



\$~8

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(COMM) 977/2025**
JIOSTAR INDIA PRIVATE LIMITEDPlaintiff

Through: Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder
Garg, Mr. Priyansh Kohli & Ms. Ishi
Singh, Advocates.

versus

VEGAMOVIES.YACHTS & ORS.Defendants

Through: Ms. Aishwarya Kane, Advocate for
Defendant Nos. 31 & 34.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **12.09.2025**

I.A. 22642/2025 (O-XI R-1(4) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908)

1. The present Application has been filed on behalf of the Plaintiff under Order XI Rule 1(4) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (“CPC”) as applicable to Commercial Suits under the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 (“CC Act”) seeking leave to place on record additional documents.
2. The Plaintiff is permitted to file additional documents in accordance with the provisions of the CC Act and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.
3. Accordingly, the Application stands disposed of.

I.A. 22643/2025 (Extension of time to file Court Fees)

4. The present Application has been filed by the Plaintiff under Section



149 read with Section 151 of the CPC, seeking exemption from payment of Court Fees at the time of the filing of the Suit.

5. Considering the submissions made in the present Application, time of two weeks is granted to file the Court Fees.

6. The Application stands disposed of.

I.A. 22640/2025 (Exemption from pre-institution Mediation)

7. This is an Application filed by the Plaintiff seeking exemption from instituting pre-litigation Mediation under Section 12A of the CC Act.

8. As the present matter contemplates urgent interim relief, in light of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Yamini Manohar v. T.K.D. Krithi*, 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1382, exemption from the requirement of pre-institution Mediation is granted.

9. The Application stands disposed of.

I.A. 22641/2025 (for exemption from giving written notice to the government authority)

10. This is an Application filed by the Plaintiff under Section 80 read with Section 151 of the CPC seeking exemption from serving two months' prior notice under Section 80 of the CPC to Defendant No. 36, i.e., Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., Defendant No. 39, i.e., Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd., Defendant No. 44, i.e., Department of Telecommunications and Defendant No. 45, i.e., the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology.

11. For the reasons stated in the Application, the same is allowed.

12. The Application stands disposed of.

CS(COMM) 977/2025

13. Let the Plaint be registered as a Suit.

14. Issue Summons. The learned Counsel for Defendant Nos. 31 and 34



accepts Summons.

15. Let the Summons be served to the remaining Defendants through all permissible modes upon filing of the Process Fee.

16. The Summons shall state that the Written Statement(s) shall be filed by the Defendants within 30 days from the date of the receipt of Summons. Along with the Written Statement(s), the Defendants shall also file an Affidavit of Admission / Denial of the documents of the Plaintiff, without which the Written Statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

17. Liberty is granted to the Plaintiff to file Replication(s), if any, within 30 days from the receipt of the Written Statement(s). Along with the Replication(s) filed by the Plaintiff, an Affidavit of Admission / Denial of the documents of Defendants be filed by the Plaintiff, without which the Replication(s) shall not be taken on record.

18. In case any Party is placing reliance on a document, which is not in their power and possession, its details and source shall be mentioned in the list of reliance, which shall also be filed with the pleadings.

19. If any of the Parties wish to seek inspection of any documents, the same shall be sought and given within the prescribed timelines.

20. List before the learned Joint Registrar on 07.11.2025 for completion of service and pleadings.

I.A. 22639/2025 (U/O XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 of CPC)

21. Issue Notice. The learned Counsel for Defendant Nos. 31 and 34 accepts Notice.

22. Notice to the remaining Defendants be served through all permissible modes upon filing of the Process Fees.

23. The present Suit has been filed for permanent injunction restraining



Defendant Nos. 1 to 24 (“**Websites**”) and other unknown Parties from hosting, streaming, communicating in any manner and / or making available for viewing and downloading, without authorization, on the Websites or other platforms, the content of the upcoming film ‘Jolly LLB 3’ (“**Film**”).

24. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff submitted that the Plaintiff is a leading media house and film production and distribution company in India, which has produced and / or acquired the exclusive media rights in various films across varied genres and languages.

25. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff submitted that the Plaintiff commissioned Kangra Talkies Private Limited (“**Kangra Talkies**”) for the development and line production of the Film. Kangra Talkies *vide* its letter dated 21.08.2025, confirmed that the Plaintiff is the sole and exclusive owner of all the rights including all the Intellectual Property Rights and Exploitation Rights of the Film and its script, *inter alia* the rights for initiating or defending any proceedings relating to the infringement in respect of the Film.

26. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff submitted that the Plaintiff have acquired exclusive global media rights, comprising television rights to be exercised *via* broadcast delivery systems, digital rights to be exercised *via* digital delivery systems, including internet and mobile technology, and certain ancillary rights.

27. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff submitted that the Film is scheduled for a theatrical release on 19.09.2025. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff further submitted that the Websites, which includes streaming websites and downloading websites primarily and substantially engage in, *inter alia*, communicating to the public, hosting, streaming and / or making available to the public the Plaintiff’s copyright-protected content as well as



third-party content (including films), without authorization and / or facilitating the same (“**Impugned Services**”). Defendant Nos. 25 to 34 are various Domain Name Registrars (“**DNRs**”) and Defendant Nos. 35 to 43 are various Internet Service Providers (“**ISPs**”), who have been arrayed to ensure the effective implementation of any relief. The Plaintiff has also arrayed Defendant No. 44, the Department of Telecommunications and Defendant No. 45, the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology to assist in enforcing / ensuring compliance with any orders of injunction.

28. The DNRs for each of the Websites as set out in Paragraph No. 42 of the Plaint, are reproduced hereunder:

Defendant No.	Domains Name	Defendant No.	Registrar
1	vegamovies.yachts	25	Namecheap
5	hdfriday.monster	25	Namecheap
6	allmovieshub.dev	25	Namecheap
9	downloadhub.cash	25	Namecheap
14	hdmovie2.institute	25	Namecheap
18	moviesnation.tattoo	25	Namecheap
2	filmyzilla20.com	26	Cloudflare
24	1tamilmv.gd	26	Cloudflare
3	filmyzilla20.net	27	Dynadot
4	1cinevood.co	27	Dynadot
17	moviesflix.lt	27	Dynadot
7	bolly4u.fish	28	Tucows
15	mkvcinemas.gift	28	Tucows
23	world4ufree.news	28	Tucows
8	bolly4u.fo	29	TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd.
10	filmyfly.navy	30	Namesilo
19	multimovies.pro	30	Namesilo
11	filmyhunkcom.live	31	Hosting concepts
12	filmyhunks.buzz	32	Spaceship



16	moviesdrive.rodeo	32	Spaceship
13	hdmovie2.cd	33	SCPT
20	vegamovie.cards	34	Porkbun
21	vegamovies.taipei	34	Porkbun
22	vegamovies8.hai	34	Porkbun

29. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff submitted that the Websites offering the Impugned Services are accessible and operational within the territorial limits of this Court. The Defendants are illegally communicating, streaming, and making available the Plaintiff's copyrighted content to viewers, resulting in infringement and unauthorized exploitation of the Plaintiff's Copyright within this jurisdiction. The services offered by the Websites are not geo-restricted and are freely accessible to users across India, including in Delhi.

30. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff further submitted that in this Court *vide* order dated 16.02.2023 in CS (COMM) 87 of 2023 titled as ***Star India Private Limited v. moviesverse.ac & Ors.***, passed an order injunctioning the rogue defendants from making available the plaintiff's exclusive content in the film 'Selfiee'. This Court also extended such injunctions to cover any other rogue websites discovered during the course of proceedings and was duly notified on affidavit by the plaintiff, thereby recognizing the evolving and evasive tactics adopted by such infringing entities.

31. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff submitted that the ISPs are engaged in the business of providing internet and telecommunication services to the public and are the gateways, which enable access of Websites through internet into India.

32. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff submitted that the Plaintiff will be exposed to irreparable harm in case the Websites are not restrained from being



made available in India and infringing Plaintiff's Copyright. The Plaintiff is thus, entitled to seek protection of its rights from the Websites.

33. The learned Counsel for Defendant Nos. 31 and 34 objected to the prayers sought by the Plaintiff in respect to the real time basis, stating that the Plaintiff's Film is not a real time event.

34. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Counsel for the Plaintiff and Defendant Nos. 31 and 34, the pleadings and the documents on record, a *prima facie* case has been made out by the Plaintiff for the grant of an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction. The Plaintiff being the producer and owner of the Film has the exclusive distribution rights to publicly exhibit and communicate the Film and contents associates with it, through all modes including but not limited to theatrical exhibition.

35. The apprehension of the unauthorized dissemination, telecasting, or communication of the Film on the Websites shall pose a significant threat to the Plaintiff's revenue streams undermining the value of the considerable investment made by the Plaintiff in producing the Film.

36. The issue of the Websites engaging in the piracy of copyrighted content presents a recurring threat and disseminating or communicating any portions of the Film, without proper authorization or licensing from the Plaintiff, would violate the Plaintiff's Copyright.

37. This Court in ***Universal City Studios LLC v. Dotmovies.baby***, Neutral Citation:2023:DHC:5842, granted a 'Dynamic+' injunction granting protection to works generated during the course of the pendency of the suit as also future works that will be created in the future so that while the content is generated, the same is not infringed upon in violation of Section 37 of the



Trade Marks Act, 1999, till the time courts come to the rescue of the right holder. A relevant portion thereof, is reproduced below:

“17. Any injunction granted by a Court of law ought to be effective in nature. The injunction ought to also not merely extend to content which is past content created prior to the filing of the suit but also to content which may be generated on a day-to-day basis by the Plaintiffs. In a usual case for copyright infringement, the Court firstly identifies the work, determines the Copyright of the Plaintiff in the said work, and thereafter grants an injunction. However, owing to the nature of the illegalities that rogue websites indulge in, there is a need to pass injunctions which are also dynamic qua the Plaintiffs as well, as it is seen that upon any film or series being released, they may be immediately uploaded on the rogue websites, causing severe and instant monetary loss. Copyright in future works comes into existence immediately upon the work being created, and Plaintiffs may not be able to approach the Court for each and every film or series that is produced in the future, to secure an injunction against piracy.

xxxxxx

19. As innovation in technology continues, remedies to be granted also ought to be calibrated by Courts. This is not to say that in every case, an injunction qua future works can be granted. Such grant of an injunction would depend on the fact situation that arises and is placed before the Court.”

38. In view of the above, given the fact that the Plaintiff’s Copyright in the Film is in question, if an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction is not granted at this stage, irreparable harm would be caused to the Plaintiff as the Film is scheduled to be released on 19.09.2025, it is evident that the considering the possibility of unauthorized dissemination of the Film in question in the age of internet would require effective and swift means to contain the spread of unauthorized dissemination of the Film.

39. Balance of convenience also lies in the favour of the Plaintiff. The need for immediate relief is particularly pressing in this case, considering the



release of the Film. Any delay in blocking access to Websites or any other rogue websites providing the Impugned Services, could lead to financial losses for the Plaintiff, and an irreparable breach of their Copyright. Therefore, swift action to prevent the alleged infringements is crucial in the present case.

40. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing, it is directed that:

- a. Defendant Nos. 1 to 24, and / or any person acting on their behalf, are restrained from communicating, hosting, streaming, screening, or making available for viewing / downloading, without authorization of the Film, 'Jolly LLB 3', on any electronic or digital platform, in any manner whatsoever.
- b. Defendant Nos. 25 to 34 shall suspend the use, block, disable and deactivate the DNRs of Defendant Nos. 1 to 24 as hereunder within 72 hours of receiving copy of Notice and this Order.

Defendant Nos.	Domain Name
DNR – Namecheap, LLC Defendant No.25	
1.	vegamovies.yachts
5.	hdfriday.monster
6.	allmovieshub.dev
9.	downloadhub.cash
14.	hdmovie2.institute
18.	moviesnation.tattoo
DNR – Cloudflare, Defendant No. 26	
2.	filmyzilla20.com



24.	1tamilmv.gd
DNR – Dynadot LLC, Defendant No. 27	
3.	filmyzilla20.net
4.	1cinevood.co
17.	moviesflix.lt
DNR – Tucows Domains Inc., Defendant No. 28	
7.	bolly4u.fish
15.	mkvcinemas.gift
23.	world4ufree.news
DNR - TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd., Defendant No. 29	
8.	bolly4u.fo
DNR - NameSilo LLC, Defendant No. 30	
10.	filmyfly.navy
19.	multimovies.pro
DNR - Hosting Concepts – Defendant No. 31	
11.	filmyhunkcom.live
DNR – Spaceship Inc., Defendant No. 32	
12.	filmyhunks.buzz
16.	moviesdrive.rodeo
DNR – SCPT Hosting & Registry, Defendant No. 33	
13.	hdmovie2.cd
DNR – Porkbun LLC, Defendant No. 34	
20.	vegamovie.cards
21.	vegamovies.taipei
22.	vegamovies8.hair



- c. Defendant Nos. 25 to 34, i.e., the DNRs, are directed to furnish, by way of an Affidavit in a sealed cover / password protected document disclosing, the following information of Defendant Nos. 1 to 24 as identified in Paragraph No. 40(b) of this Order within two weeks from receiving copy of Notice and this Order:
- i. Complete details such as name, address, email address, phone number, IP address, etc.; and
 - ii. Mode of payment along with payment details used for registration of domain name by the registrant(s).
- d. Defendant Nos. 35 to 43 shall suspend the use, block, disable and deactivate the Websites as set out in Paragraph No. 40(b) of this Order and such other domains which are discovered during the present proceedings by the Plaintiff to have been infringing the Plaintiff's Copyright.
- e. Defendant Nos. 44 and 45 shall issue a notification calling upon the various ISPs registered under them to block access to the various domains / websites set out in Paragraph No. 40(b) of this Order and such other websites / domains that may subsequently be notified by the Plaintiff to be infringing / authorizing infringement of its Copyright.
- f. Prior to or during the release of the Film, if any further websites are discovered, which are unauthorizedly streaming and communicating content over which the Plaintiff has the copyright, the Plaintiff is granted liberty to communicate the details of such websites to Defendant Nos. 25 to 45 for blocking,



disabling and deactivating the said websites on a real time basis without undue delay. Upon receiving the said intimation from the Plaintiff, Defendant Nos. 35 to 43 shall take steps to immediately block the said websites in question and Defendant Nos. 44 and 45 shall also issue necessary blocking orders immediately upon the Plaintiff communicating the details of the websites, which are illegally streaming the Film.

41. Such a relief is called for in the present case as any delay in blocking the websites would, in fact, result in considerable pecuniary loss to the Plaintiff and result in irreparable violation of the copyright of the Plaintiff.

42. The Plaintiff shall continue to file Affidavits providing the 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. The Plaintiff shall also file appropriate applications for impleadment of the said websites for passing appropriate orders to extend this Order to the said proposed Defendants.

43. 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.

44. Let the Reply to the present Application be filed within four weeks after service of Notice. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.



45. The compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of the CPC be done within a period of two days and file the Compliance Affidavit within two weeks.
46. List before this Court on 20.01.2026.

TEJAS KARIA, J

SEPTEMBER 12, 2025/ 'A'