



\$~38

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(COMM) 1203/2025**
JIOSTAR INDIA PRIVATE LIMITEDPlaintiff
Through: Mr. Siddharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder
Garg, Mr. Priyansh Kohli, Ms. Ishi
Singh, Mr. Shudhata Sudhir & Mr.
Manish Singh, Advocates.

versus

CRICFY TV & ORS.Defendants
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

%

11.11.2025

I.A. 27872/2025 (Exemption from pre-institution Mediation)

1. This is an Application filed by the Plaintiff seeking exemption from instituting pre-litigation Mediation under Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 (“CC Act”).
2. As the present matter 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.
3. The Application stands disposed of.

I.A. 27873/2025 (U/S 80 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908)

4. The present Application has been filed under Section 80 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (“CPC”) seeking exemption from issuing Notice to Defendant No. 17, Department of Telecommunications (“DoT”), and Defendant No. 18, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology

CS(COMM) 1203/2025

Page 1 of 11



(“MeITY”), Defendant No. 9, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. and Defendant No. 12, Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited.

5. In view of the urgent relief and the nature of relief sought against Defendant Nos. 17, 18, 9 and 12, the Plaintiff is exempted from effecting prior notice under Section 80 of the CPC upon Defendant Nos. 17, 18, 9 and 12.

6. The Application stands disposed of.

I.A. 27875/2025 (Extension of time to file Court Fees)

7. The present Application has been filed by the Plaintiff under Section 149 read with Section 151 of the CPC, seeking exemption from payment of Court Fees at the time of the filing of the Suit.

8. Considering the submissions made in the present Application, time of two weeks is granted to deposit the Court Fees.

9. The Application stands disposed of.

CS(COMM) 1203/2025

10. Let the Plaint be registered as a Suit.

11. Issue Summons. Let the Summons be served to the Defendants through all permissible modes upon filing of the Process Fee.

12. The Summons shall state that the Written Statement(s) shall be filed by the Defendants within 30 days from the date of the receipt of Summons. Along with the Written Statement(s), the Defendants shall also file an Affidavit of Admission / Denial of the documents of the Plaintiff, without which the Written Statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

13. Liberty is granted to the Plaintiff to file Replication(s), if any, within 30 days from the receipt of the Written Statement(s). Along with the Replication(s) filed by the Plaintiff, an Affidavit of Admission / Denial of the



documents of Defendants be filed by the Plaintiff, without which the Replication(s) shall not be taken on record.

14. In case any Party is placing reliance on a document, which is not in their power and possession, its details and source shall be mentioned in the list of reliance, which shall also be filed with the pleadings.

15. If any of the Parties wish to seek inspection of any documents, the same shall be sought and given within the prescribed timelines.

16. List before the learned Joint Registrar on 23.12.2025 for completion of service and pleadings.

I.A. 27874/2025 (O-XI R-1(4) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908)

17. The present Application has been filed on behalf of the Plaintiff under Order XI Rule 1(4) of the CPC as applicable to Commercial Suits under the CC Act seeking leave to place on record additional documents.

18. The Plaintiffs are permitted to file additional documents in accordance with the provisions of the CC Act and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

19. Accordingly, the Application stands disposed of.

I.A. 27871/2025 (U/O XXXIX Rules 1 & 2 of CPC)

20. Issue Notice. Notice be served through all permissible modes upon filing of the Process Fees.

21. The Plaintiff has filed the present Suit seeking a permanent injunction to restrain infringement of their Broadcast Reproduction Rights by Defendant Nos. 1 to 4 (“**Defendants’ Applications**”) and other unknown parties.

22. Defendant Nos. 5 to 7 are Domain Name Registrars (“**DNRs**”) arrayed for the purpose of blocking access to the UI(s)/ URL(s)/ Website(s) associated



with Defendants' Applications and to disclose information such as Name, Address, Email address, Mobile Number, payment details etc. related to the Registrants of the UI(s)/ URL(s)/ Website(s) associated with Defendants' Applications.

23. Defendant Nos. 8 to 16 are Internet Service Providers ("**ISPs**"), Defendant Nos. 17 and 18 are arrayed by the Plaintiff to assist in enforcing / ensuring compliance with any orders of injunction that may be granted during the course of proceedings.

24. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff made the following submissions before this Court:

24.1 The subject matter of the present suit pertains to the 'South Africa Tour of India 2025' and 'New Zealand Tour of India 2026' ("**Events**"), organised by the Board of Control for Cricket in India ("**BCCI**"). The South Africa Tour of India 2025 is scheduled to run from 14.11.2025 till 19.12.2025 and the New Zealand Tour of India 2026 is scheduled to run from 11.01.2026 till 31.01.2026. The matches will be held in India, and include a total of 18 matches.

24.2 The Plaintiff owns the media rights in respect of various sporting events including international cricket matches organized by the BCCI and International Cricket Council. The Plaintiff, along with its affiliates, is the owner of an extensive portfolio of more than 100 channels in over ten languages ("**JioStar Channels**"). The Plaintiff also owns and operates an OTT platform, JioHotstar.

24.3 The Plaintiff entered into the Media Rights Agreement with the



BCCI for exclusive global digital media rights and television rights in relation to various BCCI events, including the Events, for a period of five years from 2023 to 2028 (“**Exclusive Rights**”). The existence of Exclusive Rights in favour of the Plaintiff has also been confirmed by the BCCI *vide* letter dated 12.09.2023 and 25.09.2024. Consequently, the Plaintiff enjoys broadcast reproduction rights which are contemplated and conferred in terms of Section 37 of the Copyright Act, 1957 (“**Copyright Act**”).

24.4 Defendant Nos. 1 to 4, are online locations and mobile applications whose purpose is to communicate, make available for viewing and providing access to content of the Plaintiff free of cost (or at minimal subscription) and without any authorization. These rogue apps are completely illegal mobile applications and have no permission or authorisation to reproduce, store, transmit, communicate, make available for viewing or provide access to any of the Plaintiff’s Content. It is also submitted that most of the content communicated through these rogue apps does not belong to them. It is also contended that the download, distribution and use of these Android based rogue apps, occurs through an Android Package Kit. The primary intent and purpose of these rogue apps is to exploit various copyright-protected works, of the Plaintiff’s content and to provide an alternative to legitimate sources to the user, such that the user does not have to pay for enjoying the copyright-protected works. The Defendants’ Applications have also



illegally communicated recently concluded West Indies Tour of India 2025 in which Plaintiff has exclusive rights.

- 24.5 Defendant Nos. 5 to 7 are Domain Name Registrars (“**DNRs**”) of the domain names, where the said associated UI(s)/ URL(s)/ Website(s) are being hosted. Defendant Nos. 8 to 16, are various Internet Service Providers (“**ISPs**”), and Telecom Service Providers (“**TSPs**”). Defendant Nos. 17 and 18 are, respectively, the DoT and MeitY.
- 24.6 Based on past instances of illegal dissemination of major sporting events, the Plaintiff apprehends that once the Events commences, given their status as one of the most popular sporting events in the world, a large number of the mobile applications, included, but not limited to Defendant Nos. 1 to 4, are likely to indulge in unauthorised disseminations and communications of the cricket matches and parts thereof, on online platforms (“**Impugned Activities**”). Additionally, that a large number of associated UI(s)/ URL(s)/ Website(s), upon being blocked / taken down, may also create new UI(s)/ URL(s)/ Website(s) to continue the illegal transmission / communication / broadcast of the Events.
- 24.7 On previous occasions, while an initial injunction was granted in respect of the few applications and associated UI(s)/ URL(s)/ Website(s) identified in the plaint, a substantial number of Applications/ UI(s)/ URL(s)/ Website(s) tend to be subsequently uncovered, which continue to unlawfully disseminate the sporting events.



24.8 In such circumstances, the Plaintiff in order to protect its Exclusive Rights, seeks an injunction restraining the Impugned Activities.

25. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Counsel for the Plaintiff, the pleadings and the documents on record, the Plaintiff has secured the Exclusive Rights for various events, including, the Events as specified in the Rights Confirmation Letter dated 12.09.2023, through considerable financial investment. The Events will be broadcasted through the Plaintiff's JioStar Channels and its OTT platform JioHotstar, which is accessible across a variety of digital devices including computers, smartphones, tablets, and other electronic gadgets.

26. The apprehension of the unauthorized dissemination, telecasting, or broadcasting of the Events on Defendants' Applications shall pose a significant threat to the Plaintiff's revenue streams undermining the value of the considerable investment made by the Plaintiff in acquiring the Exclusive Rights. Additionally, the broadcast content, including footage, commentary, and other composite elements, is fully safeguarded under the Copyright Act. Therefore, the unauthorized use of these elements shall also infringe upon the copyright protections accorded to the broadcast content under the Exclusive Rights.

27. The issue of rogue apps engaging in the piracy of copyrighted content presents a recurring threat and disseminating or communicating any portions of the Events, without proper authorization or licensing from the Plaintiff, would violate the Plaintiff's Exclusive Rights.

28. This Court in **Universal City Studios LLC v. Dotmovies.baby**, 2023:DHC:5842, granted a 'Dynamic+' injunction granting protection to



works generated during the course of the pendency of the suit as also future works that will be created in the future so that while the content is generated, the same is not infringed upon in violation of Section 37 of the Copyright Act, till the time Courts come to the rescue of the right holder.

29. In view of the above, given that the Plaintiff's Exclusive Rights, as acquired from BCCI are required to be protected, if an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction is not granted at this stage, irreparable harm would be caused to the Plaintiff. Balance of convenience also lies in the favour of the Plaintiff. The immediate interim relief is required to be granted in this case, considering the live broadcast of the Events. Any delay in blocking access to the associated UI(s)/ URL(s)/ Website(s) used by Defendants' Applications or any other UI(s)/ URL(s)/ Website(s) engaged in the Impugned Activities, could lead to financial losses for the Plaintiff, and an irreparable breach of their Exclusive Rights. Therefore, swift action to prevent the alleged infringements is crucial in the present case.

30. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case has been made out by the Plaintiff for the grant of an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction. In view of the above, till the next date of hearing, Defendant Nos. 1 to 4 their owners, partners, proprietors, officers, servants, employees, and all others in capacity of principals or agents, acting for and on their behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under them (and any other UI(s)/website(s) which appears to be associated with any of the defendant apps and website(s) based on its name, branding or the identity of its operator, or discovered to provide additional means of accessing, the Defendants' Applications, and other domains/domain/apps/UI(s) along with their sub-domains and subdirectories, owners/website operators/entities which are discovered to have been



engaging in infringing the Plaintiff's exclusive broadcasting rights), are hereby restrained from, in any manner, hosting, streaming, reproducing, distributing, making available to the public and/or communicating to the public, or facilitating the same, on their Apps/UI(s)/website(s), through the internet in any manner whatsoever, the upcoming South Africa Tour of India 2025 and New Zealand Tour of India 2026.

31. Defendant Nos. 5 to 7, i.e., the Domain Name Registrars, are directed to block and suspend the following Domain Names associated with Defendant Nos. 1 to 4 within 72 hours from the receipt of the Notice and copy of this Order:

S.No.	List of Associated UI(s) and Website(s) (Document A filed with Plaintiff)
Namecheap Inc. (Defendant No.6)	
1.	https://cricfytv.live/
2.	https://sportzxtv.com/
3.	popefranciss.site
Namesilo LLC (Defendant No. 5)	
4.	ghdghjsjbdj17.top
5.	cfyhfhghjjv78.top
6.	clyche.pro
7.	https://hdstreamz.life/
Ownregistrar Inc. (Defendant No.7)	
8.	https://ghdsportspro.net/

32. Further, Defendant Nos. 5 to 7 shall file an Affidavit in a sealed cover / password protected document disclosing the complete details of the abovementioned UI(s) / Website(s), as available with Defendant Nos. 5 to 7, including e-mail addresses, mobile numbers, contact details, payment details

CS(COMM) 1203/2025 Page 9 of 11



and KYC details, within four weeks from the receipt of the Notice and copy of this Order.

33. Defendant Nos. 8 to 16, i.e., ISPs / TSPs, are also directed to block UI(s) / Website(s) as specified in Paragraph No. 31 of this Order, within 72 hours from the receipt of the Notice and copy of this Order by the Plaintiff's Counsel.

34. Defendant Nos. 17 and 18 are directed to issue necessary directions to all ISPs for blocking / removing access to the website(s) as specified in Paragraph No. 31 of this Order.

35. Prior to or during the currency of the Events, if any further application(s)/ UI(s)/ website(s) are discovered, which are unauthorizedly streaming and communicating content over which the Plaintiff has Exclusive Rights, the Plaintiff is granted liberty to communicate the details of such application(s)/ UI(s)/ website(s) to Defendant Nos. 5 to 18 for blocking the said UI(s)/ website(s) on a real time basis without undue delay. Upon receiving the said intimation from the Plaintiff, Defendant Nos. 8 to 16 shall take steps to immediately block the said UI(s)/ website(s) in question and Defendant Nos. 17 and 18 shall also issue necessary blocking orders immediately upon the Plaintiff communicating the details of the UI(s)/ website(s), which are illegally streaming the Events.

36. Such a relief is granted in the present matter as any delay in blocking the UI(s)/ website(s) would, in fact, result in considerable pecuniary loss to the Plaintiff and result in irreparable violation of the Exclusive Rights of the Plaintiff.

37. The Plaintiff shall continue to file Affidavits providing the details of the newly discovered application(s)/ UI(s)/ website(s), their Domain Names,



and the URL(s), which are communicated and blocked to ensure that the Court is fully informed of the application(s)/ UI(s)/ website(s) in respect of which blocking orders are sought. The Plaintiff shall also file appropriate applications for impleadment of the said application(s)/ UI(s)/ website(s) and this Order shall be extended against the said newly added Defendants.

38. If any application/ UI/ website, which is not primarily infringing the Exclusive Rights, is blocked in pursuance of this Order, such entity is permitted to approach the Court by giving an undertaking that it does not intend to do any illegal dissemination of the content over which the Plaintiff has Exclusive Rights and the Court would consider modifying the injunction, if the facts and circumstances so warrant.

39. Let the Reply to the present Application be filed within four weeks after service of Notice. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

40. The compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of the CPC be done within two weeks.

41. List before this Court on 03.03.2026.

TEJAS KARIA, J

NOVEMBER 11, 2025/ 'A'