

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. 813-7/25/2024-DS-II

Dated: 30-04-2025

To,
All Licensees with Internet Service Authorization

Subject: CS(COMM) 108 of 2025: STAR INDIA PVT. LTD. versus IPTV SMARTER PRO & ORS. in the High Court of Delhi.

Please find enclosed the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi orders dated **24.04.2025** and **10.02.2025** in the captioned suit.

2. Please refer to court order dated **24.04.2025** and **para 40 (IV & V)** of the court order dated **10.02.2025** in respect of **blocking of domains/websites [3 nos]** in respect of additional Defendant nos. 35 and 37 to 38 in the captioned suit.

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, in compliance with the said court order.

Encl: A/A

Digitally signed by

SHASHI KUMAR

Date: 30-04-2025

19:27:05

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 enclosed Annexure pl.
- ii.) Ms. Ishi Singh (ishi@saikrishnaassociates.com), Plaintiff's Counsel for kind information and requested to take action as per the enclosed Annexure pl.



\$~21

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

+ **CS(COMM) 108/2025**

STAR INDIA PVT LTD

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Yatinder Garg, Ms.
Disha Sharma, Ms. Rimjhim
Tiwari & Ms. Ishi Singh,
Advs.

versus

IPTV SMARTER PRO & ORS.

.....Defendant

Through: Mr. Mrinal Ojha, Mr.
Debarshi Dutta, Mr. Yogesh
Singh & Mr. Nikhil Gupta,
Advs. for D-7.

CORAM:

**SIDHARTH MATHUR (DHJS), JOINT REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)**

ORDER

24.04.2025

%

In view of the impleadment of the defendant no. 35, 37 & 38 allowed today, issue summons to these defendants through all permissible modes, subject to the filing of PF, returnable for the date already fixed i.e. **01.07.2025**.

IA No. 10319/2025 (By plaintiff u/o 1 Rule 10 CPC seeking impleadment of domains engaged in infringing activities as defendants (rogue domains/URLs/UIs) & extension of ad-interim order dated 10.02.2025)

The plaintiff is seeking to implead additional mirrors/re-directs/alphanumeric variations/ URLs as the defendant nos. 37 (URL i.e. arg100.xyz) & 38 (URL i.e. jfltex.ru) since they are illegally distributing the copyrighted content of the plaintiff. The

This is a digitally signed order.

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

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 29/04/2025 at 15:28:59



relevant details of these infringer are mentioned in para no. 5 of the application. Keeping in view, the contents of this application so read in the light of the prayers made in the suit, the same is allowed.

It is worthwhile to note that the additional mirrors/re-directs/alphanumeric variations/URLs impleaded as the defendant nos. 37 (*URL: atg100.xyz*) & 38 (*URL: filex.tv*) shall be subject to the interim orders already passed in the suit.

IA No. 9784/2025 (By plaintiff u/o 1 Rule 10 CPC seeking impleadment of impugned application & its associated domains engaged in infringing activities as defendants (associated rogue domains/URLs/UIs) & extension of ad-interim order dated 10.02.2025)

The application was first listed on 17.04.2025 when this court was on leave. The counsel for the plaintiff thus requests that the same be taken up today as its next date of 21.05.2025 was cancelled, vide order dated 22.04.2025. The counsel for the plaintiff explains the urgency that the infringed content of the ongoing IPL is being broadcasted on the impugned URL (*etrontv.xyz*) i.e. defendant no. 35. Accordingly this application is taken up today, alongwith the aforesaid IA No. 10319/2025 which was already listed for today.

In this application, the plaintiff is seeking to implead additional mirror/re-direct/alphanumeric variation (*i.e. URL: etrontv.xyz*) as the defendant no. 35 since it is illegally distributing the copyrighted content of the plaintiff. The relevant details of this infringer (*i.e. URL: etrontv.xyz*) are mentioned in para no. 5 of the application. Keeping in view, the contents of this application so read in the light of the prayers made in the suit, the same is allowed.

This is a digitally signed order.

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

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 29/04/2025 at 15:28:59

It is worthwhile to note that the additional mirrors/re-directs/alphanumeric variations impleaded as the



defendant nos. 35 (*i.e.* URL: e-senty.xyz) shall be subject to the interim orders already passed in the suit.

**SIDHARTH MATHUR (DHJS)
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)**

APRIL 24, 2025/jr

Click here to check corrigendum, if any

This is a digitally signed order.

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

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 29/04/2025 at 15:28:59

Domain / URL/ UI [i/o Defendant nos 35 and 37 to 38 in CS Comm no. 108 of 2025]

etrontv.xyz

atg100.xyz

filex.tv



\$~29

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

+ CS(COMM) 108/2025 & I.A. Nos. 3363/2025, 3364/2025,
3365/2025, 3366/2025 & 3367/2025

STAR INDIA PVT. LTD.

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Siddharth Chopra with
Mr. Yatinder Garg, Ms. Disha
Sharma, Ms. Rimjhim Tiwari and
Ms. Ishi Singh, Advocates.
(M): 9999064036
Email: yatinder@saikrishnaassociates.com

versus

IPTV SMARTER PRO & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Avish Sharma with
Mr. Subhashish Kumar, Mr. Himesh
Dwivedi and Ms. Ishika Jain,
Advocates for defendant no. 1.
(M): 8603705017
Email: subhashish.adv@gmail.com
Mr. Mrinal Ojha with Mr. Debarshi
Dutta, Mr. Arjun Mookerjee and
Ms. Nikita Rathi, Advocates for
defendant no. 7.
(M): 9674388460
Email: arjun.mookerjee@solarislegal.in

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

10.02.2025

I.A. 3365/2025 (Exemption from filing original and certified copies of documents)

1. The present is an application under Section 151 of the Code of Civil



Procedure, 1908 (“CPC”), on behalf of the plaintiff, seeking exemption from filing original documents/certified copies of documents/clearer copies of documents/documents with appropriate margins/translated copies and seeking permission to file dim documents.

2. Exemption is granted, subject to all just exceptions.
3. Plaintiff shall file legible, clear, and translated copies of the documents, on which the plaintiff may seek to place reliance, before the next date of hearing.
4. Accordingly, the present application is disposed of.

I.A. 3364/2025 (Exemption from undergoing Pre-Institution Mediation)

5. The present is an application under Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015, read with Section 151 of CPC, seeking exemption from undergoing Pre-Institution Mediation.
6. Issue notice to the defendants.
7. Notice is accepted by learned counsels appearing for defendant nos. 1 and 7.
8. Let notice be issued to other defendants.

I.A. 3367/2025 (Application seeking leave to file additional documents)

9. This is an application under Order XI Rule 1(4) read with Section 151 CPC, as amended by the Commercial Courts Act, 2015, seeking leave to file additional documents.
10. The plaintiff, if it wishes to file additional documents at a later stage, shall do so strictly as per the provisions of Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.
11. The application is disposed of, with the aforesaid directions.

I.A. 3366/2025 (Exemption from advance service to the defendant nos.



10, 13, 17 and 18)

12. The present is an application under Section 80(2), read with Section 151 CPC, seeking exemption from advance notice to the defendant nos. 10 (BSNL), 13 (MTNL), 17 [Department of Telecommunication (DoT)] and 18 [Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MEITY)].

13. Considering the submissions made before this Court and considering the urgent nature of the suit, exemption is allowed.

14. With the aforesaid directions, the present application is disposed of.

CS(COMM) 108/2025

15. Let the plaint be registered as suit.

16. Issue summons.

17. Summons is accepted by learned counsels appearing for defendant nos. 1 and 7. Let written statement be filed within thirty days from today by the said defendants.

18. Upon filing of the Process Fee, issue summons to the other defendants by all permissible modes.

19. Let the written statement be filed by the other defendants within thirty days from the date of receipt of summons. Along with the written statement, the defendants shall also file affidavit of admission/denial of the plaintiff's documents, without which, the written statement shall not be taken on record.

20. Liberty is given to the plaintiff to file replication within thirty days from the date of receipt of the written statement. Further, along with the replication, if any, filed by the plaintiff, an affidavit of admission/denial of documents of the defendants, be filed by the plaintiff, without which, the replication shall not be taken on record. If any of the parties wish to seek



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

21. List before the Joint Registrar (Judicial) for marking of exhibits, on 14th April, 2025.

22. List before the Court on 14th July, 2025.

I.A. 3363/2025 (Application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC)

23. The present suit has been filed for permanent injunction restraining the defendant nos. 1 to 4 alleging that they are engaged in the infringement of plaintiff's copyrights and broadcast reproduction rights, rendition of accounts, damages, etc.

24. Learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff submits that the plaintiff is a leading entertainment and media company in India, engaged, *inter alia*, in the production of popular content broadcast on its STAR channels. The plaintiff is also an exclusive right owner for several work broadcasted on its STAR channels. Plaintiff, along with its affiliates, is the owner of an extensive portfolio of more than 100 channels in over ten languages – including channels like Star Movies, Colors Infinity, Sports18, Star Bharat, Star Gold, Jalsha Movies, Star Sports 1, Star Sports HD 1, Star Sports Select 1, Star Sports Select HD 1, Maa Movies, Star Plus, Colors, Colors Rishtey, VH1, MTV, Disney Channel, National Geographic.

25. It is submitted that plaintiff also owns and operates the online audio-visual streaming platform and website, www.hotstar.com, www.Jiocinema.com and the mobile application, 'Disney+Hotstar', formerly known as 'Hotstar' and JioCinema.

26. It is further submitted that the STAR Channels also broadcast various sporting events in the field of cricket, football, F1, badminton, tennis,



hockey etc. Thus, by virtue of quality of content and the time, effort and resources expended by plaintiff, to advertise and promote the channels, the channels of the plaintiff are extremely popular amongst the viewing audiences. The STAR Channels have acquired tremendous goodwill and reputation in the entertainment industry amongst the people.

27. It is submitted that plaintiff's OTTs i.e., Disney+ Hotstar and JioCinema enable viewers to watch television serials and programs, films, sports content including live sports content, trailers of upcoming films and television serials, international content, including, viewing schedules of content offered etc.

28. Learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff submits that the rogue Apps, by hosting the original content and making available the streaming of plaintiff's STAR Channels without authorization, are causing irreparable harm and grave monetary loss to the plaintiff by diverting viewers away from its platforms, Disney+Hotstar and JioCinema, thereby, undermining the value of plaintiff's intellectual property, depriving plaintiff of rightful revenue streams, and enabling piracy and copyright infringement on a large scale, thereby damaging the plaintiff's business.

29. It is submitted that defendant no. 1's rogue App showcases content under four categories, viz. Indian Sports, Disney+Hotstar, JioCinema Cricket, Big Boss Series, and Indian Entertainment. The defendant no. 1's App can be accessed through Android devices as well as iOS devices, wherein, various channels of plaintiff's works and logo are being made available for public viewing

30. It is submitted that as per information on the 'About Us' page of defendant no.1's rogue App, it claims to be a software development



company specializing in ‘Custom OTT’.

31. It is submitted that the plaintiff also issued a Cease and Desist notice to defendant no. 1 on 08th October, 2024, however, no response has been received on its behalf and the rogue App continues to make available infringing content.

32. It is submitted that defendant nos. 2 and 3, have structured their platforms in a manner that closely mirrors the operational framework of defendant no. 1. The application of defendant no. 3 offers subscription packages under two distinct categories, which is available on a yearly subscription basis. These packages provide users with illegal access to a wide range of plaintiff’s work/content, including, but not limited to live sports events, movies, series, and other forms of entertainment.

33. Learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff has drawn the attention of this Court to the various documents to show that the content, over which the plaintiff has copyright, is being streamed by the defendant nos. 1 to 4.

34. Issue notice.

35. Notice is accepted by learned counsels appearing for defendant nos. 1 and 7.

36. Learned counsel appearing for defendant no. 1 submits that defendant no. 1 is only a video player and does not indulge in any infringing activity.

37. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff submits that though the defendant no. 1, including, defendant nos. 2, 3 and 4, may be a video player, however, the content being streamed on their video player, infringes the copyright of the plaintiff. Thus, learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff submits that as of today, the plaintiff is praying for directions to defendant nos. 5 and 6 to block the websites, which infringe the copyrighted



content of the plaintiff, which are streamed on the platforms of defendant nos. 1 to 4.

38. Learned counsel appearing for defendant no. 1 appearing on advance notice submits that defendant no. 1 is only a video player and does not encourage any infringing content, therefore, it has no objection if directions are issued to defendant nos. 5 and 6 to block the websites in question.

39. In the above circumstances, the plaintiff has demonstrated a *prima facie* case for grant of injunction and, in case, no *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction is granted, the plaintiff will suffer an irreparable loss. Further, balance of convenience also lies in favour of the plaintiff, and against the defendants.

40. Accordingly, the following directions are issued:

I. Defendant nos. 5 and 6 are directed to block the following websites:

a) starshare.live

<http://starshare.live:8080>

b) xtv.ooo

<http://xtv.ooo:8080>

c) opplex.live

<http://opplex.live:8080>

d) smart4k.cc

<http://smart4k.cc>

II. Defendant nos. 5 to 8, are directed to disclose the information of the registrant details and payment information, as available of the following domains:



S.No.	Domain Name / Website
1.	starshare.live (http://starshare.live:8080)
2.	xtv.ooo (http://xtv.ooo:8080)
3.	opplex.live (http://opplex.live:808)
4.	smart4k.cc (http://smart4k.cc)
5.	https://iptvsmarterpro.app/
6.	https://www.iptvsmarters.com/
7.	https://iptvstreamplayer.com/
8.	https://xciptv.com/

III. Defendant nos. 9 to 16 are directed to block access to the various domains, as follows:

- a) starshare.live
<http://starshare.live:8080>
- b) xtv.ooo
<http://xtv.ooo:8080>
- c) opplex.live
<http://opplex.live:8080>
- d) smart4k.cc
<http://smart4k.cc>

IV. Defendant nos. 17 and 18 are directed to issue a notification calling



upon the various internet and telecom service providers registered under it to block access to the following domains:

- a) starshare.live
<http://starshare.live:8080>
- b) xtv.ooo
<http://xtv.ooo:8080>
- c) opplex.live
<http://opplex.live:8080>
- d) smart4k.cc
<http://smart4k.cc>

V. It is further directed that in case, any domains are discovered by the plaintiff during the course of the proceedings, the same shall be notified by the plaintiff for infringing the plaintiff's exclusive rights, copyrights, by filing the same before the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial). Upon satisfaction of the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) with respect to any infringement being carried out by any domains which are discovered by the plaintiff and notified on the affidavit, the present order shall extend to such domains also.

41. Issue notice to the other defendants by all permissible modes, upon filing of the Process Fee, returnable on the next date of hearing.

42. Let reply be filed by the defendants within a period of four weeks.

43. In their reply, defendant nos. 1 to 4 shall also disclose compliance with respect to the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code), Rules, 2021.

44. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks, thereafter.

45. Compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC, be done, within a period



of one week, from today.

46. List before the Court on 14th July, 2025.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

FEBRUARY 10, 2025

c

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

I.A NO. ____ OF 2025
IN
CS (COMM) NO. 108 OF 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

Star India Pvt. Ltd.

...Plaintiff

Versus

IPTV Smarter Pro & Ors.

...Defendants

INDEX

S. No.	PARTICULARS	PAGE NO.
1.	Notice of Motion	1
2.	Urgent Application	2
3.	Application on behalf of the Plaintiff under Order I Rule 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 seeking impleadment of domains engaged in infringing activities as defendants (Rogue Domains/URLs/UIs) and extension of ad-interim order dated 10.02.2025	3-14
4.	Amended Memo of Parties	15-23
5.	Copy of the Order dated 10.02.2025 in CS (COMM) 108/2025	24-33

6.	Copy of the Judgement dated 10.04.2019 in CS(COMM) 724/ 2017, UTV Software Communications Ltd. & Ors. v. 1337x.to & Ors.	34-132
7.	Affidavit of Service along with Proof of Service	133-135

Yatinder
D-1570/2015
1337x.to & Ors.

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

Place: New Delhi

Saikrishna and Associates

Date : 22.04.2025

Advocates for the Plaintiff

57 Jor Bagh,

New Delhi, 110003

rimjhim@saikrishnaassociates.com

Note:

- 1. The present application is being filed in a app/website blocking suit. The Email IDs of the newly impleaded rogue domains/URLs/ UIs i.e., Defendants No. 37-38 are the only publicly available contact details and have been served with a copy of the present application on the said Email IDs.*
- 2. Please note that the evidence pertaining to the newly impleaded defendants have been filed separately vide diary no._____.*
- 3. All defendants have been served a copy of the present application on their publicly available contact details, i.e. Email IDs, in advance and proof of service along with supporting affidavit of Plaintiff's counsel is filed herewith.*
- 4. This application may be listed before the Ld. Joint Registrar on 24.04.2025 as per the Judgment dated 10.04.2019 in CS(COMM) 724/ 2017, UTV Software Communications Ltd. & Ors. v. 1337x.to & Ors. All prayers are connected in nature. List it as it is, subject to office objections.*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
(ORDINARY ORIGINAL COMMERCIAL JURISDICTION)
I.A NO. ____ OF 2025
IN
CS (COMM) NO. 108 OF 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

Star India Pvt. Ltd.

...Plaintiff

Versus

IPTV Smarter Pro & Ors.

...Defendants

NOTICE OF MOTION

Sir,

The enclosed Application in the aforesaid matter is being filed on behalf of the Plaintiff and is likely to be listed on 24 April 2025 before the Hon'ble High Court. Please take note accordingly.

Yatinder
D-1330/2015
(Yatinder Garg)

Yatinder Garg | Disha Sharma | Rimjhim Tiwari | Ishi Singh
(D/1330/2015) | (D/130/2017) | (D/4021/2022) | (D/1977/2024)
Saikrishna and Associates
Advocates for the Plaintiff
57 Jor Bagh,
New Delhi, 110003
rimjhim@saikrishnaassociates.com

Date: 22.04.2025
Place: New Delhi



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

I.A NO. ____ OF 2025
IN
CS (COMM) NO. 108 OF 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

Star India Pvt. LtdPlaintiff
Versus
IPTV Smarter Pro & Ors. ...Defendants

To,
The Deputy Registrar,
High Court of Delhi,
New Delhi
Sir,

Will you kindly treat the accompanying application as an urgent one in accordance with the High Court Rules and Orders and list the present application before the Hon'ble Court on 24 April 2025.

The ground of urgency:

As prayed

Yours Faithfully,

Yatinder Garg | Disha Sharma | Rimjhim Tiwari | Ishi Singh
(D/1330/2015) | (D/130/2017) | (D/4021/2022) | (D/1977/2024)
Saikrishna and Associates
Advocates for the Plaintiff
57 Jor Bagh,
New Delhi, 110003
rimjhim@saikrishnaassociates.com

Date: 22.04.2025
Place: New Delhi

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
(ORDINARY ORIGINAL COMMERCIAL JURISDICTION)
I.A NO. ____ OF 2025
IN
CS (COMM) NO. 108 OF 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

Star India Pvt. Ltd.

...Plaintiff

versus

IPTV Smarter Pro & Ors.

...Defendants

APPLICATION ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF UNDER
ORDER I RULE 10 OF THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE,
1908 SEEKING IMPLEADMENT OF DOMAINS ENGAGED
IN INFRINGING ACTIVITIES AS DEFENDANTS (ROGUE
DOMAINS/URLs/UIs) AND EXTENSION OF AD-INTERIM
ORDER DATED 10.02.2025

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

1. The Plaintiff has filed the instant suit for permanent injunction restraining infringement of its copyright and broadcast reproduction rights on account of the illegal and unlawful activities by the Defendant Nos. 1-4 and any other unknown Defendants in communicating / facilitating / enabling / authorizing access to the public, the Plaintiff's exclusive content, including, *inter alia*, live Star channels, films, general entertainment content like TV serials, original web series, etc. ("Plaintiff's Exclusive Content") on Defendant Nos. 1-4 Applications and unknown applications ("Impugned Applications"), without authorization / permission from the Plaintiff. The domains (the registrants ostensibly of which are the creators / developers of the Impugned Applications) provide access and/or link where the illegal / infringing copies of the content of the right owners such as the

Plaintiff are stored and/or hosted and are specified along with the Impugned Applications in the memo of parties. That the said domains (“Rogue Domains/ Rogue UI”) are solely dedicated to providing access to the infringing copies of the rights owners’ contents including the Plaintiff herein, on the said Impugned Applications. The Plaintiff has sought the relief of permanent injunction against infringement of its copyright, broadcasting reproduction rights, damages, rendition of accounts, etc., against Defendant Nos. 1 - 4 (Impugned Application and Rogue Domains/Rogue UIs) and unknown Defendants associated with Defendant Nos. 1- 4. The Plaintiff has also sought certain directions against other *pro forma* Defendants, in the event this Hon’ble Court is inclined to issue any injunction against the Defendant Nos.1-4. The Plaintiff seeks the leave of this Hon’ble Court to treat and read the averments contained in the accompanying Plaint as part and parcel of the present Application, which are not being repeated herein for the sake of brevity.

2. It is submitted that *vide* Order dated 10.02.2025, this Hon’ble Court was pleased to pass *an ex-parte ad interim* Order against the additional applications/ domains/ URLs/UIs of the Impugned Applications, directing their respective DNRs to lock/suspend these associated domains/URLs/UIs and disclose the information of their registrant details and payment information. Also directing the ISPs to suspend access to these associated domains/URLs/UIs. The relevant portion of the order dated 10.02.2025 is reproduced herein below:

“40. Accordingly, the following directions are issued:

I. Defendant nos. 5 and 6 are directed to block the following websites:

a) *starshare.live*
http://starshare.live:8080

b) *xtv.ooo*
http://xtv.ooo:8080

c) *opplex.live*
http://opplex.live:8080

d) *smart4k.cc*
http://smart4k.cc

II. Defendant nos. 5 to 8, are directed to disclose the information of the registrant details and payment information, as available of the following domains:

S.No.	Domain Name / Website
1.	starshare.live (http://starshare.live:8080)
2.	xtv.ooo (http://xtv.ooo:8080)
3.	opplex.live (http://opplex.live:808)
4.	smart4k.cc (http://smart4k.cc)
5.	https://iptvsmarterpro.app/
6.	https://www.iptvsmarters.com/
7.	https://iptvstreamplayer.com/
8.	https://xciptv.com/

III. Defendant nos. 9 to 16 are directed to block access to the various domains, as follows:

a) *starshare.live*
http://starshare.live:8080

b) *xtv.ooo*
http://xtv.ooo:8080

c) *opplex.live*
http://opplex.live:8080

d) *smart4k.cc*
http://smart4k.cc

IV. Defendant nos. 17 and 18 are directed to issue a notification calling upon the various internet and telecom

service providers registered under it to block access to the following domains:

*a) starshare.live
http://starshare.live:8080*

*b) xtv.ooo
http://xtv.ooo:8080*

*c) opplex.live
http://opplex.live:8080*

*d) smart4k.cc
http://smart4k.cc”*

3. It is pertinent to note that this Hon’ble Court allowed the Plaintiff to file impleadment applications /Affidavits with respect to applications/ domains/ URLs/UIs that are discovered by the plaintiff during the course of the proceedings to have been engaging in infringement of the Plaintiff’s Exclusive Content. Further, it was directed that the direction passed in *ex-parte ad-interim* order dated 10.02.2025 shall be extended to such applications/ domains/URLs/ UIs as and when an application is filed, subject to the satisfaction of the Ld. Joint Registrar.

“V. It is further directed that in case, any domains are discovered by the plaintiff during the course of the proceedings, the same shall be notified by the plaintiff for infringing the plaintiff’s exclusive rights, copyrights, by filing the same before the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial). Upon satisfaction of the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) with respect to any infringement being carried out by any domains which are discovered by the plaintiff and notified on the affidavit, the present order shall extend to such domains also.”

A Copy of the Order dated 10.02.2025 is attached herewith.

4. It is submitted that “Ashok Kumar” (Defendant No. 19) or John Doe were also impleaded as party to the suit and leave of this

Hon'ble Court was duly sought by the Plaintiff (under paragraph 57 of the Plaint) to implead the additional impugned applications or its additional associated rogue domains/URLs/UIs and amend the memo of parties accordingly, which are indulged in similar activities as that of the Original Defendant Rogue Domains/ Rogue UIs.

5. The present application is being filed seeking impleadment of the rogue domains/ URLs/UIs i.e. Defendant No. 37-38 ("Proposed Defendants") under Order I Rule 10 of CPC. These Proposed Defendants are found to be engaged in illegally broadcasting and making available the Plaintiff's work without any due authorization from the right owner/Plaintiff on the identified rogue domains/ URLs/UIs. The Plaintiff has identified, the following additional rogue domains/URLs/UIs i.e. Defendant Nos. 37-38/ Proposed Defendants that are engaged in the illegal and unauthorised activities, as listed in Document A annexed herewith:

Proposed Defendant Nos.	Additional Rogue Domains/URLs/UIs (Mirror/redirect/alphanumeric domain name of the Proposed Defendant)	Associated Impugned Application	Domain Name Registrar (DNR)
37.	atg100.xyz	IPTV Stream Player (Defendant No.2)	Namecheap Inc. (Defendant No. 6)
38.	filex.tv	IPTV Stream Player (Defendant No.2)	Dynadot LLC (Defendant No.5)

6. Reliance is also placed upon CS (COMM) 724 of 2017, *UTV Software Communication Ltd. & Anr. v. 1337x.to and Ors.*, (UTV Judgement), filed before this the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. The Plaintiffs therein obtained a permanent injunction against the Defendant websites that were communicating to the public, Plaintiffs' copyright works without their authorization. It is submitted that this Hon'ble Court was pleased to record that the Defendant websites are "*Hydra Headed*" rogue websites which on being blocked, actually multiply and resurface as redirect or mirror or alphanumeric websites. Further, this Hon'ble Court held that such hydra headed websites can be blocked by filing an impleadment application under Order I Rule 10 along with the evidence against them. The relevant portion of the Judgement is reiterated herein below:

"94. Now, the question that arises for consideration is how should courts deal with _hydra headed' websites who on being blocked, actually multiply and resurface as alphanumeric or mirror websites. In the present batch of matters though this Court had injuncted the main website by way of the initial injunction order, yet the mirror/alphanumeric/redirect websites had been created subsequently to circumvent the injunction orders.

95. It is pertinent to mention that in Greek mythology the Hydra also called Lernaean Hydra is a serpent-like monster. The Hydra is a nine-headed serpent like snake. It was said that if you cut off one hydra head, two more would grow back.

96. Critics claim that website blocking is an exercise in futility as website operators shift sites—the so-called —whack-a-mole effect.

97. Internationally, there has been some recent development to deal with the aforesaid menace in the form of a "Dynamic

Injunction" though limited to mirror websites.

98. The High Court of Singapore in the case of Disney Enterprise v. M1 Ltd., (2018) SGHC 206 has after discussing the cases of 20 th Century Fox v. British Telecommunications PLC, (2012) 1 All ER 869 and Cartier International AG v. British Sky Broadcasting (supra), held that the applicant was not obligated to return to court for an order with respect to every single IP address of the infringing URLs already determined by the Court. The Court held as under:-

"38 I found that the court has the jurisdiction to issue a dynamic injunction given that such an injunction constitutes "reasonable steps to disable access to the flagrantly infringing online location". This is because the dynamic injunction does not require the defendants to block additional FIOs which have not been included in the main injunction. It only requires the defendants to block additional domain names, URLs and/or IP addresses that provide access to the same websites which are the subject of the main injunction and which I have found constitute FIOs (see [19] - [29] above). Therefore, the dynamic injunction merely blocks new means of accessing the same infringing websites, rather than blocking new infringing websites that have not been included in the main injunction.

39 In fact, under the dynamic injunction applied for in the present case, the plaintiffs would be required to show in its affidavit that the new FQDNs provide access to the same FIOs which are the subject of the main injunction before the defendants would be required to block the new FQDNs (see [6] above)

... xxx xxx xxx.....

42. In relation to S 193DB(3)(d) of the Copyright Act, ie, the effectiveness of the proposed order, the dynamic injunction was necessary to ensure that the main injunction operated effectively to reduce further harm to the plaintiffs. This is due to the ease and speed at which circumventive measures may be taken by owners and operators of FIOs to evade the main injunction, through for instance changing the primary domain name of the FIO. Without a continuing obligation to block

additional domain names, URLs and/or IP addresses upon being informed of such sites, it is unlikely that there would be effective disabling of access to the 53 FIOs." (emphasis supplied)

99. Though the dynamic injunction was issued by the Singapore High Court under the provisions of Section 193 DDA of the Singapore Copyright Act, and no similar procedure exists in India, yet in order to meet the ends of justice and to address the menace of piracy, this Court in exercise of its inherent power under Section 151 CPC permits the plaintiffs to implead the mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites under Order I Rule 10 CPC as these websites merely provide access to the same websites which are the subject of the main injunction.

100. It is desirable that the Court is freed from constantly monitoring and adjudicating the issue of mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites and also that the plaintiffs are not burdened with filing fresh suits. However, it is not disputed that given the wide ramifications of site-wide blocking orders, there has to be judicial scrutiny of such directions and that ISPs ought not to be tasked with the role of arbiters, contrary to their strictly passive and neutral role as intermediaries

101. Consequently, along with the Order I Rule 10 application for impleadment, the plaintiffs shall file an affidavit confirming that the newly impleaded website is a mirror/redirect/alphanumeric website with sufficient supporting evidence. On being satisfied that the impugned website is indeed a mirror/redirect/alphanumeric website of injuncted Rogue Website(s) and merely provides new means of accessing the same primary infringing website, the Joint Registrar shall issue directions to ISPs to disable access in India to such mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites in terms of the orders passed."

A copy of the Judgement dated 10.04.2019 is being filed along with the present Application.

7. It is submitted that the newly Proposed Defendants i.e. Defendant Nos. 37-38 (as identified at para 5) are engaged in similar activities as the Rogue Domains/ Rogue UI associated with Defendant Nos. 1-4 by making available and communicating Plaintiff's work without authorization/ permission. It is submitted that since the Proposed Defendants are showing Plaintiff's work without authorization, these websites fall squarely within the scope of the order dated 10.02.2025 and thus, the Plaintiff is entitled to seek their impleadment and extension of the order dated 10.02.2025.
8. It is submitted that in the present suit, vide Order dated 21.02.2025, 19.03.2025 and 04.04.2025 this Hon'ble Court was pleased to allow Plaintiff's Order 1 Rule 10, CPC application and pass an order impleading and extending the ex-parte order in accordance with the ex-parte order dated 10.02.2025. The Plaintiff had sought to implead the Defendant Nos. 20-36
9. In light of the above, it is imperative to implead Proposed Defendants, i.e., Defendant Nos. 37-38. In lieu of the same, it is submitted that this Hon'ble Court ought to extend the *ex-parte ad-interim injunction* order dated 10.02.2025 against the Proposed Defendants, i.e., Defendant Nos. 37-38. That the evidence produced by the Plaintiff to show the infringing and unauthorized activities of the newly impleaded rogue domains/ URLs/UIs is being filed herewith. Accordingly, pursuant to the Order dated 10.02.2025, the said rogue domain/ URLs/UIs ought to be blocked, and details of its registrant and payment information must be disclosed, thus this Hon'ble Court ought to issue directions to the ISPs, DOT, MEITY and their DNRs, to block the access and lock/suspend and disclose the relevant information of the newly identified rogue domains/ URLs/UIs i.e. Defendant Nos. 37-38.

10. It is submitted that the Plaintiff has, through its investigator, served Legal Notices to the Proposed Defendants calling upon them to cease and desist from indulging in such infringing activities. However, till date, the Proposed Defendants have failed to stop their infringing activities.
11. Thus, in light of the above, it is imperative that the Proposed Defendants (mentioned in paragraph no. 5 herein above) be impleaded in the instant suit as Defendant Nos. 37-38 to safeguard the interest of the Plaintiff.
12. The present application is *bonafide* and no prejudice is caused to any party.

PRAYER:

13. In view of the above, the Plaintiff humbly prays that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to:
 - a. Implead the additional rogue associated domain / URLs/UIs (identified in paragraph no. 5), as *Defendant No.37-38* to the instant suit.
 - b. Take the amended Memo of Parties (annexed with the present application) on record;
 - c. Extend the Order dated 10.02.2025 in relation to Defendant No.37-38.

- d. Pass any further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case be passed.


It is prayed accordingly.



Ankush Mahajan

Authorised Signatory

Yours Faithfully,



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

Place: New Delhi

Date : 21.04.2025

Saikrishna and Associates

Advocates for the Plaintiff

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

I.A. No. ____ OF 2025
CS(COMM) NO. 108 OF 2025

IN THE MATTER OF
Star India Pvt. Ltd.

...Plaintiff

Versus

IPTV Smarter Pro & Ors.

...Defendants

AFFIDAVIT OF MR. ANKUSH MAHAJAN, S/O MR. MANMOHAN MAHAJAN, AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS, AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY OF PLAINTIFFS, HAVING ITS OFFICE AT STAR HOUSE, URMI ESTATE, 95 GANPATRAO KADAM MARG, LOWER PAREL (W), MUMBAI, 400013, PRESENTLY AT NEW DELHI

I, the abovenamed deponent, do hereby solemnly affirm and declare as under:

1. That I am the authorized signatory of the Plaintiff and am duly authorized and competent to swear the present Affidavit.
2. That I have read the contents of the accompanying Application and the contents of the same, as well as the documents filed along with it.


The same may be read as part and parcel of the present affidavit, the same is not being reproduced herein for the sake of brevity.

VERIFICATION:

Verified at New Delhi on this 21 day of April 2025 that the contents of the above Affidavit are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief and nothing material has been concealed therefrom.

CERTIFIED THAT THE DEPONENT
Smt./Smt./Km.
S/o, W/o R/o
Identified by Shri/Smt.
Has solemnly affirmed before me at
Delhi on
That the contents of the Affidavit which
have been read & explained to him/her
are true & correct to his/her knowledge

21 APR 2025 NOTARY



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

CS (COMM) NO. ____ OF 2025

AMENDED 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@disney.com
Mobile Number: +91 9315762402

...Plaintiff

Versus

1. IPTV Smarter Pro
<https://iptvsmarterpro.app/>; www.iptvsmarters.com
Associated domains/URLs/UIs:
starshare.live; <http://starshare.live:8080>
H No. - 121 TDI City Sector -118,
Mohali, Punjab, India, 140501
Email: support@iptvsmarters.com;
admin@iptvsmarters.com;

info@prodigylegal.com; abuse@zetservers.com
 aman@newsparktechnology.com;
 info@smarterspro.com
 Phone number: +91 969105552

2. IPTV Stream Player

<https://iptvstreamplayer.com/>

Associated Domains/URLs/UIs:

xtv.ooo; <http://xtv.ooo:8080>

A-786, Sector 17

Chandigarh

Punjab - 160017

Email: abuse@ipv4superhub.com; iptvstreamplayer@gmail.com

iptvarplayer01@gmail.com; arsoft05@gmail.com

3. XCIPTV Player

<https://xciptv.com/>

Associated Domains/URLs/UIs:

opplex.live; <http://opplex.live:8080>

Email: support@ottrun.com; abuse@logicweb.com

Phone Number: +91 8826275333

4. iSTB Player

Associated Domains/URLs/UIs:

smart4k.cc; <http://smart4k.cc>

Email: na.apps.co+support@gmail.com;

nihalahmed.apps@gmail.com

5. Dynadot LLC

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

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

6. Namecheap, Inc.
 4600 East Washington Street Suite 300,
 Phoenix, Arizona 85034, US
 Email: support@namecheap.com ;
grievance.officer@namecheap.com

7. Godaddy.com, LLC
 4th Floor, Statesman House, Barakhamba Road
 Connaught Place, New Delhi,
 Central Delhi, Delhi.
 Email: grievanceofficer@godaddy.com

8. Hostinger operations, UAB
 Hostinger, UAB. Jonavos str. 60C, 44192
 Email: support@hostinger.com

9. 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

10. 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

11. Bharti Airtel Ltd.

Airtel Center Plot No. 16,

Udyog Vihar, Phase-IV, Gurugram – 122015, India

E-mail: amit.bhatia@airtel.com

12. 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

13. Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd.

5th Floor, Mahanagar Doorsanchar Sadan

9, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road

New Delhi – 110003

E-mail: raco.mtnl@gmail.com, mtnlcsco@gmail.com,
gmracomtnl@gmail.com

14. 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

15. 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

16. 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
Florescia.deproses@vodafoneidea.com
Sanjeet.sarkar@vodafoneidea.com
Arun.madhav@vodafoneidea.com

17. 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

18. 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
19. *Ashok Kumar(s)*
20. 9Xtream Player
<https://9xtream.com/>
Associated Doamin/ URLs/ UIs
m2e.fun; <http://m2e.fun:8080>
Email: abuse@globaltelehost.com,
xtreamplayeranddownloader@gmail.com, khadijanasib12@gmail.com,
lucidsws.info@gmail.com
21. opplex.ch
Email: support@ottrun.com, abuse@pio.hosting
22. opplex.st
Email: support@ottrun.com, abuse@pio.hosting
23. opplex.tv
Email: abuse@ipv4superhub.com, support@ottrun.com
24. opplex.cyou
Email: abuse@hetzner.de, support@ottrun.com
25. rolextv.asia
Email: support@ottrun.com, abuse@pio.hosting

26. xsmarters.top
Email: abuse@hetzner.de, support@ottrun.com
27. zonflix.vip
Email: abuse@hetzner.de, support@ottrun.com
28. EPAG Domain services GmbH
Strandvejen125
DK-2900Hellerup,
Denmark
Email: sales@ascio.com
29. NETIM
264 avenue Arthur Notebart,
59160 Lille France
Email: sales@netim.com; grievance-officier@netim.net;
abuse@netim.net
30. Namesilo LLP
1300 E. Missouri Avenue Suite A-110
Email: internaldomains@namesilo.com
31. mega4k.one
Email: abuse@cloudinnovation.org;
iptvarplayer01@gmail.com
32. premiumtvsn.net
Email: abuse@zetServers.com
33. starshare.me
Email: abuse@zetServers.com
34. starshare.org
Email: abuse@zetServers.com

35. XP IPTV Player
Associated Domain/URL/UI
etrontv.xyz;http://etrontv.xyz:8080
Email:9x.playerpro@gmail.com,
xpiptv.player@gmail.com,
abuse@hetzner.com
36. Televizo IPTV Player
https://televizo.net/
Associate Domain/URL/UI
hybridtv.live ; http://hybridtv.live:8080
Email: abuse@hetzner.com, televizoiptv@gmail.com
37. atg100.xyz
Email: iptvarplayer01@gmail.com, iptvstreamplayer@gmail.com,
abuse@host9x.com
38. filex.tv
Email: iptvarplayer01@gmail.com, iptvstreamplayer@gmail.com,
abuse@estoxy.com

.... 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

rimjhim@saikrishnaassociates.com

Date: 22.04.2025

Place: New Delhi

DOCUMENT – A

Proposed Defendant Nos.	Additional Rogue Domains/URLs/UIs (Mirror/redirect/alphanumeric domain name of the Proposed Defendant)	Associated Impugned Application	Domain Name Registrar (DNR)
37.	atg100.xyz	IPTV Stream Player (Defendant No.2)	Namecheap Inc. (Defendant No. 6)
38.	filex.tv	IPTV Stream Player (Defendant No.2)	Dynadot LLC (Defendant No.5)

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.