

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-56/2024-DS-II

Dated:11-02-2025

To,

All Internet Service Licensee

Subject: CS(COMM) 1094 of 2024: STAR INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED Vs. CRICHD-LIVE.TOP & ORS. before the High Court of Delhi.

Kindly find enclosed the Hon'ble Delhi High Court order dated**09.12.2024** and **6th additional list** on the subject matter.

2. Please refer to the **para 41 and 42** of the said court order in respect of blocking of **websites** enumerated in the **6th additional list** of websites.
3. In view of the above, all the Internet Service Licensees are hereby instructed to take immediate necessary action for blocking of the said websites, as above, for compliance of the said court order.

Encl: AA

**Digitally signed by
SHASHI KUMAR
Date: 11-02-2025
12:23:40**

**Director (DS-II)
Email: dirds2-dot@nic.in**

Copy to:

- i. Sh. V. Chinnasamy, Scientist E (chinnasamy.v@meity.gov.in), Electronics Niketan, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) New Delhi for kind information and requested for taking action as per **Annexure**.
- ii. Sh. Ishi Singh <ishi@saikrishnaassociates.com> Plaintiff Advocate for kind information. [Requested to take action as per Annexure].
- iii. IT wing of DoT for uploading this order on DoT websites please.



\$~39

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

+ **CS(COMM) 1094/2024 & I.A. 47492-47496/2024**

STAR INDIA PRIVATE LIMITEDPlaintiff

Through: Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder Garg, Ms. Astha Sehgal, Mr. Priyansh Kohli and Ms. Ishi Singh, Advocates.

versus

CRICHD-LIVE.TOP & ORS.Defendants

Through: Mr. Mrinal Ojha, Mr. Debarshi Dutta and Mr. Arjun Mookerjee, Advocates for D-8.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL**

ORDER
09.12.2024

%

I.A. 49493/2024 (seeking exemption from filing certified/clearer copies etc.)

1. Allowed, subject to the plaintiff filing legible copies of the annexures within four (4) weeks from today.
2. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 47494/2024 (seeking exemption from issuing notice)

3. Upon payment of process fee, issue notice to defendant no. 14/Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., defendant no.17/Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd., defendant no.22/Department of Telecommunications and defendant no.23/Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, by all permissible modes, returnable on 26th March, 2025.
4. Reply, if any, be filed within four (4) weeks from date of service.

CS(COMM) 1094/2024

Page 1 of 14



5. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two (2) weeks thereafter.

I.A. 47495/2024 (u/O XI Rule 1 (4) of CPC)

6. The present application has been filed on behalf of the plaintiff seeking leave to file additional documents under the Commercial Courts Act, 2015.

7. The plaintiff is permitted to file additional documents in accordance with the provisions of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

8. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

I.A. 47496/2024 (u/S 12-A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015)

9. As the present suit 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.

10. The application stands disposed of.

CS(COMM) 1094/2024

11. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

12. Issue summons.

13. Mr. Mrinal Ojha, counsel appearing on behalf of defendant no.8/GoDaddy.com LLC accepts summons in the suit.

14. Summons be issued to the remaining defendants through all permissible modes. The summons shall state that the written statement(s) shall be filed by the defendants within thirty days from the date of the receipt of summons. Along with the written statement(s), the defendants shall also file affidavit of admission/denial of the documents of the plaintiff, without which the written statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

15. Liberty is given to the plaintiff to file replication(s), if any, within thirty



days from the receipt of the written statement(s). Along with the replication(s) filed by the plaintiff, affidavit of admission/denial of the documents of the defendants be filed by the plaintiff.

16. The parties shall file all original documents in support of their respective claims along with their respective pleadings. In case parties are placing reliance on a document, which is not in their power and possession, its detail and source shall be mentioned in the list of reliance, which shall also be filed with the pleadings.

17. If any of the parties wish to seek inspection of any documents, the same shall be sought and given within the timelines.

18. List before the Joint Registrar on 10th February, 2025 for completion of service and pleadings.

19. List before the Court on 26th March, 2025.

I.A. 47492/2024 (u/O XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC)

20. The present suit has been filed seeking permanent injunction restraining the defendant nos.1 to 6 from infringing the plaintiff's exclusive broadcasting and reproduction rights, along with other ancillary reliefs.

21. The subject matter of the present suit pertains to the 'India Tour of Australia 2024-25 and the Big Bash League 2024-2025' (*hereinafter collectively referred to as 'Events'*). The matches of India Tour of Australia 2024-25 have already started from 22nd November 2024 and the last match will be played on 3rd January 2025. The India Tour of Australia 2024-25 includes 5 test matches and 3 first-class warm up matches. Further the Big Bash League 2024-25 will be played from 15th December 2024 to 27th January 2025 and will comprise of 44 T20 matches. The matches are being held in Australia.



22. It is stated in the plaint that the plaintiff owns the media/television rights in respect of various sporting events relating to, *inter alia*, football, badminton, hockey, as well as domestic and international cricket matches organized by the ICC and Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI). The plaintiff owns and operates several general entertainment channels and regional channels, including, but not limited to Star Plus, Start Sports 1, Start Sports HD. The plaintiff also owns and operates the online video streaming platform/ website 'www.hotstar.com' and the mobile application 'Disney+ Hotstar'

23. The plaint avers that the plaintiff entered into the Media Rights Agreement dated 5th July 2022 [*hereinafter* 'Agreement'] with the Cricket Australia ('CA') for exclusive digital media rights and television rights for India, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka in relation to various domestic and international men's and women's cricket competitions, *inter alia*, the Events to be conducted in Australia for a period of seven years i.e. from 1st July 2023 to 30th June 2030. The existence of these rights in favour of the Plaintiff, detailed at paragraph no.9 of the plaint, have been confirmed by the CA *vide* a certificate. A copy of the said certificate has been placed on record by the plaintiff. Consequently, plaintiff enjoys broadcast reproduction rights which are contemplated and conferred in terms of Section 37 of the Copyright Act, 1957 [*hereinafter* 'Copyright Act'].

24. It is stated that the plaintiff has paid a significant consideration for the acquisition of the Media Rights in the Events and is also expecting to earn substantial revenue from the broadcast and live streaming of the Events on its digital platform. Earning such revenue is the only way the plaintiff can recoup



the huge investment made in acquisition of the Media Rights.

25. It came to the knowledge of the plaintiff that certain rogue websites are infringing the plaintiff's rights and the rights of various third-party owners. The said rogue websites/domain names have been impleaded in the present suit as defendant nos. 1 to 6.

25.1 Defendant nos.7 to 12 are Domain Name Registrars (DNRs) of the domain names, where the said rogue websites are being hosted.

25.2 Defendant nos. 13 to 21, are various Internet Service Providers (ISPs), and Telecom Service Providers (TSPs).

25.3 Defendant Nos. 22 and 23 are, respectively, the Department of Telecommunications (DoT) and Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY).

26. It is contended that based on past instances of illegal dissemination of major sporting events, *inter alia*, the matches of the ongoing India Tour of Australia 2024-2025, the plaintiff strongly apprehends that once the Big Bash League 2024-2025 commences, given their status as one of the most popular sporting events in the world, a large number of websites, including, but not limited to defendant nos.1 to 6, are likely to indulge in unauthorised disseminations and communications of the pending matches of the India Tour of Australia 2024-2025 and the upcoming matches of the Big Bash League 2024-25 and parts thereof, on online platforms.

27. Additionally, the plaintiff believes that a large number of rogue websites, upon being blocked/ taken down, may also create further mirror websites to continue the illegal transmission/ communication/ broadcast of the Events.

28. Mr Sidharth Chopra, counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff



submits that on previous occasions, while an initial injunction has typically been granted in respect of the few websites identified in the plaint, a substantial number of rogue websites tend to be subsequently uncovered, which continue to unlawfully disseminate the sporting events. Accordingly, such rogue websites have been enjoined and taken down by virtue of the ‘*dynamic injunction*’ granted by this Court. To substantiate this averment, reliance is placed on the following illustrative chart:

Sr. no	Suit and Event	No. of Websites impleaded in the Suit	No. of Additional Affidavits filed pursuant to Court Order	No. of Rogue Websites identified subsequently discovered during the event.
1.	<i>Star India Private Limited vs. crichd.pk & Ors. CS(COMM) 840 of 2024</i> Event: ICC Women’s T20 World Cup	5	6	102
2.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. Magicwin.games & Ors. [CS (COMM) 490/2024] Order dated 30.05.2024		3	25
3.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. Stream2watch.pk & Ors. [CS(COMM) 455 of 2024] Order dated: 28.05.2024	11	19	96
4.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. Jiolive.tv &	9	8 (54 list)	392



	Ors. [CS (Comm) 688 of 2023] Order dated: 27.09.2023			
5.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. v. Yl.mylivecricket.biz & Ors [CS (Comm) 151 of 2021] Order dated: 26.03.2021 Event: IPL 2021	16	14	165
6.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. V. filmyclub.wapkiz.com & Ors. [CS(Comm.) 518 of 2021] Order dated 12.10.2021 Event: ICC Men's T20 World Cup 2021	7	6	122
7.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. live.flixbus.net & Ors. [CS (Comm) 157 of 2022] Order dated: 11.03.2022 Event: IPL 2022	8	11	120
8.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. tl.mylivecricket.club. [CS (Comm) 699 of 2022] Order dated: 11.10.2022 Event: ICC Men's T20 World Cup, 2022	8	15	120
9.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. v. mhdtv.world & Ors. [CS (Comm) 567 of 2022] Order Dated: 22.08.2022	11	12	127



	Event: Asia Cup 2022			
10.	Star India Private Limited & Anr. Vs. Live4wap.click & Ors. [CS(COMM) 11 of 2023] Order dated: 11.01.2023 Event: BCCI Events	11	11	87
11.	Star India Private Limited & Anr. Vs. Crichd SC & Ors. [CS(COMM) 518 of 2023] Order dated: 02.08.2023 Event: Asia Cup 2023	22	10	158

29. Mr Chopra therefore submits that there is an urgent need to restrain such rogue websites on a real time basis, without requiring parties to first approach the Court, by filing affidavits in respect of each such website which starts unauthorizedly disseminating/ telecasting matches. Accordingly, the plaintiff seeks a 'dynamic +' injunction to ensure protection of the plaintiff's rights over works mentioned in the plaint, as well as any other protected content generated during the pendency of the suit proceedings. [See: *Universal City Studios LLC v. Dotmovies.baby*, 2023:DHC:5842]

30. Attention of this Court has been drawn to a list of cases, wherein, similar issue was involved and orders have been passed in favour of the plaintiff by this Court, detailed at Pg.186 to 192 of the document filed along with the plaint.

31. I have heard the counsel for the parties and perused the material on record.

32. Having considered the submissions and prayers outlined in the present



application, the Court recognizes the widespread appeal and significance of the Events, particularly, given the popularity of cricket in India. These events are broadcasted through the Plaintiff's OTT platform 'Disney + Hotstar', which is accessible across a variety of digital devices including computers, smartphones, tablets, and other electronic gadgets. The plaintiff has secured the digital and television broadcasting rights for various events, including, the Events as specified in the certificate, through substantial financial investment.

33. The unauthorized dissemination, telecasting, or broadcasting of the Events on various websites and digital platforms, pose a significant threat to the plaintiff's revenue streams. Such illicit activities undermine the value of the considerable investment made by the plaintiff in acquiring these rights. Additionally, the broadcast content, including footage, commentary, and other composite elements, is fully safeguarded under the Copyright Act.

34. Thus, the unauthorized use of these elements not only affects the financial returns, but also infringes upon the copyright protections accorded to the broadcast content. It is, thus, imperative to recognize the legal rights associated with the creation and dissemination of this content, emphasizing the need for stringent measures to prevent unauthorized broadcasts and safeguard the plaintiff's interests.

35. The issue of rogue websites engaging in the piracy of copyrighted content presents a recurring threat, especially, with the imminent Events. These sites have demonstrated a propensity to illegally broadcast copyrighted works, underscoring the urgency to pre-emptively block their access to such content. Consequently, there's a critical need for judicial intervention to prohibit these rogue websites from disseminating or communicating any portions of the Events, without proper authorization or licensing from the



plaintiff.

36. The dynamic and ever-evolving nature of the digital landscape necessitates that court orders are not static, but evolve in tandem with the technological advancements and challenges posed by the virtual domain. The legal remedies must remain robust and effective in curtailing copyright infringement, particularly, in the fast-paced environment of the internet. In *Universal City Studios* (supra), this Court has elucidated on this issue, relevant portion whereof, is extracted as under:

“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.

...

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.

20. In the facts and circumstances as set out above, an *ex parte ad interim* injunction is granted restraining the Defendants, who are all rogue websites, from in any manner streaming, reproducing, distributing, making available to the public and/or communicating to the public any copyrighted content of the Plaintiffs including future works of the Plaintiffs, in which ownership of copyright is undisputed, through their websites identified in the suit or any mirror/redirect websites or alphanumeric variations thereof including those websites which are associated with the Defendants’ websites either based on the name, branding, identity or even source of content. **To keep pace with the dynamic nature of the**



infringement that is undertaken by hydra-headed websites, this Court has deemed it appropriate to issue this 'Dynamic+ injunction' to protect copyrighted works as soon as they are created, to ensure that no irreparable loss is caused to the authors and owners of copyrighted works, as there is an imminent possibility of works being uploaded on rogue websites or their newer versions immediately upon the films/shows/series etc. The Plaintiffs are permitted to implead any mirror/redirect/alpha numeric variations of the websites identified in the suit as Defendants Nos.1 to 16 including those websites which are associated with the Defendants Nos.1 to 16, 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. The Plaintiffs are at liberty to also file an appropriate application seeking protection qua their copyrighted works, including future works, if the need so arises. Upon filing such applications before the Registrar along with an affidavit with sufficient supporting evidence seeking extension of the injunction to such websites, to protect the content of the Plaintiffs, including future works, 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.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

37. In view of the above, given the fact that the plaintiff's digital rights, as acquired from the CA are not in question, the Court is of the view that the plaintiff has made out a *prima facie* case for grant of an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction.

38. If an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction is not granted at this stage, irreparable harm would be caused to the plaintiff. Balance of convenience also lies in the favour of the plaintiff. The need for immediate relief is particularly pressing in this case, considering the live broadcast of the Events, which are characterized by their brief duration. The short duration of these matches means that any delay in blocking access to rogue websites, could lead to significant financial losses for the plaintiff, and an irreparable breach of their broadcast reproduction rights. Therefore, swift action to prevent such



infringements is crucial to preserving the plaintiff's investment in the broadcasting rights and maintaining their copyright protections.

39. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing the defendant nos.1 to 6, and/or any person acting on their behalf, are restrained from communicating, hosting, streaming, screening, disseminating or making available for viewing/ downloading, without authorization, any part of the Events on any electronic or digital platform, in any manner whatsoever.

40. The defendant nos. 7 to 12, *i.e.*, the Domain Name Registrars, are directed to lock and suspend the following domain names of defendant nos.1 to 6 (*detailed below*) within 72 hours of being communicated a copy of this order by the plaintiff. Further, they shall file an affidavit in a sealed cover disclosing the complete details of defendant nos.1 to 6, as available with them, including e-mail addresses, mobile numbers, contact details, payment details and KYC details, within a period of two (2) weeks from date of communication of this order.

Websites	Domain Name Registrars
crichd-live.top	NameSilo, LLC
tflix.app	Godaddy.com, LLC
sportslive24.shop	PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com
deporte-libre.top	Tucows.com CO
cracksports.me	Sarek Oy
24tvfilm.ru	TIMEWEB-RU

41. The defendant nos. 13 to 21, *i.e.*, ISPs/ TSPs, are also directed to block the websites of defendants nos.1 to 6, immediately upon receiving copies of



this order from the plaintiff. Defendants nos. 22 and 23 are directed to issue necessary directions to all ISPs and TSPs for blocking/ removing access to these websites.

42. During the currency of the Events, if any further websites are discovered, which are illegally streaming and communicating content over which the plaintiff has rights, the plaintiff is granted liberty to communicate the details of such websites to the defendant nos.22 (DoT) and 23 (MeitY), for issuance of blocking orders, and simultaneously to the ISPs for blocking the said websites, so as to ensure that these websites can be blocked on a real time basis and there is no undue delay. Upon receiving the said intimation from the plaintiff, the ISPs shall take steps to immediately block the rogue websites in question. Likewise, the DoT and MeitY shall also issue necessary blocking orders immediately upon the Plaintiff communicating the details of the websites, which are illegally streaming Events.

43. After communicating details of the rogue websites to the concerned authorities, plaintiff shall file affidavits with the Court in order to ensure that the Court is fully informed of the websites in respect of which blocking orders are sought.

44. If any website, which is not primarily an infringing website, is blocked pursuant to the present order, they shall be permitted to approach the Court by giving an undertaking that it does not intend to engage in any unauthorised or illegal dissemination of the Events or any other content over which the plaintiff has rights. In such a situation the Court would consider modifying the injunction as the facts and circumstances, so warrant.

45. In the unique facts of this case, plaintiff is permitted to ensure compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908



through email, within a period of one (1) week, from today.

46. Issue notice.

47. Notice is accepted by Mr. Mrinal Ojha, counsel appearing on behalf of defendant No.8/GoDaddy.

48. Let notice be issued to the remaining defendants through all permissible modes.

49. Reply be filed within four (4) weeks.

50. Rejoinder(s) thereto, if any, be filed within a period of two (2) weeks, thereafter.

51. List before the Joint Registrar on 10th February, 2025.

52. List before the Court on 26th March, 2025

53. *Dasti.*

AMIT BANSAL, J

DECEMBER 9, 2024

Vivek/-

Websites
bdixtv24.tv
cric2watch.com
neesports.live
paktech2.com
sslivetv.com

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
(ORDINARY ORIGINAL COMMERCIAL JURISDICTION)

CS (COMM) NO. OF 2024

IN THE MATTER OF:

Star India Private Limited

...Plaintiff

Versus

crichd-live.top & Ors.

...Defendants

Star India Private Limited

Star House, Urmi Estate,
95, Ganpatrao Kadam Marg,
Lower Parel (W),
Mumbai- 400013

Also, at:

Vatika Business Centre, Thapar House,
Gate No. 1, Eastern & Central Wing
3rd Floor, 124 Janpath
New Delhi -110001

Email: Hitender.adlakha@jiostar.com

Mobile No. +91 9315762402

...Plaintiff

Versus

1. crichd-live.top

Email: ourcontactmail24@gmail.com

2. tv.tflix.app

Email: abuse@godaddy.com

3. sportslive24.shop

Email: abuse-contact@publicdomainregistry.com



4. deporte-libre.top
Email: domainabuse@tu cows.com
5. cracksports.me
Email: admin@cracksports.me
6. 24tvfilm.ru
Email: info.24tvfilm@rambler.ru
7. NameSilo, LLC
1300 E. Missouri Avenue Suite A-110
Email: internal_domains@namesilo.com
8. Godaddy.com, LLC
14455 North Hayden Road, Suite 219
Scottsdale, AZ 85260, United States
Email: grievanceofficer@godaddy.com
9. PDR Ltd. - Public Domain Registry
5335 Gate Pkwy, 2nd Floor,
Jacksonville, FL 32256, USA
Email: grievance-officer@publicdomainregistry.com,
abuse-contact@publicdomainregistry.com,
compliance@publicdomainregistry.com
10. Tucows.com CO
96 Mowat Avenue, Toronto,
Ontario, M6K 3M1, Canada
Email: compliance@tucows.com;
domainabuse@tucows.com
11. Sarek Oy



Urho Kekkonen Katu 4-6 E, 00100 Helsinki

Email: terve@sarek.fi

12. TIMEWEB-RU

Saint Petersburg, Zastavskaya

St., 22, bldg. 2, lit. A, 3rd floor

Email: info@timeweb.ru;

partner@timeweb.ru; abuse@timeweb.ru; noc@timeweb.ru

13. Atria Convergence Technologies Private Limited

99A/113A, Manorayana Palya

R.T. Nagar Bangalore – 560032

Also, at:

2nd and 3rd Floor, No. 1,

Indian Express Building, Queen's Road,

Bangalore – 560001, Karnataka

Email: nodal.term@actcorp.in; nodalofficer.ncr@actcorp.in,

jitesh.chathambil@actcorp.in

14. Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd

Bharat Sanchar Bhawan, Regulation Cell

5th floor, Harish Chandra Mathur Lane

Janpath, New Delhi -110001

E-mail: ddg_reg@bsnl.co.in; sbkhare@bsnl.co.in;

averma@bsnl.co.in; sushmamishra71@gmail.com

15. Bharti Airtel Ltd.

Airtel Centre, Tower-A, 6th Floor

'A' Wing, Plot No.16, Udyog Vihar

Ph - IV, Gurgaon – 122016

E-mail: amit.bhatia@airtel.com



16. Hathway Cable & Datacom Pvt. Ltd.
'Rahejas', 4 floor, Main Avenue
Santacruz (W), Mumbai-40054
E-mail: ajay.singh@hathway.net; dulal@hathway.net;
sudhir.shetye@hathway.net
17. Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd.
5th Floor, Mahanagar Doorsanchar Sadan
9, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi – 110003
E-mail: raco.mtnl@gmail.com; mtnlesco@gmail.com;
gmracomtnl@gmail.com
18. Reliance Jio Infocomm Limited
RCP 14 (TC 23), Phase 4,
B-Block, 3rd Floor,
C 4 130 Twane- belapur Road,
Gansoli, Navi Mumbai- 400701
E-mail: care@jio.com; Hitesh.marthak@relianceada.com;
Kapoor.guliani@ril.com; mahipal.singh@ril.com;
sunil.kr.gupta@ril.com; shilpi.kant@ril.com;
jyoti.jain@ril.com; rudraksha.sinha@ril.com;
neelakantan.an@ril.com
19. Shyam Spectra Pvt. Ltd.
Plot No. 258,
Okhla Industrial Estate, Phase III,
New Delhi – 110020
Also, at:
Plot No. 21-22, 3rd Floor,



Udyog Vihar, Phase IV,
Gurugram -122015
E-mail: info@spectra.co; compliance@spectra.co

20. Tata Teleservices Ltd.

10th Floor, Tower- I,
Jeevan Bharati, 124 Connaught Circus,
New Delhi- 110001
E-mail: pravin.jogani@tatatel.co.in;
anand.dalal@tatatel.co.in;
satya.yadav@tatatel.co.in;
rishabh.aditya@tatatel.co.in

21. Vodafone Idea Limited

Vodafone House,
Peninsula Corporate Park,
Ganpatrao Kadam Marg,
Lower Parel, Mumbai - 400 013 India
Also, at:
Birla Centurion,
10th Floor, Plot no.794,
B Wing, Pandurang Budhkar Marg,
Worli, Mumbai - 400 030 India
E-mail: smitha.menon@vodafoneidea.com;
pankaj.kapdeo@vodafoneidea.com
Radhika.gokhale@vodafoneidea.com
sheena.thukral@vodafoneidea.com;
lavati.sairam@vodafoneidea.com

22. Department of Telecommunications

Through Secretary,



Ministry of Communications and IT,
20, Sanchar Bhawan, Ashoka Road,
New Delhi – 110001
E-mail: secy-dot@nic.in, dirds2-dot@nic.in

23. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology
Through the Director General (DIT) Cyber Laws & e-
security),
Electronics Niketan, 6, CGO Complex,
Lodi Road, New Delhi – 110003
E-mail: cyberlaw-legal@meity.gov.in;
gccyberlaw@meity.gov.in;
pkumar@meity.gov.in, sathya.s@meity.gov.in

24. Ashok Kumar(s) ...Defendants

Yatinder
D-1330/2015
D-3817/2019
D-2514/2022
D-1977/2024

Yatinder Garg | Astha Sehgal | Priyansh Kohli | Ishi Singh
D/1330/2015 | D/3817/2019 | D/2514/2022 | D/1977/2024
Saikrishna & Associates
Counsels for the Plaintiff
57, Jor Bagh,
New Delhi- 110003
+91 9999064036
yatinder@saikrishnaassociates.com

Place: New Delhi
Date: 03rd December 2024

NOTE: Defendant No.1 along with Defendant Nos. 2 to 6 are the
main contesting parties.

Ishi Singh

Code: 50000.01

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
(ORDINARY ORIGINAL COMMERCIAL JURISDICTION)
CS (COMM) NO. OF 2024

IN THE MATTER OF:

Star India Private Limited
Star House, Urmi Estate,
95, Ganpatrao Kadam Marg,
Lower Parel (W),
Mumbai- 400013

Also, at:

Vatika Business Centre, Thapar House,
Gate No. 1, Eastern & Central Wing
3rd Floor, 124 Janpath
New Delhi -110001

Email: Hitender.adlakha@jiostar.com

Mobile No. +91 9315762402

...Plaintiff

Versus

1. crichd-live.top
Email: ourcontactmail24@gmail.com
2. tv.tflix.app
Email: abuse@godaddy.com
3. sportslive24.shop
Email: abuse-contact@publicdomainregistry.com



4. deporte-libre.top
Email: domainabuse@tu cows.com

5. cracksports.me
Email: admin@cracksports.me

6. 24tvfilm.ru
Email: info.24tvfilm@rambler.ru

7. NameSilo, LLC
1300 E. Missouri Avenue Suite A-110
Email: internal_domains@namesilo.com

8. Godaddy.com, LLC
14455 North Hayden Road, Suite 219
Scottsdale, AZ 85260, United States
Email: grievanceofficer@godaddy.com

9. PDR Ltd. - Public Domain Registry
5335 Gate Pkwy, 2nd Floor,
Jacksonville, FL 32256, USA
Email: grievance-officer@publicdomainregistry.com, abuse-
contact@publicdomainregistry.com,
compliance@publicdomainregistry.com

10. Tucows Domains Inc.
96 Mowat Avenue, Toronto,
Ontario, M6K 3M1, Canada
Email: compliance@tu cows.com; domainabuse@tu cows.com

11. Sarek Oy
Urho Kekkosen Katu 4-6 E, 00100 Helsinki



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.