

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-02/2025-DS-II

Dated:26-03-2025

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

Subject: C.S. (COMM.) NO. 254 of 2025; Sporta Technologies Pvt. Ltd. And Anr. V. Naveen Singh Dhami Alias Galpa Herry And Ors Before Hon'ble Delhi High Court.

Kindly find enclosed the Hon'ble Delhi High Court order dated**21.03.2025** on the subject matter.

2. Please refer to the **para 36(iii)** of the said court order in respect of blocking of **websites [4 nos]** enumerated in the said para.
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 website, as above, for compliance of the said court order.

Encl: A/A

Digitally signed by
SHASHI KUMAR
Date: 26-03-2025
17:28:00
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. Mr. Ritwik Marwaha<Ritwik@fiduslawchambers.com> Plaintiff's Advocate 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.



\$~36

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

+ **CS(COMM) 254/2025**

**SPORTA TECHNOLOGIES
PVT. LTD. AND ANR**

.....Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rohan Krishna Seth and Mr.
Ritwik Marwaha, Advocates.

versus

**NAVEEN SINGH DHAMI ALIAS
GALPA HERRY AND ORS**

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Gaurav Barathi, SPC with Mr.
Krishna Chaitanya, G.P. for D-3 & 4.

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

ORDER
21.03.2025

%

I.A. 7403/2025 (Exemption from filing original and clear copies of documents)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. Plaintiffs are exempted from filing original documents at this stage.
3. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 7401/2025 (u/s 12A of Commercial Courts Act)

4. 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.

CS(COMM) 254/2025

Page 1 of 11



5. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 7402/2025 (O-XI R-1(4) of the Commercial Courts Act)

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

7. The plaintiffs are 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.

CS(COMM) 254/2025

9. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

10. Issue summons.

11. Mr. Gaurav Barathi, advocate accepts summons on behalf of the defendant no. 3 and 4 and waives issuance of formal summons.

12. None appears on behalf of the defendants no.1 and 2 despite advance service.

13. Upon filing of the process fee, issue summons to the defendants no.1 and 2 through all permissible modes, including e-mail.

14. Summons shall state that the written statement(s) be filed by the defendants within thirty days from the date of receipt of summons. Along with the written statement(s), the defendants shall also file affidavit of admission/denial of the plaintiffs' documents, without which, the written statement shall not be taken on record.

15. Liberty is given to the plaintiffs to file replication(s) within thirty days from the date of receipt of the written statement(s). Further, along with the replication(s), if any, filed by the plaintiffs, an affidavit of admission/denial of documents of the defendants, be filed by the plaintiffs, without which, the



replication(s) shall not be taken on record.

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 the documents, the same shall be sought and given within the timelines.

18. List before the Joint Registrar for marking of exhibits on 20th May, 2025.

19. List before the Court 3rd September, 2025.

I.A. 7400/2025 (O-XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 of CPC)

20. The present suit has been filed seeking permanent injunction restraining infringement of the plaintiffs' registered trademarks, passing off, rendition of accounts, fraud, dilution of trademark, damages, and delivery up.

21. It is stated in the plaint that the present action concerns the plaintiffs' trademark rights in the well-known and widely recognized trademarks DREAM11,



and infringement and passing off the same by the defendant no.1.

22. It is averred in the plaint that plaintiff no.1 was incorporated with a view to serve as a one-stop provider of a number of online fantasy sports leagues. A fantasy sports league is an online multi-player game where



participants draft virtual teams of real players of a professional sport. These virtually drafted teams get points based on the performance of the players in actual games. Each player playing on the fantasy sports platform has to create a team with a maximum budget of 100 credits. The team then earns points based on real-life matches and then the team competes with other such teams in the various contests offered by the plaintiffs on the platform. For each real-life match, there are multiple contests which a fantasy player can join, and each contest has an entry fee. The top teams of each contest are then rewarded monetarily. The amount earned is credited to the fantasy player's bank account upon his/her withdrawal request.

23. It is stated in the plaint that plaintiffs launched its highly popular fantasy sports platform under the trademark DREAM11 in 2012. Thereafter, and until the present date, the plaintiffs have been the official fantasy sports partner of the International Council of Cricket (ICC), the Campeonato Nacional de Liga de Primera Division (La Liga), Vivo Indian Premier League (IPL), KFC Big Bash League (BBL), Hero Caribbean Premier League (CPL) T20, National Basketball Association (NBA), Vivo Pro Kabaddi League (PKL), International Hockey Federation (FIH), Hero Indian Super League (ISL) and T20 Mumbai. The plaintiffs had acquired official partner rights from the Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI) for international and domestic matches in 2019.





24. It is averred in the plaint that the plaintiff no.1 is the registered proprietor of the following trademarks in India:-



S. No.	Trademark	Number	Classes	Date
1.		3802186	9, 16, 35, 41, 42	11 th April 2018
2.		3660715	9, 16, 35, 41, 42	21 st October 2017
3.		3660717	9, 16, 35, 41, 42	21 st October 2017
4.		3660851	9, 16, 35, 41, 42	22 nd October 2017
5.		3660718	9, 16, 35, 41, 42	21 st October 2017
6.		3660720	9, 16, 35, 41, 42	21 st October 2017
7.		3802184	9, 16, 35, 41, 42	11 th April 2018
8.		3802185	9, 16, 35, 41, 42	11 th April 2018

25. It is also averred in the plaint that the plaintiff no.2 is the registered proprietor of the following trademarks in India:-



S. No.	Trademark	Number	Class	Date
1.	DREAM11	4863621	9, 16, 18, 28, 35, 38, 42 & 45	25 th September 2019
2.	 	1823011	38	28 th May 2009
3.	 	1823015	41	28 th May 2009

26. All the aforesaid trademarks registrations granted in favour of the plaintiffs, are valid and subsisting.

27. It is further submitted that in connection with its business, the plaintiffs also own and operate the mobile application 'DREAM11', which is available for download on the Google Play Store, the Apple App Store and also through the plaintiffs' official website 'www.dream11.com'. The plaintiffs' DREAM11 mobile application has more than 10 Crore downloads on Google Play Store and has more than 21.1 lakh reviews. While the Apple App Store does not provide the download statistics, it does mention that the plaintiffs' DREAM11 mobile application currently ranks at No. 4 in the 'Sports' section on the Apple App Store and has more than 1.42 lakh reviews. Extracts of the plaintiffs' Google Play Store and Apple App Store listings, as given in the plaint, are reproduced as under:-



28. The case set up in the plaint is that in the month of January 2025, the plaintiffs came across the impugned websites ‘www.dream11shop.online’, ‘www.dream11.digital’, ‘www.dream11.agency’, and ‘www.dream11shop.com’, which are all identical in their ‘user interface’ and ‘look and feel’, where the defendant no.1 is using marks such as ‘DREAM





29. It is also stated in the plaint that on the abovementioned Infringing Websites, the defendant no.1 is providing tips on how to create a fantasy team for the matches and claims to predict the best outcomes on the Plaintiffs' DREAM11 platforms. Additionally, the defendant no.1 is also running sponsored/promotional posts on the infringing websites, through which the defendant no.1 is generating revenue, at the expense of adopting and using the infringing marks. The defendant no.1 claims to be running a "Professional Shop Platform" on its infringing websites.

30. It is averred that as per the 'About Us' section on the aforesaid infringing Websites, the said websites are all operated/run by the defendant no.1, Naveen Singh Dhani, under the alias 'Galpa Herry'. Extracts from all of the infringing websites have been filed as documents no.10 to 15 of the documents filed along with the plaint.

31. It is the case of the plaintiffs that defendant no.1 has no justifiable explanation for the blatant misuse of the plaintiffs' trade names and




trademarks, including 'DREAM 11', 'DREAM 11' and other related marks. By falsely claiming to provide accurate predictions and tips, the defendant no.1 is not only committing fraud, but also seeking to gain undue and illegal monetary benefits, resulting in unjust enrichment at the expense of the plaintiffs. The misuse of the plaintiffs' trademarks, constitutes a clear case of trademark infringement and passing off. This unauthorized use of the plaintiffs' trademarks misleads the public into believing that defendant no.1's services are associated with or endorsed by the plaintiffs, which is patently false. Such actions by defendant no.1 jeopardizes the plaintiffs'



brand, eroding the trust and goodwill that the plaintiffs have built over time. The defendant no.1's conduct undermines the plaintiffs' legitimate business operations and tarnishes their reputation in the market.

32. A comparative analysis of the plaintiffs' marks along with the defendants' marks is as under:

PLAINTIFFS' TRADEMARKS	DEFENDANT NO. 1'S TRADEMARKS
DREAM11	DREAM11SHOP DREAM11SHOP.ONLINE DREAM11.AGENCY DREAM11.DIGITAL
	

33. A perusal of the comparison above leaves no doubt in my mind that the defendant no.1 has slavishly copied the 'DREAM 11' trademarks of the plaintiffs in order to deceive the public.

34. In view of the above, I am of the view that a *prima facie* case of infringement of trademarks as well as passing off is made out against the defendant no.1.



35. Balance of convenience is in favour of the plaintiffs and against the defendant no.1. Irreparable injury would be caused not only to the plaintiffs but also to the public if an *ex parte ad-interim* injunction as prayed is not granted in favour of the plaintiff.

36. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing, it is directed as follows:-

i. The defendant no.1, its employees, partners, servants, agents, representatives and all other persons/entities in active concert or participation with them from or participation with them are restrained from using the marks 'DREAM 11',

,  **Dream11 Shop** ,  **Dream11 Online** ,  **Dream11 Agency**

,  **Dream11 Digital** ,  , or any other deceptively similar variant of the plaintiffs' 'DREAM 11' trademarks as/or part of their domain names, websites, promotional and/or business activities on digital or print media, or in any other manner.

ii. the defendant no.2/GoDaddy.com, LLC to suspend and lock the domains 'dream11shop.online', 'dream11.digital', 'dream11.agency', and 'dream11shop.com', and to disclose the complete and correct details of the registrant/s of the said domains, as available with them.

iii. The defendants no.3 and 4, the Department of Telecommunications and the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology respectively, are directed to issue a notification to telecom and internet service providers to disable/suspend access in India to the defendant no.1's websites 'www.dream11shop.online',



‘www.dream11.digital’, ‘www.dream11.agency’, and
‘www.dream11shop.com’.

37. Issue notice.
38. Notice is accepted by Mr. Gaurav Barathi, counsel appearing for defendants no.3 and 4.
39. None appears on behalf of the defendants no.1 and 2 despite advance service.
40. Upon filing of process fees, notice be issued to the defendants no.1 and 2 through all permissible modes, including e-mail.
41. Replies be filed within four weeks.
42. Rejoinders thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks, thereafter.
43. Compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC to be done within a period of one week from today.
44. List before the Joint Registrar for marking of exhibits on 20th May, 2025.
45. List before the Court on 3rd September, 2025.

AMIT BANSAL, J

MARCH 21, 2025

kd

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

SPORTA TECHNOLOGIES PVT. LTD. AND ANR.
... PLAINTIFFS

VERSUS

NAVEEN SINGH DHAMI *ALIAS* GALPA HERRY AND ORS.
... DEFENDANTS

MEMO OF PARTIES

Sporta Technologies Pvt. Ltd.
Unit No. 1201-1202,
12th Floor, Wing A, One BKC, G Block,
Plot No. 66, Bandra
Kurla Complex, Bandra-E
Mumbai, Maharashtra 400051
Email: litigation@fiduslawchambers.com ... Plaintiff No. 1

Dream Sports Inc.
formerly known as Dream11 Inc.
960 Holmdel Road, Bldg. 2,
Holmdel, NJ-0773
USA
Email: litigation@fiduslawchambers.com ... Plaintiff No. 2

VERSUS

Naveen Singh Dhami *alias* Galpa Herry
[Owner/ Operator of the websites –
www.dream11shop.online; www.dream11.digital;
www.dream11.agency; www.dream11shop.com;
Email: galpaherry@gmail.com ... Defendant No. 1

GoDaddy.com, LLC
Grievance Officer - Karen Gaydos
2155 E GoDaddy Way
Tempe, AZ 85284
USA

Also at,

GoDaddy India Web Services Private Limited
 First Floor, 01A1067, WeWork Bristol Chowk,
 Platina Tower, MG Road,
 Sector-28, Gurugram,
 Haryana – 122002

Through its Grievance officer

Email: grievanceofficer@godaddy.com

... Defendant No. 2

Department of Telecommunications
 Through its secretary,
 Ministry of Communications and IT,
 20, Sanchar Bhawan, Ashoka Road,
 New Delhi-110001,

Email: secy-dot@nic.in;

dirds2-dot@nic.in;

abhinesh.meena@gov.in;

uoidhc@gmail.com

... Defendant No. 3

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

Email: cyberlaw@meity.gov.in

gccyberlaws@meity.gov.in;

pkumar@meity.gov.in;

sathya.s@meity.gov.in;

uoidhc@gmail.com

... Defendant No. 4

Filed by:



Prithvi Singh | Rohan Seth | Ritwik Marwaha
 [D/2066/2011] | [D/2172/2017] | [D/7877/2024]

Fidus Law Chambers

Advocates for the Plaintiffs

F – 12, Sector – 8, Noida – 201301

Mob. No.: +91 – 9911167179

litigation@fiduslawchambers.com

Place: New Delhi

Date: 13 March 2025

Note: - Defendant No. 1 is the main Contesting Defendant.

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.