiting, distributing or screening the film "Jolly LLB 3" in any form.*

*II. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing Respondent No. 1 and Respondent No. 6 for immediate removal of song "Bhai Vakeel Hai" from all digital and social media platforms.*

*III. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing Respondent No. 2 (CBFC) to revoke any certification granted to "Jolly LLB*

*3" and to formulate stringent guidelines preventing certification of films that demean the judiciary and legal profession.*

*IV. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing Respondents No. 3 to 5 to issue a public apology for the derogatory portrayal of the legal fraternity."*

3. Opposite party no.3 is the Director of the film Jolly LL.B.-3. Opposite parties no.4 and 5 are the actors of the film. Opposite party no.6 is the social media intermediary/publisher of online curated content and opposite party no.7 Fox Star Studios India Private Limited is the producer of the film Jolly LL.B.-3.

4. It has been argued by the learned counsel for the petitioners that trailer of the film Jolly LL.B.-3 depicts/portrays the legal profession in a derogatory manner and from the same, it is evident that opposite parties only for the purpose of profit have tried to shown the judiciary in a scandalous manner; thus attempting to lower its dignity in the eyes of a common man, which amounts to the Contempt of Court and defamation of the institution. The trailer and the songs being widely circulated on YouTube and other social media platforms have already begun to prejudice the minds of the practicing Advocates causing grave injury to the judiciary. Opposite party no.2, Central Board of Film Certification violates its statutory duty under Rules 5-A and 5-B of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 by permitting certification of the material that scandalises the judiciary and is against the public order or decency. The derogatory portrayal of the Advocates violates their dignity as officers of the Court affecting their ability to discharge their professional duties effectively under the Advocates Act, 1961.

5. The derogatory portrayal in Jolly LL.B. series discourages the persons from joining the legal profession and creates disillusionment among law students, thereby affecting the future of justice delivery system.

6. Learned Deputy Solicitor General of India has raised a preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of the writ petition on the ground that this petition prays for a Mandamus to be issued to the opposite parties without there being any representation first to opposite party no.2 made by the petitioners asking them to perform their statutory duty and there is no

inaction on the part of the official opposite parties in performing their statutory duty as has been alleged in the writ petition.

7. It has been submitted that a Writ in the nature of Mandamus cannot be issued unless first a representation is made to the authority concerned by the litigant and either there is a refusal on the part of the officer to decide such representation praying to perform its official duties or there is a rejection of the case set up by the litigant.

8. It has also been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that on the basis of The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 (for short "Rules, 2021") as updated on 06.04.2023 such Rules have been framed under Section 87 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and in supersession of the Information Technology (Intermediaries Guidelines) Rules, 2011 by the Central Government, wherein online curated content by a social media intermediary or by a publisher is to be regulated and any person who has a complaint with regard to any content, may approach the intermediary or the publisher under the Act, who may look into the grievance so raised, but in the case of the petitioners such remedy as provided under the Rules, 2021 is inefficacious as the petitioners have to first approach the publisher or online curated content/social media intermediary under Part-III to follow the Code of Ethics and the regulations by the publisher may not be effective in this case as three official trailers of Jolly LL.B.-3 have been circulated on YouTube and they have already gathered three crore views.

9. We find from the petition that the petitioners have not yet approached any authority as given under the Rules, 2021. We find the preliminary objection raised by the learned Deputy Solicitor General of India to be of some substance.

10. We have also gone through the alleged three official trailers/teasers of Jolly LL.B.-3, in which according to the petitioners, are derogatory to the legal profession and tend to lower the dignity of the Court in the eyes of a common man and we did not find any objectionable matter to warrant interference by this Court. We have also gone through the lyrics of the song "Bhai Vakeel Hai" and we do not find anything which may interfere in the practice of the legal profession by genuine Advocates.

11. Writ petition stands *dismissed*.

12. No order as to costs.

**September 2, 2025**  
Rao/-

**(Brij Raj Singh,J.) (Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra,J.)**