

BY EMAIL & DoT Website

**Government of India**  
**Ministry of Communications**  
**Department of Telecommunications**  
**Sanchar Bhawan, 20, Ashoka Road, New Delhi - 110 001**  
**(Data Services Cell)**

No. 813-07/LM-29/2021-DS-II

Dated: 19.08.2024

To,

All Internet Service Licensees'

**Subject: CS (Comm) No. 401 of 2021; Universal City Studios LLC and Ors. vs myfliker.to and Ors., before Hon'ble Delhi High Court.**

Kindly refer to the following:

- (i) Hon'ble Delhi High Court order dated 30.07.2024 on the subject.
- (ii) Para 3 of Hon'ble Delhi High Court order dated 31.08.2021 regarding blocking of websites identified by plaintiff.
- (iii) Memo of Parties in CS (Comm) No. 401 of 2021

(Copies enclosed for ready reference)

2. In view of the above all the Internet Service licensees are hereby instructed to take immediate necessary action for blocking access to websites of defendants no. 177 to 183.



Director (DS-II)

Email: dirds2-dot@nic.in

Encl: A/A

Copy to:

- (i) V.Chinnasamy, Scientist E (chinnasamy.v@meity.gov.in), Electronics Niketan, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) New Delhi and kind information and with request to take action as per Annexure.
- (ii) Sanidhya Rao, Saikrishna & Associates (sanidhya@saikrishnaassociates.com) Advocate for the Plaintiffs for kind information.
  - (a) Take action as per Annexure.
- (iii) IT wing of DoT for uploading on DoT website.



\$~OS-11

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CS(COMM) 401/2021

UNIVERSAL CITY STUDIOS LLC AND ORS. .... Plaintiffs

Through Mr.Saikrishna Rajagopal, Mr.Sidharth  
Chopra, Ms.Suhasini Raina,  
Ms.Snehima Jauhari and Mr.Sanidhya  
Rao, Advs.

versus

MYFLIXER.TO AND ORS. .... Defendants

Through None.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT NATH**

**ORDER**

%

**31.08.2021**

This hearing is conducted through video conferencing.

**IA No.10899/2021**(*exemption*)

Allowed subject to all just exceptions.

**IA No.10900/2021**

This is an application seeking exemption from issuing notices to defendants No.47 and 48 under section 80 CPC. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed. The application stands disposed of.

**CS(COMM) 401/2021**

Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

Issue summons to the defendants via e-mail, returnable for 15.11.2021.

**IA No.10898/2021**

1. This is an application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC seeking the following reliefs:



“i. Pass an order of temporary injunction restraining the Defendant Nos. 1-37 (and such other mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites discovered to provide additional means of accessing the Defendant Websites, and other domains/domain owners/web site operators/entities which are discovered to have been engaging in infringing the Plaintiffs' exclusive rights), 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, any cinematograph work/content/programme/ show in relation to which Plaintiffs have copyright;

ii. Pass an order directing the Defendant Nos.38-46, their directors, partners, proprietors, officers, affiliates, servants, employees, and all others III 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. 1-37 websites identified by the Plaintiffs in the instant suit (and such other mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites discovered to provide additional means of accessing the Defendant Website, and other domains/domain owners/web site operators/entities which are discovered to have been engaging in infringing the Plaintiffs' exclusive rights);

iii. Pass an order directing the Defendant Nos.47 and 48, to issue a notification calling upon the various internet and telecom service providers registered under it to block access to the Defendant Nos.1-37 websites identified by the Plaintiffs in the instant suit (and such other mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites discovered to provide additional means of accessing the Defendant Websites, and other domains/domain owners/web site operators/entities which are discovered to have been engaging in infringing the Plaintiffs' exclusive rights).”



2. It is the case of the plaintiffs that plaintiffs No.1 to 6 are leading entertainment companies globally well-known for producing Films and TV Series etc. The plaintiffs have exclusive rights to communicate to the public their content. No other entity can without authorisation from the plaintiffs upload, stream or make available for download or communicate to the public the plaintiffs' content in any manner whatsoever.

3. It is pointed out that defendants No.1 to 37 are rogue websites and substantially indulge in online piracy by making available for download and otherwise providing access to infringing and illegal content. Defendants No.38 to 46 are Internet service providers who are being arrayed for the limited purpose of restricting or blocking access to the rogue websites. Defendants No.47 and 48 are Department of Telecommunications and Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology respective, which are Government Departments and are being arrayed for the purpose to issue notification calling upon the ISPs to block access to the rogue websites identified in the present suit and also such other websites which are subsequently discovered to be infringing the rights of the plaintiffs.

4. It is further stated that plaintiffs No.1, 3, 5 and 6 in collaboration with 6 studios had instituted 8 suits for copyright infringement against 30 infringing domains that were communicating to the public plaintiffs' copyright works which are unauthorised before this court being CS(COMM) 724/2017, title '*UTV Software Communication Ltd. & Anr. v. 1337x.to & Ors.*'. This court in the said judgment recognized the factors to be considered while determining rogue websites. Relying upon the said criteria, it is pleaded that the defendant websites have primary purpose or effect of infringing or facilitating or indulging in infringement and are also



liable for the acts of infringement by third parties by way of inducement.

5. It is further stated that the defendant websites are anonymous in nature and the information provided in the public domain regarding the owners of the websites is either incomplete, incorrect and/or protected behind a veil of secrecy.

6. Clearly, the plaintiffs have made out a *prima facie* case. An interim injunction is passed in favour of the plaintiffs and against defendants No.1 to 37 in terms of the prayer para 5(i) of the present application; an interim injunction is passed in favour of the plaintiffs and against defendants No.38 to 46 in terms of the prayer para 5(ii) of the present application; and an interim injunction is also passed in favour of the plaintiffs and against defendants No.47 and 48 in terms of the prayer para 5(iii) of the present application till further orders.

7. Issue notice to the defendants via e-mail, returnable for 15.11.2021.

8. The plaintiffs to comply with the provisions of Order 39 Rule 3 CPC within seven days via e-mail.

**JAYANT NATH, J.**

**AUGUST 31, 2021/v**



\$~21

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **CS (COMM) 401/2021**

UNIVERSAL CITY STUDIOS LLC AND ORS. .... Plaintiffs

Through: Ms. Sukasini Raina, Ms. Anjali  
Aggarwal and Ms. Mehr, Advocates.  
(M:9810621272)

versus

MYFLIXER.TO AND ORS. .... Defendants

Through: None.

**CORAM:**

**JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH**

**ORDER**

% **11.11.2022**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

**I.A. 10898/2021 (Stay) & CS(COMM) 401/2021**

2. None appears for the Defendants.

3. Ld. counsel for the Appellant seeks an adjournment to file an application seeking summary judgment in the suit.

4. In the meantime, considering that the injunction order in the suit has been operating since 31st August, 2021, the interim injunction granted vide the said order is confirmed during the pendency of the suit.

5. Accordingly, **I.A. 10898/2021** is disposed of.

6. List on 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 2023.

**PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.**

**NOVEMBER 11, 2022**

**MR/MS**



\$~19

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CS(COMM) 401/2021

UNIVERSAL CITY STUDIOS LLC AND ORS.

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Raghav Goyal, Adv.  
(M- 9205464387)

versus

MYFLIXER.TO AND ORS.

.....Defendant

Through: Mr. Peeyoosh Kalra, Ms.  
Meera Kaura Patel, Ms. Puru  
Pratap Singh, Mr. Vikash  
Vadit & Mr. Yashwant S.  
Baghel, Advs. (through VC)

**CORAM:**  
**SIDHARTH MATHUR (DHJS), JOINT REGISTRAR**  
**(JUDICIAL)**

**ORDER**  
**30.07.2024**

%

In view of the IA no. 34873/2024 having been allowed, now issue summons to the newly impleaded defendant no. 177 to 183 through emails, subject to the filing of PF.

List the matter for the completion of service of the defendant no. 163 to 183 on the date already fixed i.e. **12.08.2024**.

**IA No. 34873/2024 (By plaintiffs u/o 1 Rule 10 CPC seeking impleadment of additional mirrors, redirects, or alphanumeric variations as defendants in the memo of parties)**

The plaintiff is seeking to implead additional mirrors/re-directs/alphanumeric variations as the defendant no. 177 to 183 since it is illegally distributing the copyrighted content of the plaintiff. The relevant details of this infringer are mentioned in



para no. 2 of the application. Keeping in view, the contents of this application so read in the light of the prayers made in the suit, the same is allowed.

It is worthwhile to note that the additional mirrors/re-directs/alphanumeric variations impleaded as the defendant nos. 177 to 183 shall be subject to the interim orders already passed in the suit.

The amended memo of parties is already on record.

**SIDHARTH MATHUR (DHJS)  
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)**

**JULY 30, 2024/jr**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*



URL of New Mirror/Redirect/Alphanumeric Variation of Injuncted Website	Domain Name of Mirror/Redirect/Alphanumeric Variation of Injuncted Website
<a href="https://myflixeer.cx">https://myflixeer.cx</a>	myflixeer.cx
<a href="https://myflixeerz.org">https://myflixeerz.org</a>	myflixeerz.org
<a href="https://myflixeerr.net">https://myflixeerr.net</a>	myflixeerr.net
<a href="https://soap2day.pe">https://soap2day.pe</a> <a href="https://soap2dayto.io">https://soap2dayto.io</a>	soap2day.pe soap2dayto.io
<a href="https://soap2dayto.info">https://soap2dayto.info</a> <a href="https://flixeer.si">https://flixeer.si</a>	soap2dayto.info flixeer.si

## **Annexure**

Subject: Action requested to be taken by MEITY and Plaintiff for effective removal of content for viewing by public at large within India as per the said orders of Hon'ble Court.

It is observed that a number of orders of Hon'ble Court are issued for blocking of websites every month. There are around more than 2700 ISPs in India and these ISPs are connected among themselves in a mesh network. DOT is instructing each of the ISPs through emails/through its website for blocking of the websites as ordered by the Hon'ble Courts. Ensuring compliance of the orders by each of the ISPs is a time-consuming and complex task especially in view of multiplicity of orders of Hon'ble Courts, multiplicity of websites to be blocked and multiplicity of ISPs.

2. Allocation of Business Rules inter-alia states thus:-

*'Policy matters relating to information technology; Electronics; and Internet (all matters other than licensing of Internet Service Provider)'.*

3. In view of above and in order to ensure effective removal by content for viewing by public at large, the plaintiff is requested to do a trace route of the web server hosting the said website. In case the web server happens to be in India, the plaintiff may inform the same to Meity who may direct the owner of such web server to stop transmission of content as per IT Act and as directed by the Hon'ble Court so that the content would be blocked from the source itself and the exercise of blocking by 2700 ISPs would not be required.

4. In case such server is located abroad i.e. outside India then access to such URL/website can be blocked through the international internet gateways which are much less in number. This would result in timely and effectively removal of undesirable content for viewing by public at large as is the requirement as per the orders of Hon'ble Court.