

By Email/DoT Website

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

No. 813-07/LM-03/2025-DS-II

Dated:11-04-2025

**To,
All Licensees with Internet Service Authorization**

Subject: CS(COMM) 266 of 2025: Star India Private Limited vs. <https://crichdplayer.org> & Ors before Hon'ble Delhi High Court.

Kindly find enclosed the Hon'ble Delhi High Court order dated **25.03.2025** on the subject matter.

2. Please refer to **para 33(i) and 33(j)** of the aforementioned Court order in respect of blocking of **websites/domains [4+2+21+11=38 nos]** enumerated in the **9th, 10th, 11th and 12th additional lists** of websites, received from the plaintiff.
3. In view of the above, all Licensees with Internet Service Authorization are hereby instructed to take immediate necessary action for blocking of the said websites/domains, as above, for compliance of the said court order.

Encl: A/A

Digitally signed by
SHASHI KUMAR
Date: 11-04-2025
17:50:04
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 with request to take action as per the Annexure pl.
- II. Sh. Priyansh Kohli (priyansh@saikrishnaassociates.com), Plaintiff's Counsel for kind information and requested to take action as per the Annexure pl.
- III. IT Wing of DoT for uploading this order on DoT websites pl.

9th additional websites	
S.no	Websites
1	https://axswatch.live
2	https://bingsport1.co
3	https://crichd.ink
4	https://vernnbnc.3u90belt9bz02udeeply.cfd

10th additional websites	
S.no	Websitess
1	https://rexvtmv2.shareink.net/
2	https://hlsvidvx2.cloudycx.net

(11th additional website)

S.no	Websites
1	https://001.fclplayer.net
2	https://004.fclplayer.net
3	https://a85.azplay1.me
4	https://bllovdes.d4ssgk.su
5	https://crichd-player.top/
6	https://www.crickettvbd.com/
7	https://crictime.ch/
8	https://doc.pricesaskeloadsc.com/admin
9	https://fembedbuddy.top
10	https://florecd.pricesaskeloadsc.com/admin
11	https://ipl.watchcric.com/
12	https://livestreamhd247.live/
13	https://mhd.moviesflixter.com
14	https://one.halftime.top
15	https://papaplayer.com

16	https://processbigger.com
17	https://stream2wetch.top/
18	https://www.vipleague.pm/
19	https://vis.dlolcast.pro
20	https://webxzplay.cfd
21	https://wikinew.newkso.ru

12th additional websites

S.no	Websites
1	https://sungohd.com
2	https://stream2wetch.top
3	https://ipl.watchcric.com
4	https://goldendayshealth.com
5	https://firstball.in
6	https://dokoembed.pw
7	https://crictime.ch
8	https://cricballtv.com
9	https://bsports.moviesflixter.com
10	https://bdixmafia.com
11	https://embedtv64u.shareink.net



\$~35

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

+ CS(COMM) 266/2025

STAR INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder Garg, Mr. Akshay Maloo and Mr. Priyansh Kohli, Advs

versus

HTTPS//CRICHDPLAYER.ORG/ & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

25.03.2025

I.A. 7773/2025- Pre-institution mediation

1. *Vide* the present application filed under *Section 12A* of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015, read with *Section 151* of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ('CPC'), the plaintiff seeks exemption from pre-litigation mediation.

2. Considering the averments made in the present application, as also since the plaintiff is simultaneously seeking *ex parte ad interim* injunction, and in view of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Yamini Manohar v. T.K.D. Krithi 2024 (5) SCC 815*, which has been followed by a Division Bench this Court in *Chandra Kishore Chaurasia v. R. A. Perfumery Works Private Limited 2022:DHC:4454-DB*, the plaintiff is exempted from instituting pre-litigation mediation.

3. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

CS(COMM) 266/2025

Page 1 of 16



I.A. 7770/2025-Exp

4. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
5. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 7771/2025-Exp. from issuing notice to D-12, D-15, D-20 and D-21

6. *Vide* the present application filed under *Section 80*, read with *Section 151* of the CPC, the plaintiff seeks exemption from the requirement of advance service upon the defendant nos.12, 15, 20 and 21, namely Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited ('BSNL'), Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited ('MTNL'), Department of Telecommunications ('DoT') and Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology ('MEITY') respectively, on the ground that no formal remedy/ relief as prescribed under the Copyright Act, 1957 ('Act of 1957'), is being claimed against them, as also since they are only being arrayed to ensure compliance with any orders that may be passed by this Court.

7. For the reasons stated in the present application, as also taking into account the aforesaid factors, and since it would be in the interest of justice, the plaintiff is granted exemption from effecting advance service upon the aforesaid defendant nos.12, 15, 20 and 21, being BSNL, MTNL, DoT and MEITY respectively.

8. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

I.A. 7772/2025-Addl.doc.

9. *Vide* the present application filed under *Order XI Rule 1(4)* read with *Section 151* of the CPC, the plaintiff seeks leave of this Court to file additional documents.

10. The plaintiff will be at liberty to file additional documents at a later stage, *albeit*, after initiating appropriate steps, strictly as per the provisions



of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 read with *Section 151* of the CPC and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

11. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

CS(COMM) 266/2025

12. The plaintiff, by way of the present plaint, seeks permanent injunction and damages for infringement of copyright under the Act of 1957, as also appropriate directions to the arrayed authorities.

13. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

14. Upon filing of the process fee, issue summons of the suit to the defendants through all permissible modes, returnable before the learned Joint Registrar on 11.07.2025.

15. Needless to say, it shall be specified in the summons that the written statement(s) shall be filed by each of the defendants within a period of *thirty days* from the date of the receipt of the summons. Written statement(s) shall be accompanied by affidavit(s) of admission/ denial of documents of the plaintiff, without which the written statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

16. Replication(s) thereto, if any, be filed by the plaintiff within a period of *fifteen days* from the date of receipt of written statement(s). The said replication(s), if any, shall also be accompanied by affidavit(s) of admission/ denial of documents filed by the defendants, without which the replication(s) shall not be taken on record within the aforesaid period of *fifteen days*.

17. If, and when, any of the parties wish to seek inspection of any document(s), the same shall be sought and given within the requisite timelines.

CS(COMM) 266/2025

Page 3 of 16



18. List before the learned Joint Registrar for marking exhibits of documents on 11.07.2025. It is made clear that if any party unjustifiably denies any document(s), then such party would be liable to be burdened with costs.

19. List before the Court 20.08.2025.

I.A. 7769/2025-O.XXXIX r.1 and 2 CPC, ad interim injunction

20. The present application under *Order XXXIX, Rules 1 and 2* of the CPC has been filed by the plaintiff seeking the following reliefs:

- i. *Pass an order of temporary injunction restraining the Defendant Nos. 1 to 5 (and such other websites which are discovered during the course of the proceedings and notified on Affidavit by the Plaintiff to have been infringing the Plaintiff's exclusive rights and broadcasting rights), their owners, partners, officers, 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 communicating, hosting, streaming, and/or making available for viewing and downloading, without authorization, on their websites or other platforms, through the internet in any manner whatsoever, the Plaintiff's Works and content related to TATA IPL 2025, so as to infringe the Plaintiff's exclusive rights;*
- ii. *Pass an order directing Defendant Nos. 6 to 10, its directors, partners, officers, affiliates, and all others in capacity of principal or agent acting for and, on their behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under it, to suspend the domain name registration of the Defendant Nos. 1 – 5, as well as any additional infringing websites discovered during the course of the IPL 2025 matches and notified by the Plaintiff on Affidavit on real time basis. Specific Domain Name Registrars for each website are disclosed under para 44 of the Plaintiff.*
- iii. *Pass an order interim injunction directing the Defendant No. 6-10 to disclose the following information of the Defendant Nos.1 – 5 (and such other websites which are discovered during the course of the proceedings and notified on Affidavit by the Plaintiff to has been infringing the Plaintiff's exclusive rights and broadcast reproduction rights):*
 - a) *Complete details such as name, address, email address, phone number, IP address etc.*



b) *Mode of payment along with payment details used for registration of domain name by the registrant(s).*

iv. *Pass a temporary order directing the Defendant Nos. 11 to 19, their directors, partners, proprietors, officers, affiliates, 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, to block access to the various websites identified by the Plaintiff in the instant suit (at S. No. 1 of the Documents), as well as any additional infringing websites discovered during the course of the IPL 2025 matches and notified by the Plaintiff on Affidavit on real time basis.*

v. *Pass an order directing the Defendant Nos. 20 and 21 to issue a notification calling upon the various internet service providers registered under it to block access to the various websites identified by the Plaintiff in the instant suit (at S. No. 1 of the Documents), as well as any additional infringing websites discovered during the course of the IPL 2025 matches and notified by the Plaintiff on Affidavit on real time basis.”*

21. As per the pleadings, the brief facts are that:-

21.1. The plaintiff, namely Star India Private Limited, is a company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956, having its registered office at Mumbai, as well as a local office at Janpath, New Delhi-110 001, and is a leading entertainment and media company engaged, *inter alia*, in the production of popular content broadcasted on its channels. The plaintiff, along with its affiliates, is also an exclusive right owner for several works broadcasted on its channels, such as, Star Sports 1, Star Sports 2, Star Plus, Star Movies, National Geographic, etc., and many of such channels broadcast sporting events in the fields of Cricket, Football, Formula1, Badminton, amongst others.

21.2. The plaintiff has acquired exclusive television broadcasting rights with respect to the Indian Premier League (**‘IPL’**) matches in India for a period of *five years*, starting from 2023 till 2027, from the event



organizer, i.e., the Board of Control for Cricket in India ('BCCI') *vide* Agreement dated 27.06.2022.

21.3. *Vide* another Agreement, also dated 27.06.2022 between Viacom 18 Media Private Limited and BCCI, exclusive media rights in India and television rights overseas in relation to the said IPL matches were acquired by BCCI, which were then transferred to the plaintiff *vide* a composite arrangement.

21.4. The said composite arrangement was then approved by the National Company Law Tribunal, Mumbai *vide* order dated 30.08.2024 wherein media operations of Viacom 18 Media Private Limited and Digital 18 Media Limited were transferred to the plaintiff, including the right to use the IPL logos and other associated marks.

21.5. The said IPL matches were agreed to be exclusively streamed on the Plaintiff's Over-the-Top ('OTT') platform, i.e., *JioHotstar* and its channels.

21.6. In light of the above, the plaintiff, being a right holder of '*original works*' as envisaged under *Section 37* of the Act of 1957, is entitled to the protection available therein.

21.7. The cause of action first arose on 19.03.2025 when the defendant nos.1 to 5 being "*rogue websites*" unlawfully streamed sporting events in which the plaintiff had exclusive rights without authorization from the plaintiff or the owner of rights of the said sporting events, such as the recently concluded Women's Premier League, 2025.

21.8. To this effect, an affidavit of Mr. Nagesha P., Senior Manager of Monitoring and Enforcement at Copyright Integrity Advisory (India) Private Limited, appointed as Inspector by the plaintiff, has been filed. It



is stated therein that such “*rogue websites*” use the technique of URL-redirectation/ domain-redirectation to avoid detection and circumvent any orders passed directing the blocking of such website domains/ URLs.

21.9. The cause of action is a continuous one as, seeing the precedent of unlawful activity, and also that their very business model appears to be illegally streaming content in which third-parties have exclusive rights, the plaintiff has full conviction that the said “*rogue websites*” will once again indulge in illegal streaming of the upcoming IPL Matches of 2025, i.e., **TATA IPL 2025**, which recently commenced on 22.03.2025, and apprehends that irreparable harm will be caused to the plaintiff if it is not granted an *ex parte ad interim* injunction against the said “*rogue websites*” and their aids at the earliest.

21.10. This Court has jurisdiction to entertain the present application as per *Section 20(c)* of the Act of 1957, as the cause of action for the accompanying plaint has arisen within its territorial jurisdiction, with the infringing actions of the “*rogue websites*” and their facilitators targeting viewers situated within the precincts of this Court, where the said “*rogue websites*” are also available.

21.11. Defendant nos.6 to 10 being Domain Name Registrars (**‘DNRs’**) with respect to the said “*rogue websites*” have provided platform access to them, and are also responsible for withholding and retaining information *qua* their creators, such as name(s), address(es), and the like. The list of such “*rogue websites*” and respective DNRs is as follows:

Defendant No.	Rogue Website	Defendant No.	DNR



1	https://mobicric.org/	6	Hosting Concepts B.V.
2	https://crictime.pk/	7	PKNIC
3	https://crichdplayer.org/	8	TUCOWS, INC.
4	https://bsports.moviesflixter.com	9	CV. Jogjacamp
5	https://cricktv.site	10	Namecheap

21.12. Since the defendant nos.11 to 19 are Internet Service Providers ('ISPs') and, hence are instrumental in the functioning of the said "rogue websites", being responsible for provision of internet services across India, they have been arrayed as such. The said defendant nos.11 to 19 have a responsibility to ensure that no violation of third-party intellectual property rights takes place through their networks.

21.13. It is noteworthy that each of the said DNRs (defendant nos.6 to 10) and ISPs (defendant nos.11 to 19) have been served advance caution notices on behalf of the plaintiff prior to the institution of the present suit, urging them to block access to the said "rogue websites" and to not facilitate illegal streaming of **TATA IPL 2025**.

21.14. The DoT and the MEITY have also been arrayed as defendant nos.20 and 21 respectively, for the purposes of assistance and ensuring compliance with any orders that may be passed by this Court.



21.15. *John Doe* has also been arrayed as defendant no.22 in the form of a generic identity to protect the plaintiff against infringement by any other party which may be discovered at a later stage/ spring up in the spur of the moment even during live telecast of the IPL matches from **TATA IPL 2025**, to infringe their content.

21.16. Interestingly, prior to the institution of the present suit, in as many as *eighteen (18) cases*, real time live blocking relief has been granted by this Court in favour of the same plaintiff, i.e. Star India Private Limited, in similar matters. In fact, recently in a case bearing no. CS (COMM) 136/2025 entitled *Star India Pvt. Ltd. v. webcrichd.com & Ors.* decided on 17.02.2025, this Court has also granted dynamic injunction for the event of “*ICC Champions Trophy 2025*”. Particulars of such cases have been reproduced on *page 6* of the present application, which the learned counsel for the plaintiff has taken this Court through.

22. Placing reliance thereon, learned counsel for the plaintiff, while addressing arguments, stresses on the urgent need to arrive at a real time solution which protects the plaintiff from websites that could, plausibly, *instantaneously* telecast entire sports events and related matches from **TATA IPL 2025**, as and when they take place, thereby impinging upon the rights of the plaintiff with impunity, and under such circumstances, waiting for the respective affidavits to be filed before this Court would lead to a huge time lag, thereby rendering the rights guaranteed to the plaintiff under the Act of 1957 infructuous.

23. To further substantiate the plaintiff’s apprehensions *qua* infringement of its rights, learned counsel for the plaintiff submits that the “*rogue websites*” have an evident disregard for the provisions of the Act



of 1957, which is clearly discernible from the manner in which they stream copyrighted content without any authorization in which third-parties, including the plaintiff herein, are right holders.

24. This Court has heard the submissions of the learned counsel for the plaintiff and perused the judgments and pleadings on record.

25. In effect, the plaintiff is seeking a '*dynamic+*' *injunction*, a form of injunctive relief which is being granted by Court(s) in similar matters in the recent years, primarily with a view to protect parties like the plaintiff herein against rapidly developing online infringement platforms. For instance, the Bombay High Court, in a case bearing no. *I. A. (Lodging) 10257/2023* entitled *Applause Entertainment Private Limited v. Meta Platforms Inc. & Ors.*, which was a case involving audio-visual extracts of certain "*web-series*" being streamed illegally on multiple platforms, granted real time relief in the form of a '*dynamic+*' *injunction* to the plaintiff therein. Similarly, a Coordinate Bench of this Court in *Universal City Studios LLC v. Dotmovies.baby 2023:DHC:5842* has, also while granting such a '*dynamic+*' *injunction*, observed that any injunction granted by this Court ought to be effective in nature.

26. Therefore, the position of law apparent therefrom, which has since developed with the passage of time, clearly reflects that the rights of a plaintiff, who is an intellectual property right holder, cannot be rendered otiose in this world of rapidly developing technology and for that, enforcement of intellectual property rights on any social platform, including but not limited to, the internet as well alongwith the real world, ought to be visible and effective.



27. The upcoming technology and the technological advances association therewith, have their own implication(s) and/ or ramification(s), which are not only reachable far and wide, but are also unpredictable. With the immense degree of freedom enjoyed by developers and innovators globally today, all and sundry, especially those intellectual property right holders like the plaintiff herein, are prone to/ may be exposed and/ or vulnerable to the actions of the “*rogue websites*” herein, more so, if such right holders like the plaintiff herein, are not accorded proper protection from them. On one hand, though such intellectual property right holders like the plaintiff herein, can proceed in the normal manner, however, on the other hand, without any proper channelization, their intellectual property rights are prone to get effected by such “*rogue websites*”, who have no right, title and/ or interest therein. This would lead them and their facilitators to freely and blatantly exploit the rights of the right holders like the plaintiff herein, causing irreparable loss, damage and injury to them as also leaving them struggling on the fence exposed *dangerous edge* of technology.

28. This so-called *dangerous edge* has become *even sharper* with the fast-paced evolution of certain “*hydra-headed*” websites, which, even if blocked/ deleted, have the incredulous potential to resurface in multitudes as alphanumeric or mirror websites, with only minor, mechanical changes within seconds. Such “*hydra-headed*” websites, under the garb of privacy, are able to mask their registration/ contact details perfectly, making it virtually impossible to locate and contact their operators to, if necessary, demand cessation of infringing conduct.



29. In essence, as per the case set up by the plaintiff, the “*rogue websites*” are in flagrant infringement/ facilitation of infringement as is evident from the unabashed streaming and advertising of the copyrighted content on such “*rogue websites*”, of which the plaintiff herein, is the right holder. Moreover, the systematic, organised and intentional nature of the infringement, and the regularity and consistency with which the said content is being updated/ uploaded on the said “*rogue websites*” shows the extent of the violation of the rights of the plaintiff in real time. The said “*rogue websites*” are also employing the URL-redirection and identity masking methods as noted above, putting the plaintiff in an even more precarious condition to defend itself against their infringing actions. Under such circumstances, the defendants’ silence/ inaction to notices demonstrates the “*hydra-headed*” nature of these “*rogue websites*” which, even if blocked, multiply and resurface as alphanumeric or mirror websites within seconds.

30. Thus, in light of the violations that have already been committed by the “*rogue websites*” herein, this Court sees every likelihood that such “*rogue websites*” will continue to stream copyrighted works to the public during the currency of **TATA IPL 2025** without authorization or license from the plaintiff.

31. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, discussions and analyses, this Court is of the view that the plaintiff has been able to make out a *prima facie* case with the *balance of convenience* in its favour for grant of an *ex parte ad interim* injunction, not only *qua* the present but also *qua* the future, without which the plaintiff will likely suffer *irreparable harm*,



loss, injury and prejudice which will not be compensable in terms of money.

32. Furthermore, such a relief is called for in the present matter, especially, in view of the fact that these are *T-20* matches and any delay in blocking these “*rogue websites*” would, in fact, result in irreparable loss and injury to the plaintiff and cause violation of the intellectual property rights of the plaintiff.

33. Accordingly, in view of the aforesaid, as also keeping in mind the existing position of law, as also to keep pace with the changing times coupled with the changing technology, till the next date of hearing:

a. Any person/ entity including, but not limited to, the defendant nos.1 to 5 being “*rogue websites*”, as also their owners, partners, officers, and all others in capacity of principal or agent acting for and on their behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under them, are restrained from communicating, hosting, streaming, and/ or making available for viewing and downloading, any part of the **TATA IPL 2025** matches on any electronic or digital platform in any manner whatsoever without authorization, so as to infringe the plaintiff’s intellectual property rights *qua TATA IPL 2025*;

b. Defendant no. 6 being DNR namely *Hosting Concepts B. V.* is directed to block and suspend the website <https://mobicric.org/> within *72 hours*, after being supplied with a copy of this order by the learned counsel for the plaintiff;

c. Defendant no. 7 being DNR namely *PKNIC* is directed to block and suspend the website <https://crictime.pk/> within *72*



hours, after being supplied with a copy of this order by the learned counsel for the plaintiff;

d. Defendant no. 8 being DNR namely *TUCOWS, INC.* is directed to block and suspend the website <https://crichdplayer.org/> within *72 hours*, after being supplied with a copy of this order by the learned counsel for the plaintiff;

e. Defendant no. 9 being DNR namely *CV. Jogjacamp* is directed to block and suspend the website <https://bsports.moviesflixter.com> within *72 hours*, after being supplied with a copy of this order by the learned counsel for the plaintiff;

f. Defendant no. 10 being DNR namely *Namecheap* is directed to block and suspend the website <https://cricktv.site> within *72 hours*, after being supplied with a copy of this order by the learned counsel for the plaintiff;

g. Defendant nos.6 to 10 being the DNRs are also directed to provide details of the registrants of the “*rogue websites*” such as their names and contact details upon being requested by the learned counsel for the plaintiff;

h. Defendant nos.11 to 19 being the ISPs are also directed to block access to the abovenamed “*rogue websites*” as mentioned in *para 21.11* above, within *72 hours*, after being supplied with a copy of this order by the learned counsel for the plaintiff;

i. ‘*Dynamic+*’ *injunction* is granted in favour of the plaintiff to protect its copyrighted works as soon as they are infringed/ created. Consequently, during the currency of the



TATA IPL 2025 if, any further websites, such as mirror/ redirect/ alphanumeric variations of the “*rogue websites*” are discovered which are illegally streaming and communicating content over which the plaintiff has rights, the plaintiff will be at liberty to communicate the details of these websites to their concerned DNRs, if available, or in the alternative to the defendant nos.11 to 19 being the ISPs for blocking the said websites. As such, upon receiving the said intimation from the plaintiff, the concerned ISP(s) shall take steps to immediately block the said “*rogue websites*” on real time basis;

j. Defendant nos.20 and 21 shall take steps to ensure that defendant nos.11 to 19, being the ISPs, comply with the aforesaid directions, through appropriate communications and notices sent to the said ISPs which are registered with them;

k. However, after communicating the details of the “*rogue websites*” in terms of the above, the plaintiff shall continue to file affidavits with this Court in order to ensure that this Court is informed of the said “*rogue websites*”.

34. Upon filing of process fee, issue notice to the defendants through all permissible modes, including through email, returnable before the learned Joint Registrar on 11.07.2025.

35. Reply be filed within *eight weeks* with advance copy to counsel for plaintiff. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed on or before the next date of hearing.

36. The provisions of *Order XXXIX Rule 3* of the CPC be complied with within *one week*.



37. List before the learned Joint Registrar on 11.07.2025 for completion of service and pleadings.
38. List before this Court on 20.08.2025.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

MARCH 25, 2025

Ab

Code 50000.01

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
(ORDINARY ORIGINAL COMMERCIAL JURISDICTION)
CS (COMM) NO. OF 2025

IN THE MATTER OF: -

Star India Private Limited ...Plaintiff

Versus

<https://crichdplayer.org/> & Ors. ...Defendants

MEMO OF PARTIES

- 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: Ram.Panchal@disney.com

Mobile No. +91 9910200440

...Plaintiff

Versus

- <https://crichdplayer.org/>
Email: abuse@v-sys.org
- <https://crictime.pk/>
Email: support@crictime.pk

3. <https://mobicric.org/>
Email: abuse@24xservice.com
4. <https://bsports.moviesflixter.com>
Email: techrong24@gmail.com
5. <https://cricktv.site>
Email: grievance.officer@cricktv.site
6. Tucows Domains Inc.
96 Mowat Avenue, Toronto,
Ontario, M6K 3M1, Canada
Email: info@tucows.com, compliance@tucows.com
7. Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu
Kipstraat 3c-5c, Rotterdam 3011 RR
Netherlands, +31104482296
Email: support@openprovider.com,
support@openpriver.com
8. Namecheap, Inc.
4600 East Washington Street Suite 300,
Phoenix, Arizona 85034, US
Email: support@namecheap.com,
grievance.officer@namecheap.com
grievanceofficer@namecheap.com
9. PKNIC
PKNIC Collection 435
Tariq Block, Garden Town
Lahore, Pakistan
Email: staff@pknict.net.pk
10. CV. Jogjacamp



Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan No.33,
Pandeyan, Kec. Umbulharjo,
Kota Yogyakarta, Daerah Istimewa
Yogyakarta 55161, Indonesia
Email: info@resellercamp.com

11. 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
12. 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
13. 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
14. Reliance Jio Infocomm Limited
Office -101, Saffron Nr. Centre Point,

Panchwati 5 Rasta,Amba, wadi,
Ahmedabad, Ahmedabad,
Gujarat, India, 380006
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

15. Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd.
5th Floor, Mahanagar Doorsanchar Sadan
9, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi – 110003
Email: raco.mtnl@gmail.com; mtnlcsco@gmail.com;
gmracomtnl@gmail.com
16. 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
Email: info@spectra.co; compliance@spectra.com
17. 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

18. Tata Teleservices Ltd.
A, E & F Blocks Voltas Premises – T.B. Kadam Marg
Chinchpokli, Mumbai – 400033
Email: pravin.jogani@tatatel.co.in; anand.dalal@tatatel.co.in;
satya.yadav@tatatel.co.in
19. 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
20. Department of Telecommunication
Through Secretary,
Ministry of Communications and IT,
20, Sanchar Bhawan, Ashoka Road,
New Delhi – 110001
Email: secy-dot@nic.in, dird2-dot@nic.in
21. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology

Through the Director General (DIT) Cyber Laws & e-security),
Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110003
Email: cyberlaw-legal@meity.gov.in;
gccyberlaw@meity.gov.in; pkumar@meity.gov.in,
sathya.s@meity.gov.in

22. John Doe ...Defendant(s)



Yatinder Garg | Akshay Maloo | Priyansh Kohli
(D/1330/2015) | (D/4515/2018) | (D/2514/2022)

Saikrishna and Associates
Advocates for the Plaintiffs

Place: New Delhi
Date: 20th March 2025

57 Jor Bagh,
New Delhi - 110003
+91 9999064036

yatinder@saikrishnaassociates.com

Note: Defendant No.1 along with Defendant Nos. 2 to 5 are the main
contesting Defendants.



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.