

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/2024-DS-II

Dated:15-04-2025

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

Subject: CS (COMM) 331 of 2025: STAR INDIA PVT LTD versus DEVRAJ & ORS. in the High Court of Delhi.

Kindly find enclosed the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi order dated **09.04.2025** in the captioned suit.

2. Please refer to **para 33 (f)** of the said court order with regard to blocking of access to the rogue **URL [1 no]** mentioned in the **para 33(f)** of the said court order.

3. In view of the above, all Licensees with Internet Service Authorization are hereby instructed to take immediate necessary action with regard to blocking of access to the said URL, as above, in compliance with the said court order.

Encl: A/A

Digitally signed by
SHASHI KUMAR
Date: 15-04-2025
12:16:01
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.) Ms. Ishi Singh (ishi@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.

Domain:-

<https://bostv.one:8443>



\$~41

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

+ **CS(COMM) 331/2025**

STAR INDIA PVT LTD

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder Garg, Ms. Disha Sharma, Ms. Ishi Singh and Ms. Rimjhim Tiwari,
Advs

versus

DEVRAJ & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

09.04.2025

%

I.A. 9307/2025-Exp from pre institution mediation

1. *Vide* the present application 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 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.



I.A. 9308/2025-Exp

4. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

5. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 9309/2025-Exempt the plaintiff from issuing notice to D-5, 8, 14 & 15

6. *Vide* the present application under *Section 80*, read with *Section 151* of the CPC, the plaintiff is seeking exemption from the requirement of advance service upon the defendant nos. 5, 8, 14 and 15, i.e., Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. (**BSNL**), Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd. (**MTNL**), the Department of Telecommunications (**DoT**), and the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (**MEITY**) respectively, on the ground that no formal remedy/ relief as prescribed under the Copyright Act, 1957 (**the Act**), is being claimed against them and since urgent reliefs are also sought against other defendants in other accompanying applications, 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 connected factors involved, it would be in the interest of justice if the plaintiff is granted exemption from effecting advance service upon the aforesaid defendant nos. 5, 8, 14 and 15, i.e., BSNL, MTNL, DoT, and MEITY respectively.

8. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

I.A. 9310/2025-Additional documents

9. *Vide* the present application 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) 331/2025

12. The plaintiff *vide* the present plaint seeks permanent injunction and damages for infringement of copyright under the Act, 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 23.07.2025.

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.

18. List before the learned Joint Registrar for marking exhibits of documents on 23.07.2025. It is made clear that if any party unjustifiably denies any document(s), then such party would be liable to be burdened with costs.

I.A. 9306/2025-Stay

19. *Vide* the present application under *Order XXXIX, Rules 1 and 2* of the CPC the plaintiff is seeking the following reliefs:

“i. Pass an order of ex parte interim injunction restraining the Defendant No.1 (and such other associated URLs/domains which are discovered during the course of the proceedings and notified on Affidavit by the Plaintiff), their owners, partners, proprietors, officers, servants, affiliates, employees, and all others in capacity of principal or agent acting for and on its behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under it, from in any manner communicating to the public, hosting, storing, reproducing, streaming, broadcasting, re-broadcasting, causing to be seen or heard by public on payment of charge and/or making available for viewing the Plaintiff’s Exclusive Content through the Rogue URL/Domain (viz., <https://bostv.one:8443>; bostv.one) or any other rogue domain similar to the Rogue Domain/URL identified hereinabove, amounting to infringement of the Plaintiff’s copyright and broadcast reproduction rights;

ii. Pass an order of interim injunction directing the Defendant No. 2, its directors, 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 the domain name registration of the Defendant No. 1 as identified in Document A 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 broadcast reproduction rights);

iii. Direct the Defendant No. 2 to disclose the following information of the Rogue URL/Domain as identified in Annexure A (and such other Rogue URL/Domain 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, copyrights)-



- i) *Complete details (such as Name, Address, Email address, Phone Number, IP Address etc.) of the Defendant No. 1;*
- ii) *Mode of payment along with payment details used for registration of domain name by the Registrant.*
- iv. *Pass an order of interim injunction Defendant No. 3, 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 / suspend the WhatsApp accounts and Groups associated with the mobile numbers identified at Document B (associated with Defendant Nos. 1) and such other mobile numbers 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 broadcast reproduction rights;*
- v. *Direct the Defendant No. 3 to disclose Basic Subscription Information (BSI) of the WhatsApp Accounts and Groups identified in Document B.*
- vi. *Pass an order of interim injunction directing Defendant Nos. 6 and 12, Telecom Service Providers, 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 suspend the mobile numbers identified at Document C (associated with Defendant No. 1);*
- vii. *Pass an order of interim injunction directing Defendant No. 4 - 12, Internet Service Providers, 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 Rogue Domains/URLs identified at Document A (associated with Defendant No. 1); or such other domains / websites/ UIs that may subsequently be notified on Affidavit by the Plaintiff to be infringing / authorizing infringement of its exclusive rights and broadcast reproduction rights;*
- viii. *Pass an order of interim injunction the Defendant Nos. 14 (DoT) and 15 (MEITY) to issue a notification calling upon the various internet and telecom service providers registered under it to block access to the various websites / Rogue Defendants identified at Document A and C in the instant suit or such other domains / websites/ UIs/ URLs that may subsequently be notified on Affidavit by the Plaintiff to be infringing /*



authorizing infringement of Plaintiff's copyright and broadcast reproduction rights;

viii. Pass an order of interim injunction directing the Defendant No. 13 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 the UPI id identified by the Plaintiff in the instant suit at 'Document D'. Directing the Defendant No. 13 their directors, partners,

ix. 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 disclose the Bank account associated with the UPI Id identified by the Plaintiff in the instant suit at 'Document D' and any other available information."

20. As per pleadings, the plaintiff is a leading entertainment and media company engaged, *inter alia*, in the production and broadcasting of content in the form of television shows, films, web-series, sports, etc. on its channels such as Star Plus, Star Movies, etc., as also Over-the-Top (*OTT*) platforms like *JioHotstar* and its subsidiaries.

21. The plaintiff is a copyright holder as envisaged under *Section 13* of the Act, as the content produced by it falls under the category of '*cinematograph film(s)*' as defined in *Section 2(f)*, and is thus entitled to protection of all exclusive rights as enumerated in *Section 14(d)* of the Act.

22. At the same time, the plaintiff's channels also hold statutory licenses issued by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to transmit licensed content through television and/ or through the internet, and hence, by virtue of *Section 37* of the Act, the plaintiff is also entitled to exclusive broadcasting/ re-broadcasting and transmission rights *qua* the STAR channels and the content broadcasted therein.



23. One such example of exclusive broadcasting rights held by the plaintiff is in respect of the ongoing TATA Indian Premier League Matches of 2025 (*TATA IPL 2025*), wherein the plaintiff, after executing requisite agreements with the Board of Cricket Control India, acquired exclusive broadcasting and media rights.

24. The defendant no.1 herein is an Internet Protocol Television (*IPTV*) service provider, who is utilizing Application Programming Interface Uniform Resource Locators (*API URLs*) and login credentials thereto to provide access to unauthorized/ unlicensed third-party content through the *rogue URL*, thus enabling users to stream live television, movies, shows, sporting events, using their mobile internet or broadband connections.

25. The defendant no.1 is further using communication channels like whatsapp group chats for promoting and providing login credentials for the *rogue URL* to be used on certain '*IPTV Stream Player*' applications, while also charging a '*subscription fee*' from the users. One such whatsapp group titled '*BOSTV*' with *617 members* has been discovered by the plaintiff as being operated by the defendant no.1, where messages are sent claiming to provide access to *8500+ live channels*, *29000+ movies*, *3000+ series*, etc., along with barcodes for payment, as well as the login credentials to the *rogue URL* are changed frequently to circumvent the process of law.

26. The defendant no.2 is the Domain Name Registrar arrayed for blocking of the *rogue URL* and for disclosure of details of registrants; defendant no.3 is WhatsApp LLC arrayed for blocking/ suspension of accounts associated with the impugned whatsapp group and for disclosure of basic subscription information *qua* the same; defendant nos.4 to 15 are



Internet Service Providers (*ISPs*) and Telecom Service Providers (*TSPs*) arrayed for blocking/ suspension of the *rogue URL*; defendant no.13 is the National Payment Corporation of India arrayed for disclosure of details pertaining to financial transactions *qua* the ‘*subscription fee*’ as also for blocking of related Unified Payments Interface (*UPI*) accounts; defendant nos.14 and 15 are DoT and MEITY arrayed for compliance; and lastly defendant no.16 is the Ashok Kumar defendant, arrayed to protect the plaintiff against the infringing actions of any *rogue URLs* that may be discovered during the course of the present proceedings.

27. The cause of action arose in the month of March 2025 when the plaintiff learnt about the impugned whatsapp group which is being used to provide login credentials *qua* the *rogue URL* to infringe upon the plaintiff’s content, and as the same are being used till date, it is a recurring cause of action. Interestingly, as per the plaint, the very same plaintiff had earlier instituted CS(COMM) 108/2025, which is pending adjudication before this Court and wherein despite the directions issued by this Court, the plaintiff has been subjected to a new form of piracy using API URLs and login credentials disseminated to huge groups of people through whatsapp. Hence, the plaintiff has approached this Court by way of this fresh suit, especially in light of the ongoing TATA IPL 2025.

28. The infringing actions are wide and unrestricted and the *rogue URL* is accessible by users in Delhi.

29. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the plaintiff as also perused the record.

30. The present case, *prima facie*, appears to be a classic case of copyright infringement by masked players like the defendant no.1., who



use the veil of today's technology to conveniently conceal their true identities and unabashedly abuse and enrich themselves by using the protected works of parties like the plaintiff herein through *URL redirection/ masking*, etc. Such entities are sprouting and have to be stopped at the earliest given opportunity. If the same is not done, undoubtedly the legitimate rights of parties like the plaintiff herein would be put in serious jeopardy.

31. In light of above, under the present scenario, especially, since the plaintiff is the legally rightful owner of the intellectual property rights therein, i.e. both *qua* its original works as well as the licensed works for exclusive broadcasting, the plaintiff is well and truly entitled to seek and obtain protection. More so, since the infringing acts of the defendant no.1 are without obtaining any kind of permission/ authorization/ right/ title/ interest from the plaintiff.

32. In terms of above, the plaintiff has been able to make out a *prima facie* case in its favour and against the defendants and the *balance of convenience* is also tilting heavily towards the grant of relief in favour of the plaintiff. If an *ex parte ad interim* injunction in favour of the plaintiff is not granted, the plaintiff will likely suffer *irreparable loss and injury*. Therefore, the *rogue URL* and other such API URLs as may be discovered during the course of the proceedings cannot be allowed to continue to infringe upon the intellectual property rights of the plaintiff.

33. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing:

- a. Any person/ entity including, but not limited to, the defendant no.1 and its owners, partners, proprietors, officers, servants, affiliates, employees, and all others acting for and on



its behalf, are restrained from communicating to the public, hosting, storing, reproducing, streaming, broadcasting, re-broadcasting, causing to be seen or heard by the public on payment of charge and/ or making available for viewing the plaintiff's exclusive content protected under the Act through the *rogue URL* <https://bostv.one:8443/bostv.one> or any other similar URL in any manner whatsoever to infringe the intellectual property rights of the plaintiff;

b. Defendant no.2 is directed to block the *rogue URL* <https://bostv.one:8443/bostv.one> and to disclose the name and address of the registrant of the same within 72 hours of the plaintiff furnishing to it a copy of this order;

c. Defendant no.3 is directed to suspend the whatsapp accounts of the phone numbers [+91-8401950606](tel:+91-8401950606) and [+91-9316804896](tel:+91-9316804896), as also to provide the basic subscription information thereto within 72 hours of the plaintiff furnishing to it a copy of this order;

d. Defendant nos.4 to 12 are directed to block access to the *rogue URL* <https://bostv.one:8443/bostv.one> within 72 hours of the plaintiff furnishing to them a copy of this order.

e. Defendant no.13 is directed to provide in a sealed cover, the name and address of the person/ entity using the said UPI accounts associated with the phone numbers [+91-8401950606](tel:+91-8401950606) and [+91-9316804896](tel:+91-9316804896), *qua* the 'subscription charge' transactions as delineated above within 72 hours of the plaintiff furnishing to it a copy of this order;



f. Defendant nos.14 and 15 are directed to issue a notification calling upon the various ISPs and TSPs registered under them to block access to the *rogue URL* <https://bostv.one:8443/bostv.one> within 72 hours of the plaintiff furnishing to them a copy of this order.

g. It is further directed that in case any *rogue URL(s)* are discovered by the plaintiff which are illegally streaming and communicating content over which the plaintiff has exclusive rights, the plaintiff will be at liberty to communicate the details of such website(s) to their concerned Domain Name Registrar(s), if available, or in the alternative to the concerned ISP(s) and/ or TSP(s), for blocking the said website(s). As such, upon receiving the said intimation from the plaintiff, the concerned ISP(s) and/ or TSP(s) shall take steps to immediately block the said *rogue URL(s)* on real time basis, and defendant nos.14 and 15 shall ensure the ISP(s) and/ or TSP(s) registered under them comply with the same within 72 hours of receiving such intimation from the plaintiff;

h. However, after communicating the details of the *rogue URL(s)* in terms of the above, the plaintiff shall continue to file affidavit(s) with this Court in order to ensure that this Court is informed of the said *rogue URL(s)*.

34. Upon the plaintiff taking requisite steps, issue notice to the defendants through all permissible modes, including through *email*, returnable on 26.08.2025.



35. Reply(s) be filed within four weeks with advance copy to counsel for plaintiff. Rejoinder(s) thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks thereafter.

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

37. List before this Court on 26.08.2025.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

APRIL 9, 2025/Ab

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

CS (COMM) NO. ____ OF 2025

MEMO OF PARTIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

Star India Pvt. Ltd.

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 Number: +91 9315762402

...Plaintiff

Versus

1. Devraj
Bos IPTV Services
Associated domains/URLs/UIs:
<https://bostv.one:8443>; bostv.one
+91 8401950606; +91 9316804896;
Email: rh340298@gmail.com

2. Dynadot LLC



210 S Ellsworth Ave, #345 San Mateo,
CA, 94401 US

Email: nixi.grievance.officer@dynadot.com;
info@dynadot.com

3. Whatsapp LLC,
1 Meta Way, Menlo Park,
California 94025, USA
Email: grievance_officer_wa@support.whatsapp.com

Also At:

Whatsapp LLC,
Unit B8 and B10,
The Executive City Center,
Level 18, DLF Cyber City, Building No. 5,
Tower A, Phase – 3, Gurugram – 122002

4. 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



5. 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
6. Bharti Airtel Ltd.
Airtel Center Plot No. 16,
Udyog Vihar, Phase-IV, Gurugram – 122015, India
E-mail: amit.bhatia@airtel.com
7. 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
8. Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd.
5th Floor, Mahanagar Doorsanchar Sadan
9, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi – 110003
E-mail: raco.mtnl@gmail.com, mtnlcscsco@gmail.com,
gmracomtnl@gmail.com
9. 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

10. Tata Teleservices Ltd.

A, E & F Blocks Voltas Premises - T. B. Kadam Marg

Chinchpokli, Mumbai – 400033

E-mail: pravin.jogani@tatatel.co.in, anand.dalal@tatatel.co.in,
satya.yadav@tatatel.co.in

11. 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

Florencia.deproses@vodafoneidea.com

Sanjeet.sarkar@vodafoneidea.com

Arun.madhav@vodafoneidea.com

12. 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;

jjyoti.jain@ril.com; rudraksha.sinha@ril.com;

neelakantan.an@ril.com

13. National Payment Corporation of India

Level 8, The Executive Centre,

DLF Centre, Sansad Marg,

Connaught Place, New Delhi - 110001

Email - upihelp@npci.org.in

14. 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



15. 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

16. Ashok Kumar(s)

...Defendants



Yatinder Garg | Disha Sharma | Rimjhim Tiwari | Ishi Singh
(D/1330/2015)|(D/130/2017)| (D/4021/2022)|(D/1977/2024)

Saikrishna & Associates

Counsels for the Plaintiff

57, Jor Bagh, New Delhi- 110003

+91 9999064036

rimjhim@saikrishnaassociates.com

Place: New Delhi

Date: 07.04.2025

NOTE: Defendant No. 1 is the main contesting party. Defendant Nos. 2 to 15 are *pro forma* Defendants, and no formal relief is sought against them. Defendant No. 16 is Ashok Kumar(s).



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.