

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-24/2024-DS-II

Dated: 03-03-2025

**To,
All the Internet Service Licensees**

**Subject: CS(Comm) 175 of 2025: STAR INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED
Vs. 1XBETCOM & ORS. before the High Court of Delhi.**

Kindly find enclosed the Hon'ble Delhi High Court order dated 28.02.2025 on the subject matter.

2. Please refer to **Para 46 and 47** of the said Court order in respect of blocking of websites [**24 nos**] enumerated in the **Annexure A** of the said court order.

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: 03-03-2025
13:51:56

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

Copy to:

i. Director (DS-II) Email: dirds2-dot@nic.in 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 the Annexure.

ii. Ms. Ishi Singh <ishi@saikrishnaassociates.com> Plaintiff's Advocate for kind information.[Requested to take action as per the Annexure].

iii. IT Wing of DoT for uploading this order on DoT websites please.



\$~42

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

+ **CS(COMM) 175/2025**

STAR INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder Garg, Ms. Rinjhim Tiwari & Ms. Ishi Singh, Advocates.

versus

1XBETCOM & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Yash Raj, Advocate for D-26.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

% **28.02.2025**

I.A. 5289/2025 (seeking exemption from filing certified copies)

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. 5290/2025 (seeking exemption from issuing notice under S. 80, CPC)

3. Upon payment of process fee, issue notice to defendant no. 33/ Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd., defendant no. 36/ Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd., defendant no. 42/ Department of Telecommunications and defendant no. 43/ Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, through all permissible modes, returnable on the next date of hearing.
4. Reply, if any, be filed within four (4) weeks from date of service.
5. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two (2) weeks thereafter.
6. List before the Joint Registrar on 23rd April, 2025 for completion of service and pleadings.

CS(COMM) 175/2025

Page 1 of 21

This is a digitally signed order.

1

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

File No. 175/2025, Order No. 175/2025, Date of Order: 28.02.2025 at 20:47:11

Generated from eOffice by Shashi Kumar, DIR(SK) - DS-II, DIRECTOR(DS-II), Department of Telecommunication on 03/03/2025 04:16 pm



7. List before the Court on 12th August, 2025.

I.A. 5291/2025 (under Order XI Rule 1(4) of CPC)

8. The present application has been filed on behalf of the plaintiff seeking leave to file additional documents.

9. 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.

10. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

I.A. 5292/2025 (under Section 12 A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015)

11. 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.

12. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 5293/2025 (under Section 149 read with Section 151 of the CPC seeking exemption from filing court fees)

13. Mr. Sidharth Chopra, counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff submits that the requisite court fees shall be paid within one week from today.

14. The aforesaid statement of the counsel is taken on record.

15. The application is disposed of.

CS(COMM) 175/2025

16. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

17. Issue summons.

18. Mr. Yash Raj, Advocate accepts summons on behalf of defendant No.26 and waives issuance of formal summons.



19. 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.

20. 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.

21. 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.

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

23. List before the Joint Registrar on 23rd April, 2025 for completion of service and pleadings.

24. List before the Court on 12th August, 2025.

I.A. 5288/2025 (under Order XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 of CPC)

25. The present suit has been filed seeking permanent injunction restraining the defendant nos.1 to 24 from infringing the plaintiff's exclusive broadcasting and reproduction rights, along with other ancillary reliefs.

26. The subject matter of the present suit pertains to the 'ICC Champions Trophy 2025' (*hereinafter collectively referred to as 'Event'*). The matches



of ICC Champions Trophy 2025 have already started from 19th February 2025 and the last match will be played on 9th March 2025. The ICC Champions Trophy 2025 includes 12 matches, 2 semi-finals and a final. The matches are being held in Pakistan and the United Arab Emirates.

27. 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 'JioHotstar'

28. The plaint avers that the plaintiff entered into the Media Rights Agreement dated 27th August 2022 (*hereinafter 'Agreement'*) with the International Cricket Council ('ICC') for exclusive digital media rights and television rights for India in relation to various domestic and international men's and women's cricket competitions, *inter alia*, the Event for a period of four years i.e. from 2024-2027. The existence of these rights in favour of the Plaintiff, detailed at paragraph no. 11 of the plaint, have been confirmed by the ICC *vide* a letter. A copy of the said letter 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'*).

29. 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.

30. It came to the knowledge of the plaintiff that certain illegal defendant websites who are indulged in betting and gambling services, in contravention to the Public Gambling Act, 1867, are infringing the plaintiff's rights in sporting events to facilitate their unlawful activities. The said illegal defendant websites' names have been impleaded in the present suit as defendants no.1 to 24.

30.1 Defendants no.25 to 31 are Domain Name Registrars (DNRs) of the domain names, where the said illegal defendant websites are being hosted.

30.2 Defendants no.32 to 39, are various Internet Service Providers (ISPs), and Telecom Service Providers (TSPs). Defendants no.40 and 41 are the banks with whom the illegal defendants websites maintain their accounts.

30.3 Defendants no.42 and 43 are, the Department of Telecommunications (DoT) and Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MEITY) respectively.

30.4 Defendant no.44 is National Payment Corporation of India.

31. It is contended that based on past instances of illegal dissemination of major sporting events, *inter alia*, the matches of the ongoing ICC Champions Trophy 2025, given their status as one of the most popular sporting events in the world, a large number of illegal defendant websites, including, but not limited to defendant nos. 1 to 24, are likely to indulge in unauthorized disseminations and communications of the pending matches of the ICC Champions Trophy 2025 and parts thereof, on online platforms.

32. Additionally, the plaintiff believes that a large number of illegal



defendant websites, upon being blocked/ taken down, may also create further mirror websites to continue the illegal transmission/ communication/ broadcast of the Event.

33. 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 illegal defendant websites tend to be subsequently uncovered, which continue to unlawfully disseminate the sporting events. Accordingly, such illegal websites have been injuncted 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 Website identified subsequently discovered during the event.
1.	Star India Private Limited vs. crichd.pk & Ors. CS(COMM) 840 of 2024 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	4	3	40
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 & Ors. [CS (Comm) 688 of 2023] Order dated: 27.09.2023	9	8 (54 list)	392
5.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. v. Yl.mylivecricke t.biz & Ors [CS (Comm) 151 of 2021] Order dated: 26.03.2021 Event: IPL 2021	16	14	165
6.	Star India Pvt.	7	6	122



	Ltd. & Anr. V. filmyclub.wapk iz.com & Ors. [CS(Comm.) 518 of 2021] Order dated 12.10.2021 Event: ICC Men's T20 World Cup 2021			
7.	Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. live.flixhub.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	11	12	127



	(Comm) 567 of 2022] Order Dated: 22.08.2022 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 Asia Cup 2023	22	10	158

34. Mr. Chopra therefore submits that there is an urgent need to restrain such illegal defendant 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]

35. 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. 590 to 597 of the document filed along with the plaint.

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

37. 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 'JioHotstar', 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 Event as specified in the letter, through substantial financial investment.

38. The unauthorized dissemination, telecasting, or broadcasting of the Event 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.

39. 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.

40. The issue of illegal 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.

41. 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)

42. In view of the above, given the fact that the plaintiff's digital rights, as acquired from the ICC 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.

43. 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 illegal defendant 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.

44. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing the defendants no.1 to 24 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 Event on any electronic or digital platform, in any manner whatsoever.

45. The defendants no.25 to 31, i.e., the Domain Name Registrars, are directed to lock and suspend the following domain names of defendants no.1 to 24 (*detailed below*) within forty-eight hours (48) 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 defendants no.1 to 24, 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.

S. No.	Websites	Domain Name Registrars
1.	lotus365.online (Defendant No. 4) 10sports.com (Defendant No. 10) betbricks7.com (Defendant No. 13) diamondbook99.com (Defendant No. 14) funexch.com (Defendant No. 15) lts247.win (Defendant No. 19) shriram999.com (Defendant No. 21) ultrawin.co (Defendant No. 23)	Namecheap LLC (Defendant No.25)
2.	asiaplay247.com (Defendant No. 11)	Porkbun LLC (Defendant No.26)
3.	yolo247.co (Defendant No.2) satsport11.com (Defendant No.3)	Godaddy.com, LLC (Defendant No.27)



	<p>magicwin.games (Defendant No.5)</p> <p>crickexin.com (Defendant No.7)</p> <p>baji.live (Defendant No.8)</p> <p>badshahcric.club (Defendant No.12)</p> <p>gugobet.com (Defendant No.16)</p> <p>iplwin365.com (Defendant No.17)</p> <p>kabook99.com (Defendant No.18)</p> <p>play99.in (Defendant No.20)</p> <p>winexchange247.com (Defendant No.24)</p>	
4.	<p>fresh.casino (Defendant No.9)</p>	Dynadot LLC (Defendant No.28)
5.	<p>ind.1xbet.com (Defendant No.1)</p>	URL Solutions Inc. (Defendant No.29)
6.	<p>tigerexch.id (Defendant No.22)</p>	PT. Jagat Informasi Solusi (Defendant No.30)
7.	<p>vegas11.center (Defendant No.6)</p>	Web Commerce Communications Limited d/b/a WebNic.cc (Defendant No.31)



46. The defendants no.32 to 39, i.e., ISPs/ TSPs, are also directed to block the illegal defendant websites of defendants no.1 to 24 (annexed as Annexure A), immediately upon receiving copies of this order from the plaintiff. Defendants no.42 and 43 are directed to issue necessary directions to all ISPs and TSPs for blocking/ removing access to these websites.

47. 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 defendants no.42 (DoT) and 43 (MEITY), for issuance of blocking orders, and simultaneously to the ISPs/ DNRs 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 illegal defendant 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.

48. The defendants no.40 (Utkarsh Bank) and 41 (Bank of India) are directed to freeze the bank accounts of the illegal defendant websites identified at Annexure B, and to disclose the identity of the bank account holders, KYC documents, and statements of accounts from the date of opening of the account, with respect to all the bank accounts which are subject matter of the present suit identified at 'Annexure B' annexed with the order.

49. The defendant no.44 is directed to block the UPI ids as identified at 'Annexure C' annexed with the order and to disclose the account details of



the defendants, as available with defendant no. 44.

50. After communicating details of the illegal 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.

51. 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 unauthorized 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.

52. 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 five (5) days, from today.

53. Issue notice.

54. Notice is accepted by Mr. Yash Raj, counsel for defendant no. 26/Porkbun LLC.

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

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

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

58. List before the Joint Registrar on 23rd April, 2025.

59. List before the Court on 12th August, 2025.

AMIT BANSAL, J

FEBRUARY 28, 2025/at



ANNEXURE A

Defendant No .	Websites	Defendant No.	Domain Name Registrar
1.	1xbet.com	29.	URL Solutions, Inc.
2.	yolo247.co	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
3.	satsport11.com	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
4.	lotus365.online	25.	Namecheap, Inc.
5.	magicwin.games	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
6.	vegas11.center	31.	Web Commerce Communications Limited d/b/a WebNic.cc
7.	crickexin.com	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
8.	baji.live	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
9.	fresh.casino	28.	Dynadot Inc.
10.	10sports.com	25.	Namecheap, Inc.
11.	asiaplay247.com	26.	Porkbun LLC
12.	badshahcric.club	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
13.	betbricks7.com	25.	Namecheap, Inc.
14.	diamondbook99.com	25.	Namecheap, Inc.
15.	funexch.com	25.	Namecheap, Inc.



16.	gugobet.com	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
17.	iplwin365.com	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
18.	kabook99.com	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
19.	lts247.win	25.	Namecheap, Inc.
20.	play99.in	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC
21.	shriram999.com	25.	Namecheap, Inc.
22.	tigerexch.id	30.	PT Jagat Informasi Solusi
23.	ultrawin.co	25.	Namecheap, Inc.
24.	winexchange247.com	27.	Godaddy.com, LLC



ANNEXURE B

S.No.	Bank/Defendant	Details of the Bank Holders
1.	Utkarsh Bank (Defendant No. 40)	<p>Bank Name: Utkarsh Bank Account Number: 1537018732977246 Account Holder Name: SIVRAJ KERKETTA</p> <p>Bank Name: Utkarsh Bank Account Number: 1748018433931275 IFSC Code: UTKS0001748 Account Holder Name: Dinkar Kumar Mandal Branch: Goregaon Mumbai</p>
2.	Bank of India (Defendant No. 41)	<p>Account Number: 695310110010538 Account Holder Name: Shubham Gupta Bank Name: Bank of India IBAN/IFSC: BKID0006953</p>



ANNEXURE C

S.No.	Website	UPI Details
1.	satsport11.com (Defendant No.3)	9416439784@ibl
2.	magicwin.games (Defendant No.5)	1537018732977246@UTKS0001537.IFSC.NPCI 695310110010538@BKID0006953.IFSC.NPCI
3.	vegas11.center (Defendant No.6)	zg3u1t7mgl1y@idbi 9101375985@airtel 8943353739@ybl
4.	crickexin.com (Defendant No.7)	gurvinder.kaur28@ikwik 9381228530-1@airtel
5.	baji.live (Defendant No.8)	7083438073@ibl 1161089989463e@mairtel

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.